

Project Tracking No.:

Return on Investment (ROI) Program Funding Application

This template was built using the ITD ROI Submission Intranet application.

FINAL AUDIT REQUIRED: The Enterprise Quality Assurance Office of the Information Technology Department is required to perform post implementation outcome audits for all Pooled Technology funded projects and may perform audits on other projects.

This is a request for additional lowAccess Fund.

Amount of additional funding requested: \$137,900

FYI:

Amount of original funding received for implementation: \$66,000 (\$48,000 for IT programming and implementation; \$12,000 for paper permits imaging; \$6,000 for hosting at ITE for the first year)

Total amount of lowAccess Fund for the project: \$203,900

Section I: Proposal

Date: _January 5, 2007 ___

Agency Name: IDNR

Project Name: Improving Public Access to Iowa's Water Pollution Control Permits

Agency Manager: Angela Chen

Agency Manager Phone Number / E-Mail: (515) 281-4736/angela.chen@dnr.state.ia.us

Executive Sponsor (Agency Director or Designee): Jeff Vonk

A. Project Summary: Describe the nature and use of the proposed project, including what is to be accomplished, how it will be accomplished, and what the costs and benefits will be.

The purpose of this project is to increase public access to water pollution control permit information. This will be accomplished by developing a web front end for an existing database that contains the permit data. Web access will be provided for two user groups – the general public and permit holders. The general public will be able to review each permit and its supporting rationale. The permit holders would have the additional capabilities of submitting permit renewal applications and reviewing proposed permits online. This project will encourage the public to be more actively involved with regulating and protecting Iowa's waters, which is one of the goals outlined for the Environment in the Vilsack/Pederson Leadership Agenda.

B. Strategic Plan: How does the proposed project fit into the strategic plan of the requesting agency?

The mission for the Department of Natural Resources (IDNR) is: to conserve and enhance our natural resources in cooperation with individuals and organizations to improve the quality of life for Iowans and ensure a legacy for future generations.

One critical component of IDNR's responsibility is to issue water pollution control permits to cities and businesses to minimize the pollution to Iowa's waters. This permitting program is called NPDES (National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System). This permitting program is required to involve public in the permitting processes.

The proposed project will provide easier access for the public so that they can see which draft permits are ready for public comments and to let them provide comments online to the IDNR. IDNR's responses to all public comments will also be made available online to further the public involvement. In addition, the proposed project will increase the efficiency of IDNR's NPDES permitting process and thus further the mission to protect Iowa's natural resources.

C. Current Technology: Provide a summary of the technology used by the current system. How does the proposed project impact the agency's technological direction?

Currently, public access to water pollution control permits is provided in paper and via phone call or emails. An interested citizen would need to come to the Wallace State Office Building in Des Moines to view the permits in IDNR's Record Center. If they want to make a copy, they would have to pay for copying cost. If they cannot come to the IDNR Record Center, they would have to call either a permit writer or staff at the Record Center to request the permit be mailed to them at a cost for processing the request.

In addition, federal regulation requires that before IDNR finalize any NPDES permit, it must be put on public notice; the IDNR must allow time for public comments; and IDNR must address pertinent public comments. Currently, this public involvement process is done through newspaper publication and posting at the facilities seeking permits. IDNR had received feedback from citizens indicating that it is hard for them to follow the newspaper notifications and provide timely comments. The proposed project will provide significantly better access for the public to search and review permits, and to provide timely comments to any and all draft permits without missing the opportunity to do so.

Permit applications forms are currently posted on IDNR's website. However, permit applicant can only apply for permit by filling out the paper application forms. Completing forms on paper is inefficient for the applicant, especially if there were mistakes that have to be erased and re-entered. In addition, when the application forms were submitted to the IDNR, there were many instances when the forms were not completed fully. Those incomplete forms require addition time and effort from both applicants and IDNR permit writers to correct the mistakes or filling in the missing information required by the regulations. This delays the permitting process, causes permits to expire, and thus Iowa cannot protect its water appropriately. The web-based permit application process with its built-in quality control checks would greatly enhance the entire permit application process.

IDNR is currently working with US EPA and other stakeholders to develop an online facility-based database. This proposed project will move IDNR one step closer to fully implement that facility-based database.

D. Statutory or Other Requirements

Is this project or expenditure necessary for compliance with a Federal law, rule, or order? No

YES (If "Yes", cite the specific Federal law, rule or order, with a short explanation of how this project is impacted by it.)

Explanation:

Is this project or expenditure required by state law, rule or order? No

YES (If "YES", cite the specific state law, rule or order, with a short explanation of how this project is impacted by it.)

Explanation:

Does this project or expenditure meet a health, safety or security requirement? No

YES (If "YES", explain.)

Explanation:

Is this project or expenditure necessary for compliance with an enterprise technology standard? No

YES (If "YES", cite the specific standard.)

Explanation:

[This section to be scored by application evaluator.]

Evaluation (15 Points Maximum)

If the answer to these criteria is "no," the point value is zero (0). Depending upon how directly a qualifying project or expenditure may relate to a particular requirement (federal mandate, state mandate, health-safety-security issue, or compliance with an enterprise technology standard), or satisfies more than one requirement (e.g. it is mandated by state and federal law and fulfills a health and safety mandate), 1-15 points awarded.



E. Impact on Iowa's Citizens

a. Project Participants - List the project participants (i.e. single agency, multiple agencies, State government enterprise, citizens, associations, or businesses, other levels of government, etc.) and provide commentary concerning the nature of participant involvement. Be sure to specify who and how many **direct** users the system will impact. Also specify whether the system will be of use to other interested parties: who they may be, how many people are estimated, and how they will use the system.

The primary participant in this project will be IDNR, who is the business owner.

The direct users include more than 1500 industrial or municipal sites applying for and/or renewing NPDES permits every five years.

The general public (approximately 3 million in Iowa), the media and law enforcement will use the system to search and display the permit information as well as to provide comments to draft permits.

b. Service Improvements - Summarize the extent to which the project or expenditure improves service to Iowa citizens or within State government. Included would be such items as improving the quality of life, reducing the government hassle factor, providing enhanced services, improving work processes, etc.

Through the implementation of the proposed project, IDNR will increase efficiency in its permitting operations through reduced data entry time and by receiving applications that are more accurate and completed. The time that is saved by this online application would allow IDNR staff to provide better and more effective service to its customers (including regulated communities and the public), to process permit applications more quickly, to provide technical assistance to regulated communities, and to react more quickly to public comments on all matters related to water pollution control (NPDES) permits.

By posting NPDES permits on the web and posting draft permits online, IDNR will reduce the need for the public to come to IDNR's Record Center to view permits or draft permits. The proposed project will also reduce the burden for the public to search newspapers published all across Iowa just so they would know which draft permit is ready for public comments. Instead, the proposed project would allow them to check on IDNR's web site and get a list of all the draft permits on public notice so that they can review and decide which one to comment. The proposed online comment submission capability would also save public postage cost.

For the regulated communities, the proposed project would provide a more efficient tool to apply for permits.

c. Citizen Impact – Summarize how the project leads to a more informed citizenry, facilitates accountability, and encourages participatory democracy. If this is an extension of another project, what has been the adoption rate of Iowa's citizens or government employees with the preceding project?

The public will have easier access to permits and justifications for permit limitations. They would be able to search permits across the state by city, county, or other criteria. Knowing permits, and the limits contained in the permits, would inform citizens so that they could better understand what to expect from each wastewater discharge point from cities and businesses. If they observe abnormal wastewater discharges, they could call IDNR to investigate and thus facilitate the accountability of the regulated communities.

Also, a list of all the draft permits ready to receive public comments will be available on the web site so that the public can easily find the list, review any or all of the draft permits on the list and provides timely comments before the permits are finalized. In addition, one function of this proposed project is to allow public to sign up via proposed

web site to receive notifications from IDNR when a draft permit meeting their selection criteria (such as city, county, river/stream, type of business, etc.) is put on public notice. This entire public comment web function will greatly reduce the amount of time the public spends on searching newspapers around Iowa to ensure they have all the draft permits covered.

d. Public Health and/or Safety – Explain requirements or impact on the health and safety of the public.

The proposed project will significantly increase public awareness and participation in protecting Iowa’s waters. The increased efficiency in permitting process as a result of this project would also protect Iowa’s waters better. The combined efforts from the public and IDNR would thus provide better quality of life to Iowans from the perspective of better water resources for fishing and increased opportunities for water related recreational activities without health risks.

[This section to be scored by application evaluator.]	
<u>Evaluation</u> (15 Points Maximum) <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Minimally directly impacts Iowa citizens (0-5 points).• Moderately directly impacts Iowa citizens (6-10 points).• Significantly directly impacts Iowa citizens (11-15 points).	<input type="text"/>

[This section to be scored by application evaluator.]	
<u>Evaluation</u> (10 Points Maximum) <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Minimally improves customer service (0-3 points).• Moderately improves customer service (4-6 points).• Significantly improves customer service (7-10 points).	<input type="text"/>

F. Process Reengineering

Provide a pre-project or pre-expenditure (before implementation) description of the impacted system or process. Be sure to include the procedures used to administer the impacted system or process and how citizens interact with the current system.

Response:

Permit applications are submitted in hard copy and require that the data be manually entered into the system. Permit information can only be obtained through either a visit to IDNR Record Center in Des Moines or by telephone/email/mail inquiry made to IDNR staff.

Provide a post-project or post-expenditure (after implementation) description of the impacted system or process. Be sure to include the procedures used to administer the impacted system or process and how citizens will interact with the proposed system. In particular, note if the project or expenditure makes use of information technology in reengineering traditional government processes.

Response:

It will be possible for permit applications to be submitted electronically. The application data will be available for routing and approval without the need for a hard copy. The information will be more readily accessible to the general public to review and provide comments.

[This section to be scored by application evaluator.]

Evaluation (10 Points Maximum)

- Minimal use of information technology to reengineer government processes (0-3 points).
- Moderate use of information technology to reengineer government processes (4-6 points).
- Significant use of information technology to reengineer government processes (7-10).



G. Timeline

Provide a projected timeline for this project. Include such items as planning, database design, coding, implementation, testing, conversion, parallel installation, and date of final release. Also include the parties responsible for each item.

Deliverables	Target Completion Date
Enable public access to the existing permits	March 19, 2007
Enable all other roles to view and do the defined activities with the exception of the application forms themselves and the related features	April 9th, 2007

Enable all features as described in the requirements document as of 01/02/07	April 23, 2007
--	----------------

[This section to be scored by application evaluator.]

Evaluation (10 Points Maximum)

- The timeline contains several problem areas (0-3 points).
- The timeline seems reasonable with few problem areas (4-6 points).
- The timeline seems reasonable with no problem areas (7-10).



H. Funding Requirements

On a fiscal year basis, enter the estimated cost by funding source: Be sure to include developmental costs and ongoing costs, such as those for hosting the site, maintenance, upgrades,

	FY06		FY07		FY08	
	Cost(\$)	% Total Cost	Cost(\$)	% Total Cost	Cost(\$)	% Total Cost
State General Fund	\$0	0%	\$0	0%	\$0	0%
Pooled Tech. Fund /lowAccess Fund	\$66,000	%	\$137,900	0%	\$0	0%
Federal Funds	\$0	0%	\$0	0%	\$0	0%
Local Gov. Funds	\$0	0%	\$0	0%	\$0	0%
Grant or Private Funds	\$0	0%	\$0	0%	\$0	0%
Other Funds (Specify)	\$0	0%	\$0	0%	\$0	0%
Total Project Cost	\$66,000	32%	\$137,900	68%		0%
Non-Pooled Tech. Total	\$0	0%	\$0	0%	\$0	0%

[This section to be scored by application evaluator.]

Evaluation (10 Points Maximum)

- The funding request contains questionable items (0-3 points).
- The funding request seems reasonable with few questionable items (4-6 points).
- The funding request seems reasonable with no problem areas (7-10).



I. Scope

Is this project the first part of a future, larger project?

- YES (If "YES", explain.) NO, it is a stand-alone project.

Explanation:

Is this project a continuation of a previously begun project? No

- YES (If "YES", explain.)

Explanation: This request for additional funding is the result of better understanding of ITE staff on the details of DNR's project. Please see attached cover memo for more details.

[This section to be scored by application evaluator.]

Evaluation (10 Points Maximum)

- This is the first year of a multi-year project / expenditure or project / expenditure duration is one year (0-5 points)
- The project / expenditure is of a multi-year nature and each annual component produces a definable and stand-alone outcome, result or product (2-8 points).
- This is beyond the first year of a multi-year project / expenditure (6-10 points)



The last part of this criteria involves rating the extent to which a project or expenditure is at an advanced stage of implementation and termination of the project / expenditure would waste previously invested resources.

J. Source of Funds

On a fiscal year basis, how much of the total project cost (\$ amount and %) would be absorbed by your agency from non-Pooled Technology and/or IOWAccess funds? If desired, provide additional comment / response below.

Response:

All costs after the initial development and implementation, and the first year's hosting costs, will be absorbed by IDNR.

[This section to be scored by application evaluator.]

Evaluation (5 Points Maximum)

- 0% (0 points)
- 1%-12% (1 point)
- 13%-25% (2 points)
- 25%-38% (3 points)
- 39%-50% (4 points)
- Over 50% (5 points)



Section II: Financial Analysis

A. Project Budget Table

It is necessary to estimate and assign a useful life figure to each cost identified in the project budget. Useful life is the amount of time that project related equipment, products, or services are utilized before they are updated or replaced. In general, the useful life of hardware is three (3) years and the useful life of software is four (4) years. Depending upon the nature of the expense, the useful life for other project costs will vary between one (1) and four (4) years. On an exception basis, the useful life of individual project elements or the project as a whole may exceed four (4) years. Additionally, the ROI calculation must include all new annual ongoing costs that are project related.

The Total Annual Prorated Cost (State Share) will be calculated based on the following equation:

$$\left[\left(\frac{\text{Budget Amount}}{\text{Useful Life}} \right) \times \% \text{ State Share} \right] + (\text{Annual Ongoing Cost} \times \% \text{ State Share}) = \text{Annual Prorated Cost}$$

Budget Line Items	Budget Amount (1st Year Cost)	Useful Life (Years)	% State Share	Annual Ongoing Cost (After 1st Year)	% State Share	Annual Prorated Cost
Agency Staff	12,000	5	100			2,400
Software						
Hardware						
Training						
Facilities						
Professional Services						
Contractor Services	185,900	4	100			46,475
Supplies, Maint, etc.				6,000	100	6,000
Other						
Totals	197,900			6,000		52,475

B. Spending plan

Explain how the funds will be allocated.

\$12,000 of the fund will be used by IDNR to transfer all the permits in paper format into electronic format.

\$185,900 of the fund will be used to complete the design and implementation of the project.

C. Tangible and/or Intangible Benefits

Respond to the following and transfer data to the ROI Financial Worksheet as necessary:

1. Annual Pre-Project Cost - This section should be completed only if state government operations costs are expected to be reduced as a result of project implementation. Quantify actual state government direct and indirect costs (personnel, support, equipment, etc.) associated with the activity, system or process prior to project implementation.

Describe Annual Pre-Project Cost:

Quantify Annual Pre-Project Cost:

	State Total
FTE Cost(salary plus benefits):	\$0.00
Support Cost (i.e. office supplies, telephone, pagers, travel, etc.):	\$0.00
Other Cost (expense items other than FTEs & support costs, i.e. indirect costs if applicable, etc.):	\$0.00
Total Annual Pre-Project Cost:	\$0.00

2. Annual Post-Project Cost - This section should be completed only if state government operations costs are expected to be reduced as a result of project implementation. Quantify actual state government direct and indirect costs (personnel, support, equipment, etc.) associated with the activity, system or process after project implementation.

Describe Annual Post-Project Cost:

Quantify Annual Post-Project Cost:

	State Total
FTE Cost(salary plus benefits):	\$0.00
Support Cost (i.e. office supplies, telephone, pagers, travel, etc.):	\$0.00
Other Cost (expense items other than FTEs & support costs, i.e. indirect costs if applicable, etc.):	\$0.00

Total Annual Post-Project Cost: \$0.00

3. Citizen Benefit - Quantify the estimated annual value of the project to Iowa citizens. This includes the "hard cost" value of avoiding expenses ("hidden taxes") related to conducting business with State government. These expenses may be of a personal or business nature. They could be related to transportation, the time expended on the manual processing of governmental paperwork such as licenses or applications, taking time off work, mailing, or other similar expenses. As a "rule of thumb," use a value of \$10 per hour for citizen time.

Describe savings justification: It is estimated that at least \$65,000 could be saved by citizens. This is estimated based on time needed for citizens to travel to Des Moines, taking time off work, and expenses related to travel. In addition, this estimate includes postage savings and savings as a result of not paying for copying permits.

Transaction Savings

4. Number of annual online transactions:
 800 (estimated; including permit review, draft permit review, submitting public comments, review public comments; and apply for permits, sign permits, check permit application status...)
- Hours saved/transaction:
 4 (estimated average; including travel time, phone call & email time, time to go to post offices, typing and copying time...)
- Number of Citizens affected:
 1000 (at least)
- Value of Citizen Hour:
 \$32,000 (3200 hours at \$10/hour)
- Total Transaction Savings:
 \$65,000 (in addition to time savings above, there is also phone bill savings, postage & office supply savings, saving from not taking time off from work, savings associated with travel expenses...)
- Other Savings (Describe)
- Total Savings:** \$65,000/year

Opportunity Value/Risk or Loss Avoidance - Quantify the estimated annual non-operations benefit to State government. This could include such items as qualifying for additional matching funds, avoiding the loss of matching funds, avoiding program penalties/sanctions or interest charges, avoiding risks to health/security/safety, avoiding the consequences of not complying with State or Federal laws, providing enhanced services, avoiding the consequences of not complying with enterprise technology standards, etc.

Response:

It is hard to quantify and assign a value on how much it is worth when IDNR is providing enhanced services to the public. But the benefit is there.

ROI Financial Worksheet	
A. Total Annual Pre-Project cost (State Share from Section II C1):	0
B. Total Annual Post-Project cost (State Share from Section II C2):	0
State Government Benefit (= A-B):	0
Annual Benefit Summary:	
State Government Benefit:	0
Citizen Benefit:	\$65,000
Opportunity Value or Risk/Loss Avoidance Benefit:	0
C. Total Annual Project Benefit:	\$65,000
D. Annual Prorated Cost (From Budget Table):	\$52,475
Benefit / Cost Ratio: (C/D) =	1.24
Return On Investment (ROI): ((C-D) / Requested Project Funds) * 100 =	6.1%

5. Benefits Not Readily Quantifiable - List and summarize the overall non-quantifiable benefits (i.e., IT innovation, unique system application, utilization of new technology, hidden taxes, improving the quality of life, reducing the government hassle factor, meeting a strategic goal, etc.).

Response:

It is hard to quantify the benefits of providing better services to Iowa citizens. By providing easier access to permits and commenting process, the proposed project will reduce government hassle factor and improve the likelihood to gain more public participation in water quality regulation. Improved water quality does translate into improved quality of life but it is impossible to quantify this benefit. .

[This section to be scored by application evaluator.]

Evaluation (15 Points Maximum)

- The financial analysis contains several questionable entries and provides minimal financial benefit to citizens (0-5 points).
- The financial analysis seems reasonable with few questionable entries and provides a moderate financial benefit to citizens (6-10 points).
- The financial analysis seems reasonable with no problem areas and provides maximum financial benefit to citizens (11-15).



Appendix A. Auditable Outcome Measures

For each of the following categories, list the auditable metrics for success after implementation and identify how they will be measured.

1. Improved customer service

Goal	Measurement
More efficient alternative for permit applicant to apply for permits	Number of permit applications received online
Easier access to permits	Number of times public accessed website to search and review permits
Easier mechanism to provide public comments to draft permits	Number of times public accessed website to view the list of draft permits on public notice Number of times public submitted comments online

2. Citizen impact

This will be measure the same as above under "Improved customer services".

3. Cost Savings

This will be calculated based on the measurements under "Improved customer services" as:

$$\# \text{ of website visit} * 4 \text{ hours} * \$10/\text{hour}$$

4. Project reengineering

This will be measure the same as above under "Improved customer services".

5. Source of funds (Budget %)

6. Tangible/Intangible benefits