

# STATE FACILITIES QUARTERLY

*"Provide and protect public assets"*

Official Newsletter of the National Association of State Facilities Administrators  
An organization of planning, development, operations and maintenance officials

## Streamlining the Building Regulatory Process

By Henry G. Shirley, director, Bureau of Capital Outlay Management, Virginia

NASFA continues to participate in the national initiative to streamline the building regulatory process. Since last reported in the newsletter, eleven model processes have worked their way through the review process and have been approved by the National Project Review Committee (now called the National Streamlining Implementation Committee on which NASFA has a seat) and are available for implementation by various levels of government. In addition, there are seventeen models that have passed working committee review and are awaiting approval of draft implementation plans by the National Streamlining Implementation Committee.

Models approved cover topics such as land development, wet lands, infrastructure, automation, education, interstate compacts/reciprocal agreements, and plan review and inspection programs. The eleven approved models and their implementation plans have been posted to the National Conference of States on Building Codes and Standards, Inc. (NCSBCS) web site and are available for viewing and download. You can reach the NCSBCS web site through a link that NASFA has on its web page or directly at [www.ncsbcs.org](http://www.ncsbcs.org). All NASFA members are encouraged to check the NCSBCS web site to see the work that is being done and to assess the impact any of the models may have on the way agencies in your state conduct their capital and renovation programs.

The third review cycle of model submissions to NCSBCS will begin this fall and the National Streamlining Implementation Committee is expected to act on this next group at their scheduled January 1999 meeting in Washington, D.C. There are thirty new case studies to be considered.

A national Symposium on Streamlining the Nation's Building Regulatory Process was held November 5th, 1998, in Dana Point, California. It was expected to draw attendees from the construction industry and consumer organizations, as well as elected and administrative officials, including California Governor Pete Wilson and San Diego Mayor Susan Golding.

The symposium stems from the five-year regulatory streamlining project initiated by the NCSBCS and was supported by funding from Federal agencies and through

services from the national partners including member organizations and government agencies. It offered hands-on work sessions in which attendees learned how communities across the country have used streamlined processes to enhance public safety, environmental quality and economic development. Attendees also reviewed models of streamlined rules, regulations, processes and administrative procedures designed to help jurisdictions eliminate areas of regulatory overlap and duplication. Models featured at the symposium were developed and submitted to the Streamlining project by governmental agencies in over 26 states. Models submitted include: Private/Public Partnerships to Ensure Building Code Compliance, Building and Fire Code Computer System, Expedited Plan Processing, Residential Site Improvement Standards, Superior Special Area Improvement Standards (Wetlands), and Smart Growth Legislation.

Founded by the nation's governors in 1967, NCSBCS promotes the development of an efficient, cooperative system of building regulations to assure the public's safety in buildings which are affordable and environmentally sound.

A post symposium wrap-up will be featured in the next issue of *State Facilities Quarterly*.

For more information contact Henry G. Shirley, Vice-president Southeast Region at (804) 786-3367 or at [<hshirley@dgs.state.va.us>](mailto:hshirley@dgs.state.va.us).

### A Look Inside . . .

President's Letter . . . . .	pg. 2
State News . . . . .	pg. 2
Committee Chair's Corner . . . . .	pg. 3

This issue's Focus Section:  
*Year 2000 Update* . . . . . insert



## PRESIDENT'S LETTER

As January 1, 2000 approaches, the issue of emergency response has been pushed to the forefront of discussions and government agencies around the country.

The issue is a broad one, encompassing not only Y2K, but also workplace security and disaster preparedness in general.

Y2K presents unique challenges. While a clear time period for problems can be identified, no one knows exactly what New Year's Day 2000 will bring. Speculation on the outcome ranges from those who believe nothing of concern will occur, to those who claim virtually every computer-aided device in operation will fail. Let me suggest that one approach to the issue is to be prepared for the worst case scenario. I would encourage states to establish a process that would require them to identify vital agency functions and the buildings that should house these functions in the event of a wide-spread, Y2K-induced utility outage. These selected buildings should be altered and equipped to accept emergency power sources. In this way, vital services can continue to be provided regardless of what Y2K brings. System testing should also continue. As Utah has planned for 2000, many other states have provided valuable information to us, illustrating one of NASFA's great strengths. NASFA provides a tremendous forum for states to share their Y2K preparations so that everyone can benefit from their insights.

Fortunately, the preparations being made for Y2K enhance each state's ability to respond to other types of emergencies and disasters. However, deadlines don't often accompany natural or manmade disasters. Large-scale emergencies, like those caused by the Northridge earthquake in California or hurricane Andrew in Florida, will require substantial expertise to provide adequate emergency response. It is in this area that NASFA can provide important assistance and leadership.

Prior to such events, NASFA must develop interstate networking to share information and ideas. The experience of states that have responded to wide-scale disasters is extremely valuable. NASFA is a means to share this "real life" experience. Additionally, NASFA members should work to create a database of trained individuals capable of responding to emergencies across state lines. A major disaster in any location will render many trained, local responders unable to provide services due to personal and family concerns. Having a network to secure out-of-state trained response teams would benefit many states whose geography suggests the likelihood for natural disasters.

Workplace security also plays a significant part in emergency response. Unfortunately many disasters are often manmade. Proper workplace security can reduce the potential for such emergencies through the adoption of appropriate policies and procedures, training, and the evaluations of security needs. For intentional acts of violence, prevention, in the form of adequate workplace security measures, is the best line of defense.

Even after Y2K has come and gone, issues surrounding emergency response and workplace security will remain important ones because they impact employees, the public, the provision of services, and facilities. NASFA can play an important role in facilitating the discussion of these topics and provide a means by which experiences can be shared from across the country. Sharing such information reduces costs, leads to more comprehensive planning and makes states more efficient, effective service providers.

Jack Quintana (UT)  
NASFA President

## STATE NEWS

### Great Plains Regional Meeting

By Gary Grimes, deputy director, Division of Architectural Services, Kansas

Kansas was the host for the NASFA Great Plains Region's 15th annual fall conference. The meeting took place September 27-29 in the capital city of Topeka at the Holiday Inn West Holidome. Eight states were represented by 74 registered guests.

Dan Stanley, Kansas' secretary of administration, welcomed the attendees to the conference at the Monday morning breakfast. Attendees participated in various panel and cracker barrel discussions during the first day, including presentations on fire and life safety, document management, and legal issues in construction. The day was capped off by a tour of the Kansas State Historical Museum and History Center.

Tuesday's meeting moved to the old Supreme Court chambers at the Kansas State Capitol. Presentations included a panel discussion on partnering, cracker barrel session on capitol complex issues and reports on Kansas' programs for energy

conservation and repair and rehabilitation of state universities. A tour of the Capitol building was conducted after lunch. A few brave souls made the trip to the top of the capitol dome and were rewarded with a spectacular, and windy, view of the city. The day concluded with a dinner at the Alumni Center at Washburn University.

During Tuesday's business meeting, Missouri volunteered to host next year's regional conference. Mike Berendzen was elected President for the upcoming year and announced that the 1999 conference will be held in St. Louis.

Kansas would like to thank all those who attended the Great Plains conference in Topeka and hope they had as great a time attending as we did hosting.

### Idaho Capitol Mall Security System

By Mike Despot, manager, Facilities Services, Idaho

The July 1998 Idaho Capitol Mall security upgrade was designed to enhance the security program and to provide coverage in areas of concern. The command center is the



## Committee Chair's Corner

By Bob MacKenzie, plant operations manager, Division of A & E Services, Washington

National media are giving Year 2000 issues more play these days. It seems as if there is no middle ground, either the world will descend into mass chaos, or in the words of a national telecommunication company, "Everything is under control, and you will have full service on January 1, 2000." The truth probably lies somewhere in the middle. The Communications Committee thought it prudent to provide Year 2000 program updates from members, so enjoy this issue's special insert. If you have perspectives or follow-up questions about the articles or topics, please send them in for the next issue.

Bill Daniels, director of new business for DataDimensions, was a keynote speaker at the recent NASFA annual meeting in Scottsdale, Arizona. He spoke about realistic and practical assessment tools for building infrastructure and automated systems in preparing for the Year 2000 transition. His outlook was not entirely rosy.

"Three of my programmers have purchased and supplied cabins in the hills and are planning on being there for at least the first few weeks of the Year 2000," he said. "Major companies are not being candid [about the scope of the problem], and Asia and Europe are just now beginning to realize there is a problem."

Daniels' message to facilities professionals was clear: "think contingency planning." If systems are not Year 2000 compliant, then what can be done to "continue to provide service even without critical components?"

"How many of you have planned for a 5,000 gallon fuel tanker truck to fill your generator tanks?" he asked the audience. "You must think with 'connectivity' in mind, as one failure in the chain will impact on your overall readiness."

I think you'll agree that most states' approaches are reasonable and prudent. There has been a tremendous amount of planning and detailed review of infrastructure challenges.

The focus insert shows what some of the states have done to prepare for the Year 2000.

The winter issue of *States Facilities Quarterly* will feature as its focus insert the remodeling and upgrading of member legislative facilities. We hope all members will provide input into your newsletter.



heart of the system operating twenty-four hours a day and staffed by trained operators who also dispatch for the roving patrol officers. Each shift has at least two trained operators who can perform roving patrol or operator duties and relieve each other to break up the monotony of the operation.

The security system currently can monitor up to forty-eight cameras. Each monitor is able to show sixteen frames, representing sixteen cameras at a time, as well as other settings such as picture in picture, four frames, and zoom frame. Operators have six monitors that are part of this system, which enhances their ability to view a specific area or a number of areas at one time. If activity is seen in a particular area, the operator/dispatcher will radio the nearest roving patrol officer to dispatch them to approach the person, thus people become much more likely to see an officer when in the area. This visibility is intended to reduce the vandalism and problems while making employees and visitors feel more secure.

All exterior and motion sensor alarms automatically show on the main security monitor after hours. There are call boxes located at the main entrances for employees and the public to use for instant communication with the command center.

In the design and set-up of the command center, the need to make decisions based on the alarm coming in was eliminated. There are automatic pop-up graphics, camera views and audible alarms which have reduced training needed to operate the system. The system works from the same automatic system that controls and monitors the HVAC system, thus reducing the initial cost and the need for staff training.

For more information contact Mike Despot, manager of facilities services, at (208) 334-3819 or fax (208)334-3818. Mike's e-mail is <mdespot@adm.state.id.us>.

## NASFA CALENDAR OF EVENTS

(Visit the association's web site at <http://www.csg.org/nasfa.html> for more information.)

### CSG Annual Meeting and State Leadership Forum

December 4-8, 1998

Marriott Rivercenter

San Antonio, Texas

Contact: CSG Infoline, (606) 244-8098

### NASFA Executive Committee Mid-Year Meeting

December 5, 1998

Mariott Rivercenter

San Antonio, Texas

Contact: Marcia Stone, (606) 244-8181

### NASFA 12th Annual Conference & Trade Show

June 12-16, 1999

Snow King Resort

Jackson Hole, Wyoming

Contact: Marcia Stone, (606) 244-8181

### NASFA 13th Annual Conference & Trade Show

June, 2000

Burlington, Vermont

Contact: Marcia Stone, (606) 244-8181

## 1998-1999 NASFA EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

President	Jack Quintana (UT)
President Elect	Richard E. Thomas, AIA (NY)
Secretary/Treasurer	Ralph E. Newell (NE)
Past President	Luther C. Lewis, Jr. (GA)
Vice President - East	Thomas J. Sandretto (VT)
Vice President - West	Larry Osgood, P.E. (ID)
Vice President - Great Plains	Gary Grimes (KS)
Vice President - Southeast	Henry G. Shirley, P.E. (VA)
Vice President At-Large	Phil Maher (FL)
Vice President At-Large	Joe McKee (WY)

## 1998-1999 NASFA COMMITTEE CHAIRS

Annual Conference & Trade Show	Joe McKee (WY), Co-Chair Richard E. Thomas (NY), Co-Chair Phil Maher (FL), Chair
Membership Innovations	Gary Grimes (KS), Chair
Communications	Bob MacKenzie (WA), Chair
Special Projects	Bill Foster (OR), Chair
Site Selection	Henry G. Shirley, P.E. (VA), Chair
Advisory	Luther C. Lewis (GA), Chair
Nominating	Luther C. Lewis (GA), Chair
Strategic Planning (ad hoc)	Lamar Holland (GA), Chair

## State Facilities Quarterly

**Jack Quintana**, NASFA President  
**Bob MacKenzie**, NASFA Newsletter Chair  
**Marcia Stone**, Association Director  
**Lisa Anderson**, Editor  
**Pam Johnson**, Design & Layout

*The objective of the State Facilities Quarterly newsletter is to provide a broad perspective on issues affecting all aspects of state facilities management. Your ideas and topic suggestions are welcome at all times and will be invaluable to other state facilities managers. Please send information about studies, new projects, legislation, etc. to:*

NASFA Staff  
The Council of  
State Governments  
P.O. Box 11910  
Lexington, KY 40578-1910  
FAX: (606) 244-8015 • E-mail: [nasfa@csg.org](mailto:nasfa@csg.org)  
Web site: [www.csg.org/nasfa.html](http://www.csg.org/nasfa.html)



The National Association of State Facilities Administrators is an organization which brings together state officials involved in the planning, development, operations and maintenance of state facilities. The association was formed in 1987 to provide a forum for sharing information on effective facility administration, as well as for the sharing of problems and solutions with peers on a national level.

Any state is eligible for membership in NASFA. Annual dues entitles your state to select the individuals you want to be involved with the association. All facility administration personnel can access the information network, receive the newsletter and other mailings, and attend the association's annual meeting. Many states have elected to divide the membership fee among several departments interested in active membership.

If you are interested in obtaining more information about NASFA, contact NASFA Staff, The Council of State Governments, 2760 Research Park Drive, P.O. Box 11910, Lexington, KY 40578-1910, (606) 244-8181

## Attention States!!

Share your good ideas with your colleagues in the winter issue of *State Facilities Quarterly*.

**The deadline is January 22, 1999.**

Contact Lisa Anderson at (606) 244-8179 or e-mail her at [landerson@csg.org](mailto:landerson@csg.org) for more details.

**NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF STATE FACILITIES  
ADMINISTRATORS**  
c/o The Council of State Governments  
2760 Research Park Drive  
P.O. Box 11910  
Lexington, KY 40578-1910

Non-Profit Org.  
U.S. POSTAGE  
PAID  
Lexington, KY 40578  
Permit No. 355



Printed on recycled paper

## Y2K Glitches Could Turn Buildings into Ghost Towns

Source: *San Francisco Business Times*

Picture this: You stumble into work following the New Year's bash of the century—it's now the year 2000, after all—but you must have arrived the wrong day of the week. In your office, the lights are dim, the air chilly, and the elevators don't work. It's like a silent bomb went off over the long weekend.

Such a scenario may be worst-case, but it's not unthinkable. And it's one that facility managers will face if their building systems fail to meet Year 2000 compliance.

As most know by now, the inability of computer hardware and software to recognize the digits "00" in computer code as the year 2000 could wreak havoc for business worldwide. Commonly called the Year 2000 Problem, the Millennium Bug or Y2K, the problem could cripple countless operations that rely on calendar readings. Any system that is "date sensitive" is likely to conclude that January 1, 2000, is actually January 1, 1900, causing systems to shut down or spit out erroneous information.

Building systems are no exception. Michael Jawer, assistant vice president of government and industry affairs for the Building Owners and Managers Association (BOMA) International in Washington, D.C., has warned members to make no assumptions. According to Jawer, the window is closing fast. It could take 18 to 24 months to identify and fix problems, and January 1, 2000 is less than 14 months away. Facility professionals should have started checking building systems by now.

No one is exactly sure how extensively building systems—lighting, security, elevators, parking, heating, ventilation, air conditioning—will be affected. Some of these systems run independent of hardware and software or are controlled by equipment that is not date-sensitive. Most glitches will likely fall into the annoying category. For example, an automated maintenance system might send out a building crew to fix errors that have not occurred, or lighting schedules may be put out of sequence. On the other end of the spectrum, it could disable sensitive fire and security systems.

In most facilities, three central platforms are at stake: software, hardware and embedded systems. PC-based software typically automates some building functions. Hardware controlling LAN (local area network) and WAN (wide area network) systems may also be date-sensitive. However, these are generally easier to correct, often with newer versions of the same systems.

While software programs have received the majority of media attention, only recently has the public considered the potential problem posed by embedded chips, which are tiny, universal microprocessors that run everything from VCRs to cellular phones. These same chips control an entire spectrum of automated systems with multiple building functions. It is

estimated that between 5 and 20 percent of embedded systems could fail to function properly when the date rolls over to the next century.

The job of ascertaining whether or not all "firmware" in a facility's automated building system is Year 2000 compliant is likely to be difficult, time-consuming and frustrating. Much will have to be visually inspected unless it is very old or very new.

While the deadline to deal with the Year 2000 Problem is fixed and immovable, some facility professionals might find solace in this little known fact: January 1, 2000, falls on a Saturday, buying at least one day before returning to work to face a possible dilemma.

## Washington State Can't Push Back Year 2000 Work

Source: *Matrix Newsletter, Washington State Department of Information Services*

It's 11:45 p.m., December 31, 1999, at the Rainier School in Buckley, Washington. The school's physical plant personnel are waiting for midnight, wary but confident. Will the facility's systems keep working past midnight? Or will the new millennium bring failure – and one big mess?

It is the job of the state's Department of General Administration (GA), working closely with their colleagues at the Department of Information Systems (DIS), to do all they can to see that there are no Year 2000 failures at Rainier School and hundreds of other buildings and institutions around Washington. And, they have less than 14 months to get it done.

"I can't overemphasize the urgency of our work," said Marsha Tadano Long, GA's director. "This is not a project for which we get to change the end date."

The job is a big one. Every day there are new challenges with machines, equipment and systems that work together or independently, that link people and agencies in ways large and small, that control the simplest things or the most complicated — all potentially threatened by failure on January 1, 2000.

Long emphasizes her department must do "everything we can to make sure the state's critical systems — heavy equipment, scientific equipment, medical equipment, energy-management systems and many, many more — don't shut down when the clock ticks past midnight on the first day of the new millennium."

With many projects, department staff can look to the way they did it "the last time" and take note of what worked and what didn't. However, the Y2K project has no such precedent — there was no last time. At the turn of the last century, automobiles and airplanes represented the absolute height of technology, and computer chips were, if anything, the substance of science fiction.

So department staff have to create their own models. Rainier School is one of more than a dozen pilot projects the department has launched around the state. They are working

closely with lead agencies and their facilities staff at special-population institutions like Rainier School, at correctional institutions, at community colleges, and K-12 schools. Closer to headquarters, they are doing pilot projects in the Legislative Building and Transportation Building in Olympia.

The State's collective priorities in this critical arena are clear. The first priority is to work on systems that affect the life, health and safety of citizens of the state. This might mean food-delivery systems to institutions like Rainier School, systems that help deliver life-saving medicine, or critical utilities and their backup systems. The second priority is to protect systems that affect the benefits so many state residents rely upon, such as unemployment checks, food stamps, and veterans' benefits. The third priority is to protect public resources by safeguarding against failure of systems monitoring water quality, air quality and other natural resources.

"We need to be flexible when we establish these priorities," said Long. "For instance, failure of the heating and ventilation system at Office Building Two would be an inconvenience. At the Rainier School, it could be a health and safety disaster."

Time is short, and the challenges are many, but Long is optimistic. "The state of Washington has recognized the importance and the magnitude of the Year 2000 work, and we're working closely with vendors and manufacturers in the private sector toward a common goal: no failures of critical systems."

*For more information contact Bob MacKenzie, plant operations manager, Division of Engineering and Architect Services at (360) 902-7257 or fax (360) 753-2848. Bob's e-mail is <bmacken@ga.wa.gov>.*

## **Kansas Using Four-Phase Process for Assessing Facilities**

*By Kerry Ranabargar, Division of Facilities Management, Kansas*

**K**ansas' Division of Facilities Management began its preliminary inventory of equipment in December 1997 and is currently around 90 percent complete with all phases of the assessment. This issue has been taken very seriously and there will be only minimal remediation needed to be what Kansas considers Y2K compliant.

In preliminary meetings it was decided to use a four-phase process for assessing each of the facilities. Phase one began with a preliminary meeting with the building managers from each facility to determine the types and approximate quantities of systems believed to have embedded processors. This information was used as a reference to any items that might be missed during the walk-through. A walk-through was then arranged for each building where staff, as well as consultants, inventoried each item at the direction of the building manager. Information such as serial numbers, manufacturer and anything else that might help determine the make and model of the item was logged and then processed into a database that would serve as a tool to track items throughout the project.

Phase two of the plan has been to perform the compliance assessment. This is where consultants conducted the vendor management on each item. They were responsible for sending out requests, via e-mail, the Internet, or certified letters, for certification on products and building a documented file for each

product, which included the vendor response for each item.

Phase three reported the monitoring of corrective actions. Staff has conducted meetings with the consultants to determine an action plan for each item found to be non-compliant as well as any item considered to be "mission critical." Each item has been categorized by risk factors: low, medium, and high, with high risk being priority for replacement and testing. Vendors were then contacted for testing procedures that could be used.

Phase four included the testing and installation of all high-risk items in order to bring facilities up to full compliance. Although Kansas is only about half way through this phase, its goal is to be fully completed with the installation or updating of all non-compliant items by December 31, 1998, so there will be a full year to test all of the mission critical systems.

*For more information contact Kerry Ranabargar at (785) 296-1318 or fax (785) 296-3456. Kerry's e-mail is <Kerryr@dafm.wpo.state.ks.us>.*

## **Year 2000 in Vermont**

*By Bill Laferriere, director of Communication and Information Technology, Vermont*

**T**hough small in size, Vermont is experiencing many of the same problems and concerns as larger states regarding the Year 2000 problem. There are over 1,700 facilities utilized by government agencies and departments within Vermont. All of these are being evaluated and analyzed to determine if the millennium change will have any impact. Security systems, fire alarms, HVAC and elevators as well as other elements of infrastructure are impacted to some extent.

This analysis is being managed by the director of Communication and Information Technology (CIT) and status is reported monthly to the secretary of administration, who is part of the Governor's staff. Findings are published on the Vermont web site for Year 2000 and updated monthly. There is a current list of products and systems that are utilized within the building infrastructure that detail compliance, conditional compliance or a complete failure to meet the requirements. This list is available to the public and is updated regularly. The buildings inventory was completed September 1998, and upgrades and testing to any noncompliant systems will be performed over the winter months. As of September 1, 1998, Vermont was 76 percent compliant in building infrastructure and is looking for complete compliance by June 1999.

*Information on Vermont's Y2K efforts can be found at <<http://y2k.state.vt.us/y2k/>> or by contacting Bill Laferriere via e-mail <[blaferriere@cit.state.vt.us](mailto:blaferriere@cit.state.vt.us)>*

## **Year 2000, Utah Style**

*By Bruce Whittington, managing facilities coordinator, Division of Facilities Construction & Management, Utah*

**T**he Y2K issue is generally thought of as a data processing problem. However, the proliferation of computers embedded in so many systems, from utilities to elevators, make the Y2K problem a serious facility problem. The

following plan to provide emergency energy sources will enable the Utah Division of Facilities Construction and Management (DFCM) to respond to Y2K needs, as well as all types of emergencies or natural disasters.

When computer clocks change to the year 2000, no one knows exactly what will happen. It is likely that many of the systems that regulate and control building conditions will malfunction or fail entirely. However, these systems cannot function at any level without the utilities that feed them.

Utah Senator Robert Bennett's committee studying the Year 2000 issue estimates that only 20% of utility companies have tested the ability of their automated systems to function at the turn of the millennium. In a worst case scenario, widespread, lengthy outages of both electrical and natural gas services could result. Such outages in freezing January temperatures would cause significant damage to facilities and render the buildings inoperable, resulting in service interruptions to the public.

DFCM is charged with the responsibility of maintaining buildings and repairing them in the event of an emergency or natural disaster. To fulfill this duty, the division is preparing to keep selected state facilities functioning regardless of what 2000 brings so that, at a minimum, agencies assigned critical functions can continue to provide service to the public.

The following plan will enable equipment and lights to function in a facility, regardless of the utilities or systems that are operable. However, building heating systems are of secondary importance and will not be fueled by emergency power sources. If necessary, portable heating equipment can be used to maintain minimum temperature in a facility. To reduce damage to equipment, DFCM staff will shut down non-essential buildings that cannot function due to power outages.

To provide emergency power sources the following actions are recommended:

- Purchase or lease a generator and fuel tank. A generator and fuel tank can provide a large building with the necessary energy to maintain equipment and provide lighting. The generator and fuel tank are mobile and can be delivered via flat bed truck in the case of Y2K outages or via a National Guard helicopter in the case of an earthquake or other natural disaster. At least one building must be wired to accept the generator and fuel tank so that a facility is prepared to house vital services in the event of Y2K induced power outage.
- Cost of purchasing a 480 3 Phase 60 Hertz, 1000 Kw generator, complete with trailer, 3,000 gallon fuel tank, main breaker, wire, and accessories: \$127,400
- Cost of leasing a 480 3 Phase 60 Hertz, 1000 Kw generator, complete with trailer, 2,300 gallon fuel tank, transfer switch, and necessary cable: \$7,000 a week standby, \$10,000 per week operating
- Prepare a hub of facilities to accept the generator and fuel tank. As funds are available, critical buildings should be identified and wired to accept the generator and fuel tank. In this case, regardless of the geographical location of the emergency, key buildings can remain functional and vital public services can continue. Buildings can be prepared for the generator and fuel tank at an estimated cost of \$25,000 per facility.

While Y2K presents serious implications for facilities, these problems are also associated with many other types of emergencies and natural disasters. By preparing buildings to accept emergency energy sources today, the state not only

prepares for possible Y2K utility interruptions, but also provides the flexibility to ensure that public services can continue regardless of the type of emergency that may arise.

*For more information concerning Utah's Year 2000 plan contact Bruce Whittington at (801) 538-3547 or via e-mail at <bwhittin@state.ut.us>.*

## Year 2000—The Big and Small of It

Source: <<http://www.stateside.com/y2k.html#top>>

The Information Technology Group of the Department of Administration is the agency responsible for Year 2000 compliance for Alaska's government computers. An Alaska Year 2000 Task Force was established in February to ensure that all branches of state government are adequately addressing Year 2000 issues. Although this Task Force was only formed this year, state agency sources report that they have been working for months to assess and fix Year 2000 problems and several key computer systems have already been repaired or are scheduled for remediation in the near future. Other systems, such as criminal justice, child support enforcement and budget systems were overhauled for other reasons and are now Year 2000 compliant. Major systems such as payroll and accounting are expected to be Year 2000 compliant by December 21, 1998.

The state also hired a Year 2000 project manager to assess and document the state's readiness for potential problems, provide overall statewide coordination and management and assist state agencies in identifying and resolving specific issues and problems. For the Fiscal Year 1999 budget, the Task Force recommended \$15.98 million for Year 2000 activities. One issue that still needs to be addressed is liability of outside vendor systems. Vendors are becoming reluctant to warrant and certify their products as being Year 2000 compliant given potential liability. Staff report that this issue will be addressed administratively.

An analysis prepared for Rhode Island on the Year 2000 problem, reports that direct costs are estimated to be between \$6 million and \$21 million, with a median estimate of almost \$13 million. The estimates are based on incomplete information from technical assessments by state personnel and assume current programming rates. An opportunity may exist in current state project plans to recoup the costs of Year 2000 compliance by renovating rather than replacing the existing Department of Administration mainframe applications while meeting targeted business goals.

There is a 50-50 chance the state will succeed in bringing its systems into compliance. In order to assure success, as well as prevent runaway costs, aggressive management with the authority to commandeer budgets, override agency maintenance decisions, reallocate personnel, and bypass state procurement and bid protest procedures will be required.

Year 2000 compliance is substantially at risk due to on-going maintenance of applications, and postponement or delay in ensuring Year 2000 compliance meet state and federal mandates. The state must be prepared to choose between meeting mandates on schedule and reverting to manual processing at the applications' failure dates, or assuring continued processing by postponing mandates.

## Colorado On Schedule for Y2K Compliance

Source:

<[http://www.state.co.us/Y2K/imcy2kpress\\_release050198.html](http://www.state.co.us/Y2K/imcy2kpress_release050198.html)>

Colorado state government efforts to become Year 2000 compliant are proceeding on schedule, according to Paul Quade, chairman of the state's on Information Management Commission (IMC).

Quade says, "A methodology has been laid, and all plans are in place to give the departments the ability to be successful in their Year 2000 conversions. I am very pleased at the progress made to date. This is a huge task and also a very expensive one. At the same time there are no options. These systems must be Y2K compatible to avoid catastrophic failure as we near the year 2000."

More than 750 information systems that control everything from the state's central accounting system and driver license records to child support payments have been inventoried. A central project office guides departments as they correct potential Y2K problems. These problems, which pose a potential worldwide dilemma, could result if a computer system fails to recognize 2000 on January 1, 2000 because it was programmed to accept only the last two digits of a year. Historically, computer systems were programmed for two-digit year entries to save storage space.

The IMC Year 2000 Project Office, headed by Brian Mouty, has centralized all Y2K information system efforts, tracks projects on a monthly basis and reports to the legislative Joint Budget Committee and the IMC. The projected cost to fix information system problems is \$35 million, according to a March 31 estimate. Three state departments — Human Services, Revenue and Personnel — account for about 80 percent of this cost. Fatal systems and critical systems that are essential to an organization's operation account for 73 percent of the cost. More than three-fourths of the expected expense is for labor.

Departmental progress on Colorado's Y2K projects, along with links to other states' Y2K web sites, may be viewed at <<http://www.state.co.us/Y2K/index.html>>.

Also under way is a parallel project to identify and correct potential Y2K problems in "embedded systems." These are computer-driven functions using embedded electronic chips that operate everything from elevators to medical equipment and phone systems. A newly developed "tool kit" became available in early May 1998 to help state agencies assess operating systems to see if they have embedded chips and offer guidance for correcting problems. It includes a list of 11 tests that must be passed to meet Y2K requirements. Operating systems that cannot be repaired because the manufacturer is no longer in business or because the chip is no longer available may need to be abandoned or replaced.

Susana Villescas of the Department of Personnel/General Support Services leads the embedded systems project. No firm cost estimate will be available until the assessment is completed and manufacturers are consulted regarding correction possibilities.

For more information contact Sara Alt at (303) 866-4240, Brian Mouty-IMC Year 2000 Project Office at (303) 866-3222, or Susana Villescas-GSS Embedded Systems Team at (303) 866-4253.

## Is Your Facility Ready for the Year 2000? 10 Steps to Become Y2K Compliant

Source <<http://speedc.com/Project.htm>>

1. **Education:** Educate every staff member about the Year 2000 problem.
2. **Project Team:** Use your existing staff as team leaders and employ contractors to perform the tedious and boring code amendment.
3. **Catalog Your Systems:** Know what systems you have. It's surprising how many facilities don't know exactly what systems they have.
4. **Rationalize Your Systems:** Now that you have a systems catalog, use it! Remove redundant software from the computers where it's installed. Only allow software to be installed with the permission of the Year 2000 Project.
5. **Prioritize Your Work:** Decide which parts of which systems are critical. Know which programs would bring the facility to its knees if they aren't Year 2000 compliant.
6. **Pilot Run:** Run a Year 2000 conversion test. This information will help you to better gauge the true scale of the problem you have.
7. **Propose Solutions:** Amend your existing systems. Only replace systems when absolutely necessary or if it becomes the most cost effective route to take.
8. **Cost the Solutions:** Don't be tempted to cut corners, and remember that as resources become rarer, the costs will rise.
9. **Presenting the Solution:** Tell your state exactly how much staying in business beyond 1999 is going to cost. Point out that staying in business is the only payback.
10. **Become Year 2000 Compliant:** If you have undertaken the steps above, you should be able to convert, test, and implement the converted systems in an orderly fashion that ensures you are fully compliant well before the Year 2000.

*Good Luck and Happy Year 2000!*