

Management and Budget

MISSION STATEMENT

The mission of the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) is to support and enhance the effective, efficient operation of County government, maintain the County's fiscal integrity and financial condition, and preserve the County's AAA bond rating by developing, promulgating, and applying appropriate budgetary policies and procedures; providing accurate, timely, and objective information and recommendations to the County Executive, County departments, the County Council, and the general public; preparing and administering the operating and capital budgets in compliance with the County Charter, generally accepted accounting principles, and the policy agendas of elected officials; and ensuring that available resources are efficiently allocated and productively used.

BUDGET OVERVIEW

The total recommended FY11 Operating Budget for the Office of Management and Budget is \$3,301,820, a decrease of \$402,070 or 10.9 percent from the FY10 Approved Budget of \$3,703,890. Personnel Costs comprise 96.7 percent of the budget for 31 full-time positions for 24.5 workyears. Operating Expenses account for the remaining 3.3 percent of the FY11 budget.

LINKAGE TO COUNTY RESULT AREAS

While this program area supports all eight of the County Result Areas, the following are emphasized:

❖ A Responsive, Accountable County Government

DEPARTMENT PERFORMANCE MEASURES

Performance measures for this department are included below. The FY10 estimates incorporate the effect of the FY10 savings plan. The FY11 and FY12 targets assume the recommended FY11 budget and FY12 funding for comparable service levels.

| Measure | Actual FY08 | Actual FY09 | Estimated FY10 | Target FY11 | Target FY12 |
|--|----------------|----------------|-------------------|----------------|----------------|
| Program Measures | | | | | |
| Percent of customers rating the ability of OMB staff to provide effective support in solving problems as somewhat or very effective on the OMB Customer Survey for the budget process ¹ | 90.7 | NA | 93.0 | 95.0 | 95.0 |
| Percent of customers rating the quality of OMB training and instructional materials as good or very good on the OMB Customer Survey for the budget process ² | 81.4 | NA | 85.0 | 85.0 | 85.0 |
| Percentage of customers rating OMB services as good or very good on the OMB Customer Survey for the budget process ³ | 80.7 | NA | 85.0 | 85.0 | 85.0 |
| Average absolute percent variance between budgeted and actual expenditures | 5.3 | 6.5 | 6.5 | 3.0 | 3.0 |
| Average number of days to process requests: County Executive Correspondence | 9.2 | 2.0 | 3.0 | 4.0 | 3.0 |
| Overall Government Finance Officers Association (GFOA) Distinguished Budget Presentation Award ratings - percent rated outstanding or proficient | 95.1 | 91.4 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Average absolute dollar variance between budgeted and actual expenditures ⁴ | \$742,762 | \$1,190,341 | \$1,200,000 | \$500,000 | \$500,000 |
| Average number of days to process requests: Reports on future fiscal impact of legislation | 16.8 | 10.4 | 10.4 | 10.4 | 10.4 |
| Average number of days to process requests: Budget Adjustment | 4.6 | 5.9 | 6.0 | 6.0 | 6.0 |
| Average number of days to process requests: Position Profile Form | 7.3 | 10.1 | 9.2 | 11.0 | 9.2 |

¹ Survey not administered in FY09

² Survey not administered in FY09

³ Survey not administered in FY09

⁴ Data includes Tax-Supported departments and Enterprise Funds; actual and estimated variances reflect implementation of a savings plan in FY08, FY09 and FY10

ACCOMPLISHMENTS AND INITIATIVES

- ❖ *Administered seven separate fiscal reduction processes in FY08-FY11 that provided solutions for closing nearly \$2.0 billion budgetary shortfalls, produced balanced budgets, and preserved and advanced key County priorities.*
- ❖ *Continue to reform budgetary process to link performance with resource allocation decisions by using performance data and evidence of what works for program effectiveness and efficiency in other jurisdictions.*
- ❖ *Collaborated with County Council Staff, Offices of the County Executive, Public Information, and the National Research Center to conduct a comprehensive survey every other year of resident's views on the quality of life, County services, and satisfaction with local government.*
- ❖ *Broaden the scope of analysis for Fiscal Impact Statements to include the economic impact of actions or decisions.*

PROGRAM CONTACTS

Contact Angela Dizelos of the Office of Management and Budget at 240.777.2758 for more information regarding this department's operating budget.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTIONS

Budget Preparation and Administration

The Budget Preparation and Administration program covers the annual preparation of the Capital Budget, the six-year Public Services Program and Operating Budget, and the various activities designed to assure compliance with the County Charter and decisions of elected officials. The six-year Capital Improvements Program is prepared during even-numbered calendar years. Fiscal policy and procedures are developed to assure conformity with generally accepted accounting principles and County policies.

Six-year fiscal projections are prepared, including the identification of various Executive fiscal policy proposals and planning allocations. Fiscal planning assumptions and debt capacity analyses are updated, guidance is provided to departments and agencies, and budget recommendations are given to the Executive and Council. In addition, special analyses to monitor expenditures and revenues are conducted periodically during the year. County Executive transfers, Council transfers, and supplemental appropriations are handled as are transactions involving the creation, deletion, and movement of positions in the official position complement.

Related work includes participation in collective bargaining and compensation policy development; fiscal management and policy development; management analyses; measurement initiatives; program evaluations; fiscal impact analyses of legislation and regulations; development and amendment of administrative procedures; development and monitoring of user fees and other revenues; grants coordination; and contract review. The office's leadership, administration, automation, and process management are also included in this program. Staff provide OMB representation on the Contract Review Committee, the Interagency Group on Energy and Utilities Management, the Board of Investment Trustees of the pension system, the Diversity Council, the Telecommunications Transmission Facility Coordinating Group, and the Labor Relations Policy Committee.

BUDGET SUMMARY

| | Actual FY09 | Budget FY10 | Estimated FY10 | Recommended FY11 | % Chg Bud/Rec |
|--|------------------|------------------|-------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| COUNTY GENERAL FUND | | | | | |
| EXPENDITURES | | | | | |
| Salaries and Wages | 2,858,947 | 2,716,660 | 2,722,840 | 2,366,180 | -12.9% |
| Employee Benefits | 784,385 | 814,220 | 749,420 | 828,100 | 1.7% |
| County General Fund Personnel Costs | 3,643,332 | 3,530,880 | 3,472,260 | 3,194,280 | -9.5% |
| Operating Expenses | 183,193 | 173,010 | 88,110 | 107,540 | -37.8% |
| Capital Outlay | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | — |
| County General Fund Expenditures | 3,826,525 | 3,703,890 | 3,560,370 | 3,301,820 | -10.9% |
| PERSONNEL | | | | | |
| Full-Time | 34 | 33 | 33 | 31 | -6.1% |
| Part-Time | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | — |
| Workyears | 30.0 | 29.0 | 29.0 | 24.5 | -15.5% |

FY11 RECOMMENDED CHANGES

| | Expenditures | WYs |
|--|------------------|-------------|
| COUNTY GENERAL FUND | | |
| FY10 ORIGINAL APPROPRIATION | 3,703,890 | 29.0 |
| Changes (with service impacts) | | |
| Reduce: Reduce Printing of Budget Books | -51,330 | 0.0 |
| Reduce: Abolish Sr. Management and Budget Specialist | -79,320 | -1.0 |
| Other Adjustments (with no service impacts) | | |
| Increase Cost: Annualization of FY10 Personnel Costs | 111,420 | 0.0 |
| Increase Cost: Retirement Adjustment | 30,060 | 0.0 |
| Increase Cost: Group Insurance Adjustment | 16,860 | 0.0 |
| Decrease Cost: Metropolitan Area Travel | -250 | 0.0 |
| Decrease Cost: Advertising - Eliminate Budget for Recruitment | -500 | 0.0 |
| Decrease Cost: Daily Rental Motor Pool | -510 | 0.0 |
| Decrease Cost: Books/Reference Materials | -600 | 0.0 |
| Decrease Cost: Special County Functions | -1,000 | 0.0 |
| Decrease Cost: Other Misc Operating Expenses | -1,400 | 0.0 |
| Decrease Cost: Dues/Membership | -2,000 | 0.0 |
| Decrease Cost: Printing and Mail Adjustment | -2,880 | 0.0 |
| Decrease Cost: Education, Tuition, Training | -5,000 | 0.0 |
| Decrease Cost: Furlough Days | -111,450 | -1.0 |
| Shift: Senior Information Technology Specialist to Department of Technology Services | -126,550 | -1.0 |
| Shift: Staff Detailed to Enterprise Resource Planning Project for Implementation of Budget Modules | -177,620 | -1.5 |
| FY11 RECOMMENDED: | 3,301,820 | 24.5 |

CHARGES TO OTHER DEPARTMENTS

| Charged Department | Charged Fund | FY10 | | FY11 | |
|----------------------------|--------------|---------|-----|---------|-----|
| | | Total\$ | WYs | Total\$ | WYs |
| COUNTY GENERAL FUND | | | | | |
| CIP | CIP | 279,960 | 2.0 | 463,200 | 3.5 |

FUTURE FISCAL IMPACTS

| Title | CE REC. | | | (S000's) | | |
|--|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| | FY11 | FY12 | FY13 | FY14 | FY15 | FY16 |
| This table is intended to present significant future fiscal impacts of the department's programs. | | | | | | |
| COUNTY GENERAL FUND | | | | | | |
| Expenditures | | | | | | |
| FY11 Recommended No inflation or compensation change is included in outyear projections. | 3,302 | 3,302 | 3,302 | 3,302 | 3,302 | 3,302 |
| Resident Survey Countywide Resident Survey conducted every two years. | 0 | 39 | 0 | 43 | 0 | 43 |
| Restore Personnel Costs This represents restoration of funding to remove FY11 furloughs. | 0 | 111 | 111 | 111 | 111 | 111 |
| Subtotal Expenditures | 3,302 | 3,452 | 3,413 | 3,456 | 3,413 | 3,456 |