



# YEAR 2000

## Governor's Task Force on Year 2000 Readiness

*The information contained within this report is a Year 2000 Readiness Disclosure as defined in the Year 2000 Information and Readiness Disclosure Act of 1998. It is not intended to be an assurance, guarantee, or warranty concerning Year 2000 compliance of any system, product, or department herein mentioned.*

**NEW** 08/06/99

### Governmental Coordination Sector Status Report August 6, 1999

- I. Introduction
- II. Issues
- III. Overview from Federal Perspective
- IV. State of Colorado Perspective
- V. Colorado Municipal League
- VI. Colorado Counties, Inc.
- VII. Survey of Cities Over 10,000
- VIII. Other Organizations
- IX. The Role of the Federal Government
- X. Recommendations
- XI. Working Group Members

#### ATTACHMENTS:

**The following attachments are not available on this website. To obtain a copy you can E-mail Steve Truebner at [stueb@sni.net](mailto:stueb@sni.net) or call him at 303-620-4281.**

- A. Securities and Exchange Commission Disclosure Requirements
- B. United States Senate Special Committee on the Year 2000 Technology Problem, State and Local Government Sector Report
- C. General Information on Colorado Municipal League
- D. Colorado Municipal League's Letter of March 31, 1999
- E. General Information on Colorado Counties, Inc.
- F. Report of year 2000 Readiness for Colorado Cities with a Population Over 10,000
- G. General Information about the Cassandra Project

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report was compiled with the assistance of the working group members and their respective organizations, which are named herein. Summaries included herein are formed in part by the members and with the consent of the Working Group Chairman. This report is not a detailed representation of the Y2K preparedness of the State of Colorado, or of any one particular city or county. The opinions expressed herein reflect the needs from various perspectives of the State of Colorado and its various cities and counties, and those outside organizations that provide direct support to those same cities and counties.

Several organizations have been working to create an awareness of the Y2K issue among the cities and counties of Colorado. Some of these organizations are highly organized, such as the Colorado Municipal League, Colorado Counties Inc., and the Cassandra Project, and some are more informal such as the Rocky Mountain Y2K User Group. Through the efforts of these organizations, and no doubt many others, much information about the Y2K problem has been disseminated throughout Colorado. Nonetheless, the problem is to assess the current state of readiness of cities and counties for Y2K preparedness.

Major cities and counties seem to be the most prepared for Y2K. Of the various aspects of Y2K preparedness, Information Technology, Embedded Chip Technology, and Contingency Planning, the major effort appears to have gone into the remediation of Information Technology issues. The larger cities and counties have done some work on Embedded Systems and Contingency Planning, but these efforts are not as far along as the IT efforts. Of the very small cities and counties, there is no hard factual data to draw any firm conclusions. However, there is reason to believe they are aware of the Y2K issue, although they have made some progress in addressing it. Most small to medium counties are, at a minimum, aware

of Y2K and are addressing the issue.

Across the board, cities and counties are concerned about potential disruption to basic utility services such as electricity, natural gas, other fuels, telephone service – both local and long distance – general communications, supply chain including food distribution systems, and the delivery of services from the State and Federal governments. Concerns exist regarding the transportation infrastructure, the banking system and the supply of raw materials from overseas sources.

Individuals have expressed concerns about how Y2K will affect them individually. People are asking questions such as, "How will I keep warm", "Will my telephone work?", "Will sewage back up into my basement?", and "Will I get my Social Security check?" In various local jurisdictions, many of these questions have already been addressed, but the public has yet to hear the extent to which Y2K remediation has progressed. Clearly, the general public is in the dark about the extent of the ongoing Y2K work, and an enhanced public information campaign is required throughout all levels of government – local, county, state, and federal – and also throughout all of the public utilities, as well as critical suppliers of goods and services.

Much work remains to be done throughout Colorado's cities and counties, and especially in the smaller jurisdictions. Funding for Y2K issues appears to be a constant constraint among many organizations that have been surveyed and is probably more acute among the smaller cities and counties. Everyone would benefit if a way could be found by which Y2K remediation information could be shared without liability concerns. A process to fairly allocate the costs of identifying Y2K problems, particularly for the Embedded Chip problem, would also need to be identified.

The federal government can easily play a role here. Virtually every system or process that exists in a city or a county exists in the federal government infrastructure, especially for Embedded Technology Systems. With very little effort, compared to the overall national cost of Y2K to the country, the federal government could develop a national database of where problems have been discovered with embedded chips. This database could be supplemented by state governments and in turn shared with local cities and counties.

Additionally, it should be possible to mobilize professional engineers from the United States military reserve forces to assist small cities and counties in researching Y2K embedded chip problems. In this way, reservists receive points for retirement, local jurisdictions receive assistance at minimum or no cost, and the liability issue should not be a problem. This idea should be seriously pursued.

Contingency Planning needs to be emphasized at all levels of government. Most cities expressed a need for information or resources provided by the State and prioritization of resources during an emergency. The Task Force should have, as one of its objectives, a method to ensure Year 2000 remediation and coordinated Contingency Planning of all public safety systems. There especially needs to be a statewide state organization chart and matrix showing the names of specific individuals and their responsibilities and their direct counter part in city and county government. It is difficult at best to identify these points of contact now let alone to try to make these contacts under an emergency situation.

Y2K is a vast project that encompasses all aspects of government and the private sector. There has been no other project, except for perhaps the Manhattan Project, that is demanding so many resources from all

areas of our society. For the remaining work to be done, individual IT and ET systems need to be put into the context of critical processes and the processes need to be evaluated and tested as whole systems, end to end.

The Governor's Y2K Task Force should continue in an advisory role to the Governor and serve as a Year 2000 liaison for municipalities and counties on issues requiring State level coordination. The Task Force could develop an E-mail list to make monthly contact with cities and counties for the remainder of 1999. Cities and counties should take advantage of this communication vehicle and continue to take an active role in shaping the final course of Y2K preparation, testing, and contingency planning.

## **I. INTRODUCTION**

This report is being assembled, in part, to assist the Governor of the State of Colorado to facilitate increased interaction between State officials and appropriate representatives from federal, regional, county and local government to discuss inter-jurisdictional Y2K issues that may affect the delivery of critical government services to the public.

The methodology used was to first obtain a general idea of the general state of awareness about Y2K among the multiple cities and counties throughout the state of Colorado. To this end, the services of the Colorado Municipal League (CML), Mr. Steve Smithers, and Colorado Counties Incorporated (CCI), Ms. Michelle Stermer, were enlisted. Ms. Stermer was assisted by Mr. Eric Bergman, a Policy Analyst with CCI. Both CML and CCI have established working relationships with Colorado's cities and counties and also have a readily established line of communication. CCI initiated a Y2K survey form and conducted a Y2K survey of its membership for all counties in the state of Colorado. Ms. Angela Sims-Ceja and Ms. Beverly Gibson, both task force members, adapted the CCI survey form to survey Colorado cities with a population of over 10,000. CCI compiled the survey results for the counties and Ms. Sims-Ceja and Ms. Gibson compiled the data for the cities. The Special District Association of Colorado was invited to participate, but they declined the invitation.

Input to this report was also solicited from Ms. Cathy Moyer of the Cassandra Project, Ms. Jackie Gallatin of The Rocky Mountain Y2K User Group - Government Division, and the Colorado Press Service. Ms. Debra Vickrey, a County Commissioner in Arapahoe County, with the assistance of Mr. Shannon Carter, provided commentary on services provided to counties from or through the State. Ms. Jacque Wedding-Scott joined the Task force late, but provided an overview of Y2K issues and conducted a review of this report. Additionally, this report will reflect information gained from various other sources during the member's routine investigation of Y2K issues.

## **II. ISSUES**

### **1. THE Y2K PROBLEM**

The Y2K problem is adequately described in the executive order creating the Task Force. Y2K breaks down into three main areas: Information Technology (IT), Embedded Technology (ET), and Contingency Planning.

IT systems are what most people identify as being associated with Y2K. These systems include computer hardware, software and firmware, and apply to mainframe systems, as well as desktop computers. Most of the Y2K remediation effort to date has focussed on IT systems. Hence, if an organization has embarked upon a Y2K remediation program, it is likely the IT systems have received the most effort.

ET systems, or embedded chips, are more diverse and more difficult to identify with a specific system or process. Embedded Technology refers to micro-chips that are found within pieces of machinery, process control systems, automobile engines and transmissions, heating, ventilating and air conditioning systems, water and sewage treatment plants, medical support equipment, telephone systems, power plants, radio systems, security systems, fire alarm systems, and many numerous other systems. Embedded chips are found in every system that calculates a time or a date, or calculates a time interval based on the differences between times and dates. Even though it has been estimated that only 2% to 3% of the embedded chips may have a problem, they are found virtually everywhere, which is what makes them such a pervasive problem. The difficulty is finding them. Embedded chips are more closely related to engineering systems rather than computer systems.

The third aspect of Y2K remediation involves contingency planning. Contingency planning extends throughout all aspects of an organization, including business systems supported by computers, physical plant infrastructure, and to an organization's outside vendor support and supply lines. Since computer programming has a history of late deliveries and takes some debugging, and since embedded chips may not all be found, it is simply good business for any organization to develop contingency plans. This is especially true for city and county governments. In most cases, local governments are the final providers of services to the public. A citizen's first contact with government is either at city hall or the county seat. Statewide and local contingency plans are mandatory and must be coordinated with each other.

## 2. LOCAL CITY AND COUNTY CONCERNS

Although Colorado cities and counties differ widely in their size and the services they provide to their respective citizenry, they all provide the same basic essential services: revenue collection, public safety, fire, courts, jails, human services programs, parks and recreation services, emergency health care, water, sewer, fleet maintenance, traffic control, permitting, public health, and solid waste management. There are other services provided by local governments, such as support for State and local elections, however these are some of the basic services.

To provide these services, local governments depend on IT systems to assist in managing their business functions. For the most part, it appears local governments are addressing these systems. However, there are certain programs funded by either the federal or state

government that are administered at the local government level that obviously depend upon someone else's IT system and/or funding. These programs may include criminal records research, child support and protection issues, unemployment compensation, welfare checks, license

plates, food stamps, indigent health care, care for the elderly, and battered women and children programs.

Brian Mouty, the State of Colorado Y2K Program Manager, has indicated that the state agencies responsible for these programs have been instructed to meet with the local governments and verify that all mutually interrelated IT and ET systems have been checked and verified to be Y2K compliant. It is vital that follow up action is taken to ensure that these meetings have taken place. As of this date, it is unclear what percentage of local governments have been contacted by the corresponding or related State agencies.

The ability to transfer funds and exchange information to and from State and federal IT systems cannot be emphasized enough. For example, last year Arapahoe County received over 18% of its total revenue (over \$36 million) from State and federal funds for its Social Services Department. They also administered over \$60 million in direct benefits to close to 10,000 people. In the case of a smaller county, Archuleta, their total budget is \$8.7 million. Of that, \$4.2 million is State/federal dollars or pass-through dollars, which represents 48.31% of the county's budget. The county's social services budget is \$900,000. Of that \$207,000 is benefits. Of their SSD revenue, 83.5% comes from the State or federal government.

The continuation of these services is a major concern to the counties and their citizenry. The verification of State IT systems for Y2K compliance is important, however, it is equally important that a system-wide test of these systems is conducted and a coordinated contingency plan developed as soon as possible.

Local governments also rely on their basic infrastructure systems such as water and wastewater treatment plants, fleet vehicles, medical equipment devices, buildings, radio systems, security systems, among others. Embedded chips may affect these systems and it is not yet totally clear how much work has been done in researching these systems.

Other private and public sector businesses such as banking, food supply and distribution, trucking, railroads, pipelines, retail outlets, interstate bus services, commercial television and radio, and the U. S. Postal Service are also critical to the functioning of local governments.

All of these infrastructure systems depend on outside private suppliers for electricity, communications, natural gas, propane, and fossil fuels. Any disruption in the private sector supply systems will have an immediate impact on a local government's infrastructure and its ability to deliver its own critical and essential services.

Some cities and counties depend directly upon the state for some services such as police protection. For these types of circumstances, it is most imperative that the

communications systems be analyzed for Y2K compliance and contingency plans developed.

As mentioned in the surveys of local governments, their critical concerns are: public safety and the ability to provide emergency services. Specifically, as they examine both IT and ET systems, counties are concerned that the following systems are Y2K compliant and able to support vital public services:

- Criminal Records Research
- Child Support & Protection Issues
- Unemployment Compensation
- Welfare Checks
- License Plates
- Food Stamps
- Indigent Health Care
- Battered Women and Children Programs
- Transportation Systems (Traffic Management & Safety)
- Local Airports
- Judicial Services
- Elderly Services
- Financial Systems For Transfer of State and Federal Funds
- Water and Wastewater Treatment Plans
- Fleet Vehicles
- Medical Equipment Devices

- Ambulance Services
- Buildings
- Radio Systems
- Security Systems

In order to support these services, local governments are dependent upon Y2K-compliant vendors to support the following basic services:

- Banking
- Food Supply and Distribution
- Trucking
- Railroads
- Pipelines
- Retail Outlets
- Interstate Bus Service
- Commercial Television and Radio
- U.S. Postal Service
- Public Safety Protection

This list of concerns highlights the need for a coordinated effort to ensure that the interdependencies of these various systems have been tested and contingency plans are in place in case of failure.

## 1. INDIVIDUAL PERSONAL CONCERNS

In various public information meetings with local neighborhood groups and professional organizations, people always ask questions such as how do they personally prepare for potential Y2K disruptions? Typical questions are:



- How will I keep warm?
- Will there be electricity?
- Will the water be ok?
- Will the sewer back up in my basement?
- Will I get my Social Security check?
- Can I use the telephone?
- Will the inmates get out of jail?
- What if I have to go to the hospital?
- Will the elevators work?
- Will the grocery stores have food?
- Will I have public safety protection?
- Will food and water be available?
- Will E-911 be working?

People from all walks of life have heard different things about Y2K. Many of these things have already been addressed in many local communities, but the general public is unaware that systems have been remediated. Some others don't think that Y2K is an issue to be concerned about. Some think Y2K will be a series of catastrophic events. No matter what a person's opinion may be, people want to know very specific answers to very specific questions. Comments like, "We are aware of the Y2K problem and we have every confidence that we will be ready for the new millennium," are not sufficient answers. People want to know what separate agencies of their government are doing about Y2K in very specific terms. Anything less is met with skepticism.

Part of the goal of the Governor's Y2K Task Force is to communicate useful information about the Y2K problem and its solutions to the public. This is a very important effort and should be supported at every level of government. Every public information campaign should be geared to full and complete disclosure on every Y2K issue. Disclosure of "bad news" tends to reinforce the message that government is doing something about Y2K. Similarly, it is important to tell the public the details of things that have been checked and have been found to be Y2K compliant. Nothing short of full and honest disclosure will be believable.

The Securities and Exchange Commission has issued guidelines on the need for governments to disclose to the public what it is doing about Y2K and how much money is being expended. If a local government is about to or has issued bonds to finance public improvements, it is mandatory to issue disclosure statements so the potential purchasers of the bonds can make their own judgement on the value of the purchase. A copy of the SEC requirement is included herein as Attachment A.

### **III. OVERVIEW FROM FEDERAL PERSPECTIVE**

The United States Senate Special Committee on the Year 2000 Technology Problem presented its report on February 24, 1999. The report was prepared by Senators Robert F. Bennett and Christopher J. Dodd. The report surveyed seven critical economic sectors including state and local governments. The report noted that in addition to the 50 state governments, there are 3,068 county government jurisdictions and approximately 87,000 other local government jurisdictions within the United States.

The Senate's Y2K report included survey results from the National Association of State Information Resource Executives, the Gartner Group, the National Association of Counties, and the Government Accounting Office. The report concluded that the consequences of failures in this sector are as potentially grave to the public as failures in the vital sectors of power and telecommunications. The committee expressed serious concern about the readiness of state and local governments and believed that there is a disturbingly low overall level of preparedness on the part of county and local government jurisdictions. A copy of the State and Local Government Sector from the report is included herein as Attachment B.

### **IV. STATE OF COLORADO PERSPECTIVE**

Clearly, the state of Colorado, through Executive Order B 001 99, has made the Y2K issue a top priority. The Executive Order recognizes that it is vital that departments and agencies of State government work together in a coordinated approach with other public entities and the private sector. The Executive Order recognizes that the potential for Y2K issues to cross jurisdictional lines makes it essential to develop a coordinated approach between the public and private sectors.

The focus of this report is to identify the current state of Y2K readiness of Colorado's cities and counties and to make recommendations on methodologies to meet the objectives of the Executive Order.

### **V. COLORADO MUNICIPAL LEAGUE**

The Colorado Municipal League is a non-profit association organized and operated by Colorado municipalities to provide support services to member cities and towns.

The League has two main objectives:

1. To represent cities and towns collectively in matters before the state and federal government and,
  2. To provide a wide range of information services to assist municipal officials in managing their governments.

General information regarding the Colorado Municipal League is included herein as Attachment C.

For the past several years, CML has undertaken an extensive Y2K information campaign for its membership. Y2K information has been transmitted via the CML newsletter and magazine. In October of 1998, CML sponsored a Y2K workshop, which was attended by numerous representatives of the smaller cities and towns of Colorado. CML's experience and informal communications generally indicate the following:

- The larger cities in Colorado seem to be aware of the Y2K issue and are making good progress in remediation and contingency planning.
- Medium- and small-sized cities run the gamut of Y2K remediation and contingency planning efforts. For these cities, there continues to be a concern regarding the embedded chip problem because of the difficulty of determining whether a particular system or piece of equipment will be affected or not. The smaller cities and towns are taking the Y2K issue seriously, but don't have many resources to apply towards Y2K. but on the other hand, they may not have extensive Y2K issues. Since a detailed survey of the cities had not been performed by CML, this statement is somewhat speculative but most likely it is probably the case.
- CML receives numerous requests on how to budget for Y2K expenses. Since the nature of Y2K is a complete unknown, it is impossible to give advice and consul on any one city's Y2K budget.
- Cities seem to take advantage of the availability of the state bidding system on such things as police cars. If the state procurement system has specified that all purchases must be Y2K compliant, then it is possible that recent purchases may be Y2K compliant, however this is yet to be verified.

CML has summarized its efforts in its letter of March 31, 1999, included herein as Attachment D. CML has been very active in promoting Y2K awareness among its membership. Their September-October issue of *Colorado Municipalities* features several articles on the various aspects of Y2K. The January-February issue of *Colorado*

*Municipalities* featured a letter from a concerned citizen on Y2K. CML's newsletters since July of 1998 have consistently featured articles on Y2K.

Although CML has been very active in disseminating information about Y2K to its membership, there are numerous communities that may not have received any of the information gathered by CML. For those communities that are not CML members, the Governor's Y2K Task Force should undertake a separate information campaign.

#### **IV. COLORADO COUNTIES, INC.**

Colorado Counties, Inc. first organized in 1907 and incorporated in 1974, is a nonprofit, nonpartisan organization of counties whose purpose is to study and seek solutions to issues facing county government throughout the state. CCI's service programs focus on education, information and legislative policy.

Colorado Counties Inc.'s mission is to be a powerful vehicle for collective action enhancing county government. That mission is embodied in a number of objectives:

- To assist members (commissioners) in delivering the most cost effective and efficient services possible to their constituents;
- To foster and promote partnerships and collaborative efforts through effective communication with all levels of government and Colorado citizens; and
- To enhance understanding of public policy issues through education of members and citizens.

General information about Colorado Counties, Inc. is included herein as Attachment E. Early in 1998, CCI convened an Information Technology (IT) Task Force, chaired by Arapahoe County Commissioner Debra Vickrey, to address concerns over the development and implementation of the state Department of Human Services' Children Youth and Families (CYF) and Colorado Benefits Management System (CBMS) automation systems. The task force also initially focused (and continues to focus) on the potential financial and political consequences that could result from delays in the delivery of public assistance benefits to families as a result of Y2K computer glitches. Since that time, the scope of the task force's work has been expanded to include a variety of state and county Y2K issues. Currently, the IT Task Force is monitoring Y2K-related legislation, discussing continued Y2K compliance issues with state agency systems, working with member counties to develop a model county Y2K contingency/emergency preparedness plan, and coordinating with CCI to establish a clearinghouse for county information and resources on Y2K. The IT Task Force is also collaborating with CCI

event planners on a community-preparedness workshop that will be conducted at the CCI Annual Summer Conference in Vail.

In connection with the work of the IT Task Force, CCI has conducted a survey of its members on individual county Y2K planning efforts. The preliminary results of the survey indicate the vast majority of the counties in Colorado are in the process of both ensuring their computer systems are Y2K compliant, and taking the necessary steps to

guarantee that essential services will be deliverable in the event of unanticipated Y2K glitches.

**Y2K Compliance.** Virtually all of the counties that responded to the survey have upgraded their software and ensured their computer systems are Y2K compliant. The issue of Y2K compliance for embedded chips is somewhat obscure at this time. The majority of large urbanized counties have received assurances from the vendors and/or manufacturers that systems that are reliant on embedded chips are compliant. In the rural counties, the consensus is there really aren't a lot of systems that are reliant on embedded chips. The middle-sized counties are the ones most concerned with embedded chip issues. Several counties have been unable to verify their chips are Y2K compliant and are unable financially to replace the systems outright. These counties are making every effort to ensure that, at the very least, no essential services will be affected by glitches brought about by embedded chip failure.

**County Priorities.** The survey results indicate that the primary concern of almost all counties is public safety and the ability to provide emergency services. Other priorities include continuation of road and bridge department maintenance, continuation of water and sewer services, and the backing-up of certain critical records kept by the county clerk and recorder.

**County Contingency Planning.** Eighty five percent of the counties that responded to the survey have developed some sort of contingency plan to deal with possible Y2K fallout. In general, these plans entail the purchasing of extra generators and fuel, arranging to have key staff either on call or on-site to respond to emergencies, and enhanced coordination with municipalities, medical providers, utilities, food suppliers, and law enforcement agencies to ensure rapid and coordinated responses to any crises that may occur. Many counties have simply modified existing emergency preparedness plans (for blizzards, floods, tornadoes, etc.) to fit the possible scenarios that a Y2K glitch might bring.

**County Concerns.** CCI's survey also provided an opportunity for counties to voice some of their concerns and/or questions regarding Y2K planning. A sampling of replies:

- For many counties, the biggest obstacle to planning has stemmed from the "unknowable" nature of certain Y2K glitches, including the potential "domino effects" of many eventualities. Trying to predict all of the possible scenarios

connected with Y2K glitches is a Herculean task, and one that many counties are ill equipped to tackle.

- Some counties are struggling with how to control the paranoia bred by misinformation and the kinds of "worst-case" scenarios portrayed by movies and TV shows. While the presence of additional law enforcement is a common element of many county contingency plans,

there is still concern over the chance of a panic.

- Many of the issues associated with Y2K contingency planning (e.g., utilities, food supply, etc.) are outside the control of the board of county commissioners, which is somewhat frustrating for the commissioners.
- As mentioned before, certain middle-sized counties are struggling with the embedded chip issue. Several of those indicated they were having trouble getting answers from the vendor or manufacturer.
- There is a continuing concern regarding the reliability of state agency systems compliance, and the potential impacts to counties.

CCI has indicated a willingness to work with the Governor's Y2K Task Force in order to address these and other issues that are arising as the State prepares for the next millennium. These survey results are preliminary, and more information will be made available once all surveys have been returned.

#### **IV. GOVERNOR'S Y2K TASK FORCE SURVEY OF CITIES WITH A POPULATION OVER 10,000**

Since CML had not yet undertaken a Y2K survey of Colorado cities, the Governor's Task Force slightly modified the survey form prepared by CCI and undertook a survey of cities with a population over 10,000. Ms. Angela Sims-Ceja and Ms. Beverly Gibson prepared, distributed, and summarized the Y2K survey. In general, the survey revealed the following:

- IT systems are either in remediation or testing
- IT contingency planning is in various stages of development, ranging from just beginning to fairly complete detailed plans
- ET systems are in either inventory or assessment phases
- ET issues appear to be the least progressed in the Y2K process
- ET contingency planning is in various stages with many just now beginning
- Funding for all projects is an issue
- Efforts are underway to educate their respective constituencies on Y2K preparedness, with many cities following the recommendations of the Red Cross.
- All respondents listed the potential lack of utilities and communications as a major concern.

- Other concerns included integrated testing with state and federal systems
- There are concerns regarding the availability of major resources during an emergency such as the national Guard, the Red Cross, FEMA, etc.
- There are concerns about the prioritization and distribution of essential services such as electricity, gas and food.

The survey summary results are included herein as Attachment F.

#### **IV. OTHER ORGANIZATIONS**

##### **THE CASSANDRA PROJECT**

The Cassandra Project is an organization that advocates planning and preparedness in the event year 2000 related disruptions occur. The project objectives are:

- To raise public awareness and alert public sector organizations of potential Y2K related:
  - Health and safety risks
  - Interruption of basic and essential services
  - Promote community preparation activities
  - Monitor federal , state, and local Y2K activities as they relate to the public welfare
  - Promote contingency planning for all health, safety, and basic and essential services-related systems
  - Establish a clearinghouse for neighborhood and community preparedness activities

General information about the Cassandra Project is included herein as Attachment G.

Ms. Cathy Moyer is a co-founder of the Cassandra project and has been extremely active in the State of Colorado and nationally on Y2K issues. She is currently a consultant to the City and County of Denver on Y2K remediation activities. She speaks on Y2K topics both nationally and throughout the State of Colorado, and frequently shares the podium with other members of the Governor's Y2K Task Force. As a result of her many speaking engagements in Colorado, she has developed an awareness of Y2K readiness for many of the cities and counties in Colorado. Although there is no separate report

from the Cassandra Project, many of their findings have been useful in preparing this document.

## ROCKY MOUNTAIN Y2K USER GROUP

The Rocky Mountain Y2K User Group was started in 1996 by a small group of professionals from several Denver metropolitan businesses. This group was interested in sharing information about the potential disruptions of computers when January 1, 2000 rolled about. It soon became obvious to the group that Y2K wasn't just a 'computer' problem, but a business problem, and therefore other non-IT individuals, as well as other industries and governments within the front range, were sought after to join the group. The group has since grown to a membership of approximately 100 individuals from 75 or so different businesses, government entities, and other concerned individuals. The group has members not only from the metro area, but also from as far north as Fort Collins and as far south as Colorado Springs. The group meets for three hours on the third Wednesday of each month. The format of the meetings is one hour for presentations from businesses (computer vendor and/or other users) with specific experiences relative to Y2K; one hour for community issues for awareness and preparation for all individuals; and one hour for sharing information on Y2K testing, project plans, software releases, etc., during which vendors are excused from the meeting. Several of the members have also broken into industry-specific sub-groups and have their own meeting format. As there is no fee to join the group, all meeting coordination, facilitators, hosting and presentations are done on a volunteer basis. As of this date, there have been several good presentations from various city, county and state government entities, as well as presentations from Public Service, US West, the Cassandra Project, and other noted speakers. The group has also been very lucky to have several different companies and governments provide facilities for the meetings. The group plans to continue meeting through 1999 and will welcome any new members, volunteers for presentations, and/or the ability to host meetings. Ms Jackie Gallatin of Jeppesen Sanderson, Inc. is the founder and principal organizer of their group. Ms Gallatin may be reached at 303-799 9090.

The Rocky Mountain Y2K User Group, Government Division, is a spin-off of the main group and meets on the first Thursday of each month in the auditorium of the City and County of Denver's Police Administration Building. Attendants include representatives from many of the Front Range city and county governments, as well as occasional representatives from the state and federal governments. Discussions range from strictly government issues to infrastructure issues with the major private sector utilities. Beverly Gibson of ISYS Technologies and Dave Bufalo of the City and County of Denver are co-hairs. Ms Gibson may be reached at 303-290-8922; Mr. Bufalo may be reached at 303-575-9658. Ms Gibson may also be reached on the Internet at [bgibson@isys-inc.com](mailto:bgibson@isys-inc.com).

Reference to the Rocky Mountain Y2K User Group is made here because it is a potential resource to all city and county governments. Attending these meetings provides an opportunity to network with your peers and pick up some ideas on Y2K remediation issues without having to incur large expenses.



#### **IV. THE ROLE OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT**

The federal government is in the throes of doing Y2K remediation for its own agencies and systems. The President's Y2K commission not only keeps overall track of this effort, but also has the responsibility of encouraging the private sector to remediate its own Y2K issues. However, the federal government is not addressing the inter-relatedness and inter-connectedness of America's infrastructure as an integrated system. Moreover, it does not appear the federal government is addressing Y2K issues beyond our shores that tie to America's infrastructure systems.

For example, this country has approximately a 60 to 90-day supply of crude oil. It is not clear if anyone is looking at the overall process by which crude oil is pumped from the ground, transported to a port, loaded onto a tanker, transported across oceans, offloaded at another port, transported to a refinery, delivery of a final product to a wholesaler, final delivery to retailers, dispensing systems to the end consumers, and finally, consummating the transactions with the exchange of money. All of the above activities constitute one process and each one of the above activities has multiple systems that support the activity. Each system has multiple sub-systems that support the system, and so on and so on. Since this process extends across international boundaries and obviously involves interstate commerce, it is appropriate that the federal government undertake the investigation of Y2K issues possibly affecting this process. This is only one process out of thousands of processes that take place every day to keep America running. Again, the federal government needs to undertake these investigations.

#### **V. RECOMMENDATIONS**

The Governor's Y2K Task Force is an excellent means by which to address Y2K issues on a statewide basis. The Task force can act as an informal information-gathering agency and report concerns of cities and counties directly to the Governor. Moreover, as the

State of Colorado progresses through its own Y2K issues, the Task Force can be instrumental in disseminating this progress back through the cities and counties.

The following recommendations are based on a collective analysis of personal experiences from the various team members.

1. Federal government:

- A. Request a national database on ET non-compliant systems and hardware

1. Based on their own direct experiences,

2. Based on shared data from other states, cities and counties, and

3. Develop a process by which cities and counties can share ET research, be

partially reimbursed for their efforts and receive liability protection.

A. Expand the Good Samaritan laws to encourage more private sector companies to share ET technology.

C. Investigate our international goods and services supply chain to insure delivery of essential raw materials to the United States, especially crude oil and food imports

A. Provide a way for professional engineers in the military reserve organizations to supplement small cities', and counties' ET investigation efforts. Reservists earn points towards retirement and provide a useful service to a city or county that does not have either funds or expertise to investigate Y2K embedded chips.

B. On a national and international basis, first define overall processes and then analyze individual systems that support that process. One process for example is the process by which crude oil is pumped from the ground and then finally delivered to the end consumer. Food can be looked at in the same way.

C. Develop an emergency plan and process for suspending rules on an as-needed basis that does not require legislative action.

#### 1. State of Colorado

A. Similar to 1 A above: create a statewide database on ET non-compliant systems and hardware

1. Based on the State's direct experience,

2. Based on shared data from the federal government, counties and cities, and,

3. Develop a process by which cities and counties can share ET research, be partially reimbursed for their efforts, and receive liability protection.

A. Provide expanded protection under the Good Samaritan laws to encourage private sector companies to share the results of their own ET research efforts.

C. On a statewide basis, define overall processes and then analyze individual systems that support those processes. For example, the process by which food stamps and welfare payments are issued.

- A. Identify specific services provided directly by the State for cities and counties and analyze per 2 C above.
- B. Utilize the good offices of both the Colorado Municipal League and Colorado Counties, Inc. in distributing updates to the State's own Y2K remediation program. This should include distributing CML and CCI material to those cities and counties that are not currently members of each respective organization.
- C. Increase the statewide public information effort to keep all citizens informed about Y2K issues. This should include coordination to avoid duplication of information being distributed by cities and counties.
- D. Consider suspending some rules, regulations and laws that could become either too burdensome to comply with, or would prevent the delivery of an essential service because of a Y2K issue. For example, some environmental rules might be relaxed in some industries.
- E. After defining critical services, develop detailed organization charts, flow diagrams, a statewide matrix showing the names of specific individuals and their specific responsibility for a State function, and extend these to show a corresponding point of contact at the city and county levels. Establish working relationships between the State and local officials now, so that time is saved in the future trying to figure out who's who during some future crisis. Test the integrated systems, when feasible.
- F. Distribute the April 12, 1999 Y2K report to all of Colorado's cities and counties and encourage discussion thereof.

### 3. Cities and Counties

- A. Identify their Y2K representative who is their single point of contact for all Y2K issues.
- B. Within each city and county identify, by name and telephone number, the individual responsible for a specific function of local government and the relationship of that specific function to a State-supported process.
- C. Identify specific areas of Y2K concern to the Governor's Y2K Task Force so that a statewide uniform response can be developed and also shared with other cities and counties.
- D. Invite members of the Governor's Y2K Task Force to speak at their local functions and Y2K organization meetings.
- E. Identify non-critical systems and processes that could be done manually or delayed as part of the contingency planning.

#### 1. The Governor's Y2K Task Force

A. Expand the survey of cities to include cities with populations of less than 10,000. As noted in CML's letter of March 31, 1999, only 32 of Colorado's 269 incorporated cities have populations of over 10,000.

- A. Assist the State's Y2K coordinator in the identification of critical processes that cities and counties depend on.
- B. Participate in public discussion groups on Y2K.
- C. Coordinate a mass media campaign to be shared by all levels of government for the purpose of a consistent public education message.
- D. Monitor the Task Force recommendations and report monthly to the Governor.

## XI. WORKING GROUP MEMBERS

### **ADDRESS, PHONE,**

### **NAME TITLE E-MAIL**

Dave Bufalo Chairperson, Governor's 216-16<sup>th</sup> Street, Suite1200

Y2K Task Force, Governmental Denver, CO 80202

Coordination Working Group 303-575-9658

Director, Denver Y2K Project, [bufalo@ci.denver.co.us](mailto:bufalo@ci.denver.co.us)

City and County of Denver

Debra Vickrey Arapahoe County Colorado 5334 S. Prince Street

Board of County Commissioners Littleton, CO 80166-0001

Commissioner District 5 303-795-4630

[dvickrey@co.arapahoe.co.us](mailto:dvickrey@co.arapahoe.co.us)

Beverly Gibson Co-Host, Rocky Mountain Y2K 7951 E. Maplewood Avenue

Users Group, Government E.T. Suite 335

ISYS Technologies Greenwood Village, CO 80111

303-290-8922 [bgibson@isys-inc.com](mailto:bgibson@isys-inc.com)

Angela Sims-Ceja Special Projects Administrator 15001 E. Alameda Drive

Information Technology Department Aurora, CO 80012

City of Aurora 303-739-7765

[asims@ci.aurora.co.us](mailto:asims@ci.aurora.co.us)

Steve Smithers Manager of Special Programs 1144 Sherman Street

Colorado Municipal League Denver, CO 80203-2207

303-831-6411 [ssmithers@cml.org](mailto:ssmithers@cml.org)

Michelle Stermer Legislative Liaison 1700 Broadway, Suite 1510

Colorado Counties, Inc. Denver, CO 80290

303-861-4076 [mstermer@ccionline.org](mailto:mstermer@ccionline.org)

Jacque Wedding-Scott Finance Director 445 S. Allison Parkway

City of Lakewood Lakewood, CO 80226-3105

303-987-7601

[jacs@co.lakewood.org](mailto:jacs@co.lakewood.org)

Working group members were selected on the basis of their current personal knowledge of the Y2K issue, as well as their positions in their home organizations, which are relevant to Y2K. Additionally, they were also chosen for their enthusiasm in addressing the Y2K issue on a statewide basis.

## **ATTACHMENT A**

**This attachment is not available on this website. To obtain a copy you can E-mail Steve Truebner at [strueb@sni.net](mailto:strueb@sni.net) or call him at 303-620-4281.**

**Disclosure of Year 2000 Issues and Consequences By  
Public Companies, Investment Advisers,**

## **Investment Companies, And Municipal**

### **Securities Issuers**

#### **ATTACHMENT B**

**This attachment is not available on this website. To obtain a copy you can E-mail Steve Truebner at [strueb@sni.net](mailto:strueb@sni.net) or call him at 303-620-4281.**

**Senate Special Committee**  
**On The Year 2000 Technology Problem**  
**State and Local Government**

**ATTACHMENT C**

**This attachment is not available on this website. To obtain a copy you can E-mail Steve Truebner at [strueb@sni.net](mailto:strueb@sni.net) or call**



**him at 303-620-4281.**

**General Information**

**On**

**The Colorado Municipal League**

## **ATTACHMENT D**

**This attachment is not available on this website. To obtain a copy you can E-mail Steve Truebner at [strueb@sni.net](mailto:strueb@sni.net) or call him at 303-620-4281.**

### **Colorado Municipal League Letter**

**Dated**

**March 31, 1999**

## **ATTACHMENT E**

**This attachment is not available on this website. To obtain a copy you can E-mail Steve Truebner at [strueb@sni.net](mailto:strueb@sni.net) or call him at 303-620-4281.**

**General Information**

**On**

**Colorado Counties, Inc.**

## **ATTACHMENT F**

**This attachment is not available on this website. To obtain a copy you can E-mail Steve Truebner at [strueb@sni.net](mailto:strueb@sni.net) or call him at 303-620-4281.**

**Report Of Year 2000 Readiness**

**For**

## Colorado Cities

### ATTACHMENT G

**This attachment is not available on this website. To obtain a copy you can E-mail Steve Truebner at [strueb@sni.net](mailto:strueb@sni.net) or call him at 303-620-4281.**

## **General Information**

### **About**

## **The Cassandra Project**

**Return to:** [\[Task Force Homepage\]](#) [\[Task Force Reports Listing\]](#)

*All information provided on this Web site is designated as a Year 2000 Readiness Disclosure pursuant to federal law.*