Meeting Minutes
March 1, 2016

Opening

A meeting of the INK Board was called to order at 10:03 a.m. Tuesday, March 1, 2016 in 700 SW Harrison, 2nd Floor, Topeka, KS 66603 by Chairman Eric Rucker, representing Secretary of State, with the following members present:

Chuck Knapp, representing Lt. Governor Colyer

Eric Rucker, representing Secretary of State Kris Kobach

Matt Billingsley, representing the Secretary of Department of Revenue

Scott Hill, representing the Kansas Bar Association

Phil Wittmer, Executive Branch Chief Information Technology Officer, arrived at 10:24 a.m.

Tim Metz, representing the Kansas Bankers Association

Joseph Connor, representing Kansas Association of Counties

Tom Tunnell, representing the Kansas Grain and Feed Asssociation

Others Present

Jim Hollingsworth and Duncan Friend of INK, Phil Elwood of Goodell Stratton Edmonds & Palmer, Shane Meyers, James Adams and Ashley Gordon of Kansas Information Consortium, LLC, Kathy Sachs of Kansas Secretary of State. Guests included Bart Sprague (OITS) and Will Downing (KHP), as well as Howard Langsam, EVP of Sales of GovDelivery and Brian Szymanski, Regional Account Representative for GovDelivery.

Approval of Consent Agenda

Eric Rucker moved to accept consent agenda, seconded by Metz. Motion Carried.

Approval of Minutes

The minutes of February 2, 2015, INK Board meeting were unanimously approved as distributed.

Action Agenda
1. **Executive Session: Personnel:** It is scheduled for 30 minutes for the board to have an executive session.

> **Action Taken:** Executive Session: Personnel – Knapp moved the open meeting of the Information of Network of Kansas be recessed for a closed, executive meeting pursuant to Joint Rule 5 of the Joint Rules of the Senate and House of Representative and subsection (b) (13) of KSA 2000 Supp. 75-4319, as amended by section 2 of Chapter 190 of 2001 Session Laws of Kansas to discuss personnel issues for no longer than 30 minutes, Billingsley seconded. No further discussion. Motion Carried. Motion passes unanimously.

> **Action Taken:** Chairman Rucker motioned for Legal Counsel to stay for the discussion with the board members for the executive discussion, seconded by Hill, Motion Carried. Motion passes unanimously.

At 10:28 a.m. the board came out of executive session.

> **Action Taken:** Connor motioned to accept the resignation of and severance package for Jim Hollingsworth, the INK Executive Director with the provision that all payments end on March 29, 2016, the date of separation. The motion was seconded by Metz. No further discussion, Motion Carried. Motion passes unanimously.

2. **ITIMG PKI Account & Reimbursement Approval** – The next 2 agenda items are together. Hollingsworth explained the operation of the PKI account and the need for reimbursement. The ITIMG – information Technology Identity Management Group is the state committee, chaired by Secretary of State that is in charge of the state's Public Key Infrastructure policy. After the move to Entrust, INK has moved out of the business of certificate issuance. So, the expense for Robert Vaile is the first expense he has seen through ITIMG in the New Year. The PKI account is a separate account at Core First whose use is overseen by the ITIMG. This account was established exclusively for the use of this group over a decade ago. Hollingsworth stated the INK had established a contract with a digital certificate provider for this account. We used the funds collected from agencies to purchase the digital certificates in order to pay for the ongoing contract with the digital certificate provider, Symantec. Over the years there have been expenses that go along with this and what has been done is that the expenses would be paid out of the INK operating account at Kaw Valley and then this account would be reimbursed at the end of the year from the PKI account at Core First. Recently we had a contract for an independent contractor who did some work for the ITIMG looking into statutes and other policy changes and updates related to the move to Entrust from Symantec and INK's withdrawal from PKI issuance. The contract was approved through the ITIMG. Knapp and Hollingsworth are the only named members on the account and the expenditure request was to go ahead and pay this out of Kaw Valley. Scott's concern was he had not seen these before and wanted to make sure that the board was aware of this. He also asked if he has authority to approve the ongoing expenses. The budget worksheet in the packet shows the reimbursement and for this year for $4,000 and one that is not listed is for $3,000. At the time this was created it was not approved for the $3,000 reimbursement. The current balance is $173,000 which is on the statement and at the end of this reimbursement there will be $112,000 left in the account. This will make the INK board account whole for the expenses paid on behalf of ITIMG.

3. **Reimbursement Approval** – Hollingsworth then presented the reimbursement schedule for customer refunds. A number of years ago when INK was taking over the bank accounts, one item showed up that he had no vision into, and this was customer refunds. He wanted the ability to see who the customers were, what the reasons were, and process issues, so inserted himself into the process. The refunds are for a variety of reasons. Sometimes they double paid the annual subscription fees. Or, according to policy they can request a refund if they ask to close their account within 30 days after their account has been renewed because it's on an automatic renewal and they may not have intended to renew. He stated that this is what much of the refunds consist of. His process has been to pay the refunds out of Kay Valley and then seek reimbursement

annually from UMB. However, he hasn't done this in a few years. With it all being INK funds whether it be in UMB, Kaw Valley, and/or Core First it is "right pocket - left pocket". In the conversations with Duncan we have been talking through this transition and it might make sense that we bring this all back up to current so it's not really changing INK's balance sheet. Just moving money from account to account it is just reimbursing the INK account out of the Kaw Valley where money is received. We would like approval to be able to create those transfers and authorization for Scott Hill to be on the account. Hollingsworth's stated that his only other comment would be to note that we will have $108,000 left in our PKI account. Scott stated that the PKI relationship has been and will have a cash outlay and that it was never intended to be INK's money. We anticipate that the money will be compensated in the next year. We may see more expenditures coming. Hollingsworth noted that while there are no written agreements about the relationship with the ITIMG, but it has been the practices that this account will be used at the discretion of the IITIMG because that is what it was created for. There aren't any more funds coming into this account.

> **Action Taken:** Knapp motioned to authorize the transfer of money from those accounts for reimbursement from both PKI and UMB and the second part on going authorization to approve these expenses on behalf of ITIMG Knapp motioned, seconded by Metz. No further discussion – motioned passed unanimously -
>
> Reimbursement was covered with the motion above and passed. Chairman Rucker wants to make sure the board understands that we have a $3,000 commitment to pay Mr. Vaile and that the motion included the issuance of a $3,000 to check for Mr. Vaile for payment for services rendered for the board. - That has been authorized in approval.

4. **Network Manager Report** Shane Myers presented the Network Manager Report. He stated that the plan from last meeting was to promote Kansite throughout State and local government for 2016. At the last meeting, the group had discussed a platform called WordPress that would be rolled out as the content management solution to brand Kansite to state partners at that level. This month, they launched the INK board website after migrating it to this new infrastructure and it is now live to the public at http://ink.kansas.gov/. It is mobile-friendly and has an administrator site which Jim and/or Duncan can access to update the content. Kansas.gov has also migrated several other sites from the old Kansite platform, including the Health Care Stabilization Fund, Board of Barbering, and Governmental Ethics but not yet rolled out. Shane said that Kansas.gov has set up training to go through the sites before they are cut over. The plan for the future is to drum up business across the State of Kansas in moving to content management systems from websites. Shane then discussed customer service, presenting the results of survey feedback resulting from deployments (outlined in the Network Manager Report). He explained that this involved sending quick surveys asking if the customer understood and was kept informed of the process. The scale is 1 to 5, with 5 indicating highest satisfaction. Shane said that Kansas.gov appears to have been performing pretty well over the last four years based on the feedback that they have received, moving from an overall 4.4 to a 4.9 score in 2016. On another topic, Kansas.gov also looked at the feedback from a previous meeting on the amount of time spent on maintenance. His team came back with a proposal to start focusing on "search and retrieve" applications. The idea would be to start with the building blocks to streamline the process to get everything dead center with technology. Shane presented screens showing modifications that his team had made over a weekend to the existing Service Center application. Hollingsworth asked how the information was entered. Shane responded that the information is populated through the back-end data base process using an Excel document that has all the content labeled. Shane emphasized that the work had been done quickly - freeing up time to work on new initiatives is the overall objective. Knapp asked what they were doing different? What is the new approach? Shane stated that they are using plugins and changed the back end database from ORACLE and SQL to using Mongo DB. Mongo is not a relational database – it is tabled-based, everything has columns and rows. It's a "big version of Excel". Mongo grows as the data grows. Wittmer asked how would this fit with and address the legacy applications. Shane stated that it was both a blend and extension of what they already do. Wittmer asked "How do you decide?" what to use. Shane indicated that WordPress is one solution, mostly for content – very simple, but depends on data you are using. This type of technology could be used for more data-centric applications. The topic turned to uptime. Billingsley asked if they had any down time in the month of February. Shane said that they did in February related to credit card processing on Thursday and Saturday which was the opening of the DL. They are researching internally and will be

getting back with more information on the reason and time. Billingsley asked if that was in the report. It was not, but he requested it be put in going forward in the operations data.

      Action Taken: None.

5. **2016 Business Plan Approval –** This topic was revisited from the last meeting to give a chance to the board to become more familiar with the business plan. In reference to some of the earlier discussion on customer surveys, Knapp asked about the approach to measuring partner satisfaction and surveys. He inquired as to whether Kansas.gov has a similar type of survey process with customers and whether or not it is part of the application survey. Gordon answered, saying that the applicant can ask questions that provide information on how we can improve our services. Sometimes the customers use the feedback as a help desk function. The feedback is submitted for review and she can pull a report. If customer satisfaction / feedback shows that the customer is not happy then Kansas.gov reaches out to the customer and help them. Knapp stated that he would like to see the feedback statistics in the business plan and we should approve a goal along with the level of satisfaction. Metz posed the issue of how to document and set goals around problem resolution. Through a follow up? There is not currently a good way available in the tool to document changes in opinion and Kansas.gov doesn't want to change the original documentation. Sometimes they get the 1's (good) & 5's (excellent) mixed up after seeing comments saying they loved it.

Knapp continued with questions about the INK Business Plan. On page 15 of plan under strategy diversifying collaborative services, he asked whether or not the meaning of "outreach" should be defined. For example, does it mean calling them or emailing them? Ashley stated it can either be emailing or an in-person meeting or presentation. There are many ways to define outreach, including building the relationships for the future. Billingsley asked if KIC had participated in an RFP for the Kansas Turnpike (KDOT). Myers responded that there had not been an RFP, but that Kansas.gov had presented. It was a sole source and it appeared that the vendor chosen already had a relationship built. Knapp asked about the goal to "explore at least one native mobile service during the year" -What does explore mean? There was further discussion of terminology – "exploring" vs. "launching", "social media events", "and site promotions" and other terms used in the business plan. The discussion was lengthy and it became evident that a common understanding of the measures and terms used in plan was missing between KIC and the board. Chairman Rucker ended the discussion in this area by challenging board members to become involved with future discussion to construct a document that satisfies the board that the descriptor of what they wanted to achieve was being used in the plan so that they could adequately evaluate performance.

Wittmer asked an overall question about the plan – does it reflect INK strategies or KIC strategies? Maybe this needs to be an INK strategy. Chairman Rucker agreed and stated that the board needed to set up a committee on where they would like go a year from now to get more details on what they would like to achieve. Wittmer agreed and gave the example that INK needs a mobile strategies going forward. Maybe it would also benefit for anyone who deals with KIC to sit in on one of the quarterly meetings. Billingsley suggested that the Board should hear from some of the other agencies that were not currently at the table and get their thoughts. Billingsley thinks we should invite the Board of Nursing to see when they did there licensing to see how well they did. Ashley agreed would be great for them to give the Board feedback. Ashley stated that they do try to make every effort to get the most appropriate person and to understand their concerns, their plans, their goals, and to see how we can help them through these services. He also stated that he believes that all the services should be the same for all agencies. Knapp stated that the plan should be approved with the effort focused on the next cycle as we are almost through the 1st quarter of the year and KIC needs to have something documented so they can move forward.

Shane was asked about his thoughts and he noted that KIC built the business plan to track on a weekly and monthly basis down to the detail to get this on a regular schedule so there are no surprises at the end of the year. So, his emphasis is to get the dialog so that we can be on the same page and track that from here. Metz stated that when we hire a new executive director that is one of their jobs so we can conduct our own survey from the board's prospective. The committee to construct the Business Plan for next year will be Chairman Eric Rucker, Tim Metz, and Matt Billingsley and if we need additional resources we might reach out to other members of the board if that is alright with the board. Phil Wittmer would not

participate but could give feedback. They would also like Shane to be involved. With understanding that the board has work to do to prepare, for 2017, Chairman Rucker asked whether there was a motion on the 2016 business plan.

> **Action Taken:** Hill motioned to approve of the business plan, Billingsley seconded. No further discussion – motioned passed unanimously.

The board recessed for lunch at 11:50 a.m. Reconvened at 12:28 p.m.

6. **Network manager contract annual report -** Chairman Rucker stated that it has been suggested that we have a preliminary discussion about the contract renewal for executive session.

> **Action Taken:** Hill asked that an Executive Session to be convened to discuss renewal of the INK contract and moved the open meeting of the Information of Network of Kansas be recessed for a closed, executive meeting pursuant to Joint Rule 5 of the Joint Rules of the Senate and House of Representatives and subsection (b) (13) of KSA 2000 Supp. 75-4319, as amended by Section 2 of Chapter 190 of 2001 Session Laws of Kansas to discuss contractual issues for no longer than 20 minutes, Seconded by Tunnell. No further discussion. Motion Carried. Motion passes unanimously.

At 12:34 p.m. went into executive session and at 12:50 p.m. the board came out of executive session.

> **Action Taken** Hill motioned to grant a 1 year extension for the network manager contract, seconded by Connor. No further discussion. Motion passes unanimously

7. **HB2573 - Video Streaming - Bart Sprague (OITS) and Will Downing (KHP) -** The Kansas Highway Patrol handles a great deal of their video production aspects. The issue Bart and Will were brought in for was the video streaming. The situation is that we have three forces that are running into each other. First, the State of the State Address from the Governor's Office. KCPT (Wichita) normally does the broadcast. However, this year they decided they couldn't afford to do so, and it left them with either needing to find someone to step up and fill the spot or do either the television broadcast or video streaming. Several different forces got to work on a possible solution with INK, Legislative Services, and the Governor's Office. The situation was that they were able to get audio and video down to the media center room but while they created a video stream out it failed due to a mechanical/slot portal situation. Had they been able to get communication out to work it would have worked but had a situation where they didn't have "all of their ducks in a row" – he said there wasn't enough time to do a proof-of-concept before they did it. Second, there is a bill before the Legislature that addresses streaming. They have come to the understanding that the Legislature would like video streaming, but when the question was asked "What kind of streaming would you like?" the legislators said "yes" (without specifying). At present, Bart and Will are not sure completely what their vision is. Bart is trying to work with Terry Clark in Legislative IT to see if he can get some clarity from the legislative side. Are they wanting video or wanting audio or both? Senate has audio out (like conference call set up) and the House still has the old technologies in place where there is a video stream, but limited. Third, there is also the KCC who would like video stream some of their meetings because they draw large audiences on special occasions. Apparently they did one session where they were kind of contract out, but that approached was killed by "sticker stock". So, they went out for bid with two RFPs, one for video streaming and one for closed captioning. At this point that process is now in play and Bart is a representative for OITS and, thus can't comment further on it. Hopefully, this will be clearer once that process is complete as they will be able to release those results to let the Board know. Kathy Sachs Secretary of State, INK Representative James Adams, Terry Clark, Will Downing and others are trying to get together to walk through the process to work on a proof of concept that they can unitize both as a solution for the State of State Address and expanding video and audio streaming to the either chamber or the conference rooms. They are exploring what technology was built into the building during the remodel and then determine what technology pieces are missing. For example, what software do they need? What is the best way to stream it out to the world? At present, they are still trying to pull a couple of resources together to test the proof of concept that we have which would identify the type of camera that they might need.

Would like 1 or 2 options to give them

1. A camera put up only for special events that they choose not to stream all the time so we can do the State of State address or other special events like that.

2. A camera that they would want to use for streaming sessions all the time. It would be their call in terms of which way they want to go with this and then they could try to guide them in their selection.

They are trying to determine the best method to get the video to the media center that was built into the Capitol. That is, what pieces would be needed in terms of computer elements and additional hardware to bring the video code in to process it and then send out the streaming signal. They are hoping that within the next 2 to 3 weeks they can have a proof of concept that would allow them to make some recommendations as well as offer some cost information that they can provide to INK, the Governor's Office, and the Legislative IT Group to present to the Legislature. They have a signal footprint going forward and that KCC can log into or any other agency that wants to broadcast there meetings to do so at a rate that they can afford and not one that would break the bank. This is the update on what we are trying to do to bring these focus together for a joint resolution. They want a good model, not something going to buy into with having to update in a year or two. They would like to avoid this at all cost and provide equipment that will put everyone on the right path. Knapp stated that they want to do video in House and Senate chambers and then audio streaming in the committee rooms and then start out with a few select committees. What would they need from INK?

Bart: At some point if we get this proof of concept we would be in likely position to we can offer up a solution. Want to see if you can move that solution along like contributing resources that you have access to at this point in time in terms as offering up some equipment. We want to create a possible one or two solutions just for the House with the idea that you can offer to do that with a partnership for the rest to come. Bart said that the reason behind this is that the House has most of the architecture and infrastructure to do the audio/video streaming. He is not sure what the situation is in the Senate. The Senate by design has additional problems the way they face and speak at their desk - it creates problems. Bart feels that the best path is to offer a solution to the House with the idea that we can study and figure out the Senate chamber and committee rooms later as far as putting them on best path. The question was asked "Are we waiting on a decision from the legislative for this bill or direction of go ahead?"

Knapp stated that during the State of the State debacle this year they started this working group made up of Legislative IT, Executive Branch T, the Secretary of State, and the Governor's Communications Office and they intend to continue this working group so they won't be caught in the same situation next January. Then the legislation was introduced. So, the answer is, no - we don't need the bill to pass for them to continue. Bart stated that the State of State could move forward independently. He stated that if we offer to put up a permanent streaming video solution without their approval, putting up a camera that we can use for the State of State and like events, then that would fall under the Executive Branch under the Governor. Knapp disagreed, emphasizing that it has to be a partnership between the Legislative and Executive Branches because Legislative IT controls the chamber.

It was explained to Bart that Terry indicates that Legislative IT does the support work on the State of State, but that the State of the State is our event. The key is if we walk in with the equipment, then we would arrange someone like KCPT, and then it is up to Legislative IT to do the support work to make it all happen. The important thing is to do pricing when the Legislature is in session – we need a method to price it between the two customers. Bart stated that the RFP might help determine what the Governor would use for the State of State. This could be done as an independent solution or done as a partnership looking to the Legislature. Bart agreed that the Legislators would have to pick up their share of the cost as we would be using it for one event for the year and they would be using it daily. Short term, we need a path we can hand off to the Governor's Office, INK, and Legislative IT who becomes the stakeholders to make the decision.

Knapp asked what Bart and Will needed from INK to build the proof of concept used for the one solution or possibly the full solution later on. Bart stated that they are trying to reach out to borrow some equipment

to get the proof of concept, but that they would need $3,000 or less to buy the hardware. Knapp stated that the Board has $10,000 set aside for State of the State that wasn't used. Knapp indicated his understanding from talking with others about the equipment was that if it was purchased for the proof-of-concept, it would still be used in part of the solution going forward. Bart confirmed this was true, and that he would make sure they bought the most appropriate piece of equipment for the solution. Knapp stated that the Board had decided that Governor's transparency is part of its mission and that is why we agreed to the $10,000 to do the one-time State of the State.

> **Action Taken** Knapp Motion – The Board provide funding of up to $3,500 for equipment to be used in the proof of concept and beyond if necessary. Motion seconded by Wittmer. In the discussion of the motion, the Board asked that Bart and Will seek first to borrow the equipment before making use of this money to purchase it. No further discussion. Motion passes unanimously.

Hill stated that last month when the Board talked about HB 2573, he didn't think there was a formal budget or estimate of what the Board might be asked to spend. He wanted to know at what point the Board would be willing to accept the legislation without a clearer understanding of the cost. Chairman Rucker responded that after the last Board meeting, he had reviewed the bill more closely and spoke with Representative Whitmer. The Representative had requested amending language from Mr. Rucker and stated that the committee would consider it. The way the current bill reads, INK would not be in the position of estimating what the cost was, but would just need to come up with the money. So he had suggested amending the language in a way that ensures that the Board won't just be told what the costs are and expected to be responsible and agreed that up until today, that amount remains unspoken. He noted that in the bill one can see the problematic language: "which shall provide any services that the director determines to be necessary for the provision of such live audio streaming" and, in turn, what survives is "in providing audio streaming the director shall work in cooperation network of Kansas Inc." which Chairman Rucker didn't think the Board would find offending.

> **Action Taken:** Knapp motioned to have the amending language as just stated proposed to the House committee for inclusion in HB2573, Hill seconded. Discussion: Chairman Rucker stated that the hearing is going to be held on Thursday at 9:00 a.m. and asked that as part of the motion he be authorized to speak on behalf of the INK Board in favor as the bill as amended – Knapp amended his motion to include authorization by the board for testimony in support of the Legislation upon inclusion of the amendment. Hill seconded the amended motion. No further discussion. Motion passes unanimously.

8. **GovDelivery -** Howard Langsam, Executive Vice President of Sales for GovDelivery, made a presentation on GovDelivery services and the needs they are meeting in the government marketplace. Langsam opened with a finding that only 1/3 of Americans have accessed government services online. In addition, they've found that when it comes to government services most citizens are not using social media. While government tries to get the word out through Facebook, Twitter, and other social media, analysis shows that it is not effective. Instead, email is still the best way to reach most people. And, the best way to reach them with email is to cross market to them between agency programs. He explained the GovDelivery service and how it helps cross-market between programs at the state and federal level, starting with either the list a state agency has, or building from scratch. They have tools the product set is scheduled to have the Federal stamp of approval for security by the end of the month. A member of the Board asked if any neighboring states use this solution. Langsam and Szymanski confirmed that they did: Michigan, Indiana, Kentucky Maine, Iowa, Minnesota, Wyoming, and Oklahoma all use GovDelivery. The presentation closed with a question about FedRamp and whether federal discounts were available the state. The state pricing model is competitive with that.

> **Action Taken:** No action taken

9. **Kansas Business Center**- Friend discussed the status of the proposed contracts necessary to implement the Form Finder feature of the Kansas Business Center. He noted that most of the members were aware that he, along with Kathy from SOS, had tried to schedule a call last Friday to gain approval to move forward with the agreements. However, they'd cancelled it due to some questions. Friend directed the board members to the second page of a handout he had provided that summarized pricing in the contracts. He noted that

everything is still the same as it was then and that it is the same scope. The handout summarized the proposed motions that had been suggested for the meeting – he stated that the purpose is really just to move forward in getting the contract signed. Overall, they were asking board to reserve money for a 3 year purchase which would be a 1-year agreement with 2 one-year renewals. They would only be asking for the $106,476 as the initial agreement was for one-year of licensing with Oracle. Hill stated that he was is in favor of having board counsel review these agreements. He then brought up the idea of the contingency funds being proposed in the motion. It was his understanding that the contingency was to allow flexibility in negotiating out the final pricing. However, it is now being proposed as reserving the excess funds for other expenses that may come up during the project. Hill emphasized that he is not in favor of that and didn't think that was what was approved at last month's meeting. The board discussed what the motion had been. Friend stated that the contingency could cover discovery during the project, as well as additional licensing that may be needed (a provision is included in the contract) for seats above what was estimated. Billingsley wondered if we need to amend the motion from the last meeting that replenished the restricted funds for the KBC to $525,000 and the Board and Friend discussed what the new number should be. While the amount for Oracle for Year 1 was $106,476, the same amount would need to be included in the overall fund balance to anticipate Years 2 and 3. There was a discussion and questions about why the contract with Oracle was structured as a 1-year contract with two 1-year renewals. Sachs stated that it is because we are approaching this as a pilot, but to get the full discount we needed to go with a longer commitment in the form of the renewal options.

The board decided that it would be appropriate to make a motion to approve move forward with the contracts subject to review of the agreements by board counsel and with the contingency amount limited to $20,000 in addition to the planned outlay of $432,140, with any remaining contingency funds released from the KBC restricted balance.

> **Action Taken:** Hill motioned that the Oracle and Event us contracts be approved to be signed, subject to review of board counsel, with the total amount in the restricted fee fund to be set at $452,140 which includes the anticipated contract payments over three years and a $20,000 contingency. The motion was seconded by Billingsley.

New Business: Forming a committee on an executive director search committee Metz suggested he would be on this committee.

> **Action Taken:** Hill motioned to form a committee, seconded by Knapp – The committee will be Wittmer, Knapp, and Metz.

Agenda for Next Meeting
Agenda for the next meeting wasn't discussed.

Adjournment
Billingsley moved to adjourn the meeting, seconded by Knapp. Meeting adjourned at 1:38 p.m. Next INK board meeting will be at 10:00 a.m. on April 5, 2016, at 700 SW Harrison Topeka, Kansas, 2nd Floor Conference Room.

Minutes submitted by: Nikki Reed