

Statement by Susan Labay
Environmental Health supervisor
Southern Nevada Health District

February 23, 2012

before the Southern Nevada Health District Board of Health

Later today Eddie Larson, the IT manager, is going to get up and tell you how wonderful the EnvisionConnect computer system is working. That it is functioning as designed, and EH [Environmental Health] is ready to go live with users in the field.

What I'm here to tell you is that EnvisionConnect is far from wonderful. There are foundational issues with the basic system. It is not uncommon for EC to take up to five minutes to pull up a basic record. Many times you have to use different search options because the original option you used did not yield any entries, although a record exists. Yesterday one of my staff members was looking for a facility on Lake Mead Boulevard. When he typed in "Lake Mead Boulevard," which is one of the options for search, nothing was found. This is just not possible. There are hundreds of permits on Lake Mead Boulevard.

EC has also slowed down production of the admin staff and inspectors. It takes admin staff more time to enter vouchers than it did in VAX [the previous system], many of them are using overtime just to keep up with the rate. My admin uses 10 to 20 hours overtime to month to complete tasks that would have only taken her 40 hours normally — before EnvisionConnect.

Inspectors are also spending more time in the office, due to the system. Every day, inspectors must enter any time that is not accounted for on a vouchered activity. Too often, data entered one day will be gone by the next. Other EC problems include incorrect adding of time by the system, missed time that is already-entered activities, incorrect data due to data-conversion problems, etc.

All of these things must be corrected, requiring additional office time. The remote system has been a complete failure. To quote staff who have been testing it, nothing works — *nothing* works. The electronic signature does not work, photos won't upload, hardware is heavy, tablet is awkward, screen is too dark in the sun, system won't connect, it takes forever, won't synchronize, can't navigate because search criteria is too large, violation pull-down menus won't work, printers won't work and the list goes on and on.

The staff has complained about insufficient training for the field units. During the initial training that took place during the summer of 2011, the remote system would not work, so the trainers attempted to verbally describe what we were supposed to see and do. This made the training impossible to understand. Yet no additional training is scheduled or planned. By the way, during that 2011 training session, many staff members overheard Decade trainers saying the amount of photos we were saving would crash the system. We have not even begun to save photos yet. Instead, the admin staff are scanning in printed photos into the system.

The hardware itself is cumbersome and heavy. The unit printer, cable, wires, cords and wireless antenna weigh in at over 20 pounds. This is in addition to the other equipment the inspector must carry. If the units were stolen, the inspector would be financially responsible to the tune of \$3,000. Because of this, the units cannot be left unattended. How are we supposed to lug this thing down a busy cook line at lunch or dinner service? In addition, the system will require two outlets to complete an extension. What happens if this is not available or you have an operator who is not willing to cooperate?

There have been reports of other jurisdictions' dissatisfaction with EC. Salt Lake City has dumped the system after three years of struggle. Ohio is still limping along but is very unhappy. These jurisdictions are not even as complex as SNHD. They only use two or three programs in the system. SNHD uses more than 20.

The EC system was scheduled to go live in January of 2011, with remote access about a month later. The system went live in June of 2011, and we are still a long way from having computers in the field. A March 2012 date has been set to go live on the remotes. We must first be able to test the software before any go-live date can be established or equipment purchased. It has now been over a year since the system was supposed to be up and running. Yet we are still waiting for testable software. How much longer are we supposed to wait?

Of great concern to us are reports from staff that management has signed off on Decade as the system having met milestone deliverables that have not been met. These sign-offs were done by IT and Administration, with checks signed by Scott Weiss. All of the sign-offs were done without input from EH, which will not only be using the system but paying for it. EH has depended on IT to fix problems and provide services as IT, and this is just simply not happening. To date, SNHD has paid over a million dollars. This money appears in both last year's budget and this year's budget. Does this mean that this is going to cost us more than \$2 million? They spent close to \$350,000 on deliverables in 2011 that do not work or have yet to be delivered.

Who does this?! Who pays for something that doesn't work or hasn't been delivered?

Apparently, SNHD does. Let me make it very clear: We have paid for a product that does not work. Administration and IT have signed off on a system that is not functioning as designed. My question is, "Are we stuck with a lemon with no recourse because it has been signed off and paid for?" To quote one of the individuals responsible for testing the field unit, "We cannot even test it yet, because nothing works. It is utter garbage."

"It is utter garbage."