

MEMORANDUM

April 25, 2022

TO: Government Operations and Fiscal Policy Committee
FROM: Dr. Costis Toregas, Council IT Adviser
SUBJECT: FY23 Operating Budget for the Office of Management and Budget

Expected to attend:

Jennifer Bryant, Director, Office of Management and Budget (OMB)
Chris Mullin, Budget Manager, Office of Management and Budget (OMB)

Documents for Committee review:

1. Budget submission detail (©1-6)
2. OMB Organization Chart (©7)

**Office of Management and Budget
FY23 COUNTY EXECUTIVE RECOMMENDATION**

Office of Management and Budget	FY22 Approved	FY23 CE Recommended	Change from FY22 Approved
Total Expenditures (General Fund)	\$6,418,437	\$6,880,700	7.2%
Personnel Costs	\$4,772,722 41 FTEs	\$5,548,825 43.25 FTEs	16.3% 2.25 FTEs
Operating Costs	\$281,306	\$282,030	0.3%

Introduction

The Office of Management and Budget offers “... a broad-based, objective perspective on public policies, fiscal policies, and performance management to the County Executive, County Council, and other County partners. The analytical work performed in OMB provides policymakers with data and options to make informed decisions and supports the goals of advancing Racial Equity and Social Justice as well as addressing climate change...”.

The total recommended FY23 Operating Budget for the Office of Management and Budget is **\$6,880,700**, an increase of \$462,263 or 7.2 percent from the FY22 Approved Budget of \$6,418,437. Personnel Costs comprise 95.9 percent of the budget for 43 full-time position(s) and one part-time position, and a total of 43.25 FTEs. Total FTEs may include seasonal or temporary positions and may also reflect workforce charged to or from other departments or funds. Operating Expenses account for the remaining 4.1 percent of the FY23 budget. Details of the budget submission are on @1-6.

In order to better understand the activities and changes within the recommended budget, Council staff raised a number of questions in the Policy, Management and Operations domains, and received the following responses from the Executive branch. Council staff has provided comments and suggestions where appropriate. It might be helpful for the Committee to review each answer and provide suggestions and direction during the worksession.

Council staff *recommends the acceptance of the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) budget at the level of \$6,880,700* that the County Executive has submitted.

Summary of staff suggestions (details provided in sections below)

- The Committee and full Council should be given a detailed briefing on BET as soon as it becomes available for policy evaluation.
- Consideration should be given in future organizational evolutions of OMB to structure two separate organizations under the Director, one for the budgetary aspects and the other for the impact and evaluation elements or financial management.
- The Committee may want to further understand hiring efforts and barriers in OMB.
- By FY24, launching an SLA system would help Committee members and the full Council appreciate in a measurable way how the sharing of resources is meeting needs, as well as to lay the foundation for additional resources if warranted.
- The Committee should be briefed in the Fall regarding this RESJ governance framework, as well as preliminary results from the application of the BET tool.
- It would be useful to the Committee to be briefed on actual outcomes of the Employee Input Initiative once implementation is mature enough.

Council staff questions, answers from Executive, and (where appropriate), Council staff comments

Policy

1. **Please discuss your FY22 Baseline fiscal strategy and progress planned on RESJ; is there a budget view that ties budget allocations to accomplishment of RESJ goals for each department? Can you describe how OMB's RESJ review/analysis with the 6**

questions posed to each department worked in practice? Provide a graphic of RESJ impact using the cited interactive tool (p38-2)

Racial Equity and Social Justice is one of several ways OMB used to examine budget requests for FY23, along with analyzing the feasibility and affordability of requests, the ability of departments to deliver outcomes, impact on climate change, and fiscal stewardship.

Office of Racial Equity and Social Justice (ORESJ) used a budget equity tool to score and analyze the FY23-28 CIP submissions. Racial Equity impacts were discussed for each CIP subject area during meetings within OMB, with department staff, and with the County Executive. For example, stand-alone projects in equity emphasis areas were identified and were prioritized for funding. Analysis varied by departments – oftentimes based on the types of data that was available. For example, MCPS has enrollment data for individual schools rather than census tract data. GIS tools were also used by DEP and DOT to consider where work involving level of effort projects was planned.

During the FY23 operating budget development season the ORESJ developed the Operating Budget Equity Tool (BET), training, and guidance manual based on engagement with peer jurisdictions and research about leading practices in the development of racial equity tools. The tool was incorporated into OMB's oversight of the budget process. The goal of the BET was to bring attention to racial inequities before budget decisions are made and allocate resources in ways that contribute to reducing and ultimately eliminating racial inequities in the County. Specifically, departments were asked to:

- Explain how the department's budget allocations (including requests, reallocations, and reductions) advances racial equity in the County, reduces, or eliminate disparities, and improves outcomes for communities of color and low-income communities;
- Explain whether and how programs considered racial/ethnic disparities and/or disproportionalities in its outcomes (including quantitative data and qualitative data that was collected and analyzed);
- Describe what insights the data provided and how the program proposal (budget submission) seeks to address the identified inequities;
- Identify community residents that will potentially benefit the most or potentially be burdened the most from the program proposal (budget submission);
- Describe the potential disproportionate effects on communities of color and low-income communities as a result of the program or the initiative and how those effects will be mitigated; and
- Explain how the program proposal builds capacity to engage with marginalized communities.

Similarly, to the capital budget development process, responses to the questions varied by departments. The answers to the questions were used by OMB analysts in their budget analyses presented to the County Executive and his team and departmental leadership, and informed OMB recommendations for funding. The Director of ORESJ participated in budget review discussions with departments and decision meetings with the County

Executive to ensure that issues related to racial equity were considered and highlighted prior to decisions being finalized.

The RESJ Interactive Tool used for CIP development is still in development phase and being refined and is currently only available to internal County government staff over the County's internal network.

Council staff comment:

The Budget Equity Tool is an interesting approach to equity management, but difficult to assess as there is no current evidence of its performance. The Committee and full Council should be given a detailed briefing on BET as soon as it becomes available for policy evaluation; it could offer a new and helpful way to administer funds, and perhaps used by the Council in its FY24 budget review.

- 2. With the rising concern about cyberattacks, it is important to manage and coordinate the expenditures on security across the enterprise. Please describe the policy in place to ensure that this happens for all new IT system purchase requests in departments and agencies.**

The lead department on policy issues such as cybersecurity and security across the enterprise is the Department of Technology and Enterprise Business Solutions. OMB ensures proper coordination between departments and TEBS on cybersecurity and new system development by requiring that TEBS evaluates all new IT system budget requests.

- 3. Is there an organizational separation between the Management and the Budget element of the department? How does training, communications and support differ for each?**

OMB staff handle both management and budget issues, for both operating and capital budgets, that arise within in their assigned portfolio of departments and issues. Staff are trained on both and are equipped to communicate and provide analysis and recommendations on both issues to the Executive, Council, departments, and stakeholders. In addition, The CountyStat Team monitors and provides assistance to departments on measuring outputs and outcomes of program performance measures, and this information is incorporated into the operating and capital budget analyses and used to ensure departments are delivering the best value for taxpayer investment. The Shared Services Team assists departments in meeting their business management needs including solicitations; contract and procurement actions; budget submissions; and personnel, procurement, and accounts payable transactions.

Council staff comment:

Managing resources and budgeting for resources are inherently different aspects of public administration. Consideration should be given in future organizational evolutions of OMB to structure two separate organizations under the Director, one for the budgetary aspects and the other for the impact and evaluation elements or financial management. Other governments have found such

separation helpful and responsive both to operating department management, as well as to taxpayer concerns regarding efficiency, effectiveness and equity. For example, the federal OMB separates **Budget** development and execution from **Management**, which includes oversight of agency performance, procurement, financial management and Information Technology.

Management

- 1. Please provide an organizational chart indicating offices and individuals responsible for the major initiatives listed in the budget, and differentiating Management and Budget functions.**

See attached (circle 7).

- 2. The budget estimates that the FY22 budget will use only \$300,000 of the planned \$1m increase from FY21 levels. Explain why FY23 will be able to achieve a \$1.1m growth over the estimated \$5.7m level at the end of FY22- what new strategy will be in place that was not in place in FY22?**

OMB has had several positions vacant throughout FY22 due to staff promotions to other positions both within and outside of County government and this is the reason for the projected personnel cost savings compared to the FY22 approved budget. We are currently actively recruiting to fill these positions and anticipate having all positions filled in FY23. Also, many staff teleworked full time during the surges in COVID-19 cases in the community in late Fall through early Spring, which is the reason for the projected operating savings in FY22.

Council staff comment:

No new strategy to attract, hire, train and place in service the additional employees needed for OMB to be at full strength appears evident, nor was referenced in the answer above. As a consequence, the general fund personnel costs are likely to be underutilized in FY23 as they were in years prior, unless there is focused effort on this important task. The Committee may want to further understand hiring efforts and barriers in OMB.

- 3. Is the concept of Service Level Agreements used in teams such as Shared Services Team? Please relate current levels to the request for additional staffing in this Team.**

While Shared Services does not have specific Service Level Agreements in place, the team works with the executive branch operating departments to understand and meet their business requirements and County process requirements (i.e., Procurement deadlines, Budget deadlines, etc.). The team is in regular contact with their customers to ensure the team understands and meets their business needs and timelines.

The number of services provided has grown significantly during the year in all functions Shared Services provides, including Solicitations, Contract actions, Budget submissions, and Personnel / Procurement / Accounts Payable transactions.

In addition, while the initial focus for Shared Services was to serve eight small executive branch departments, the role has expanded to include providing support to several larger executive branch departments for either complex actions or to fill gaps in department

processing capabilities. This included the Affordable Housing Opportunity Fund Manager solicitation and contract, assisting multiple departments with dozens of contract actions, and processing numerous personnel transactions.

Shared Services has been extremely successful as evidenced by the very positive feedback OMB has received, as well as the growing number of requests and referrals. The staff has gone above and beyond to meet operating department needs; however, this level of support, and an expected growth in requests cannot be sustained / met without additional staff resources as included in the recommended budget.

Council staff comment:

A Service Level Agreement framework should be considered as the program grows in scope and impact. Lacking a formal mechanism, user department expectations will be managed through “best effort” promises that in the long term will not have a positive effect. By FY24, launching an SLA system would help Committee members and the full Council appreciate in a measurable way how the sharing of resources is meeting needs, as well as to lay the foundation for additional resources if warranted. **The current \$94,956 requested for an Administrative Services coordinator** is otherwise difficult to evaluate.

Operations

- 1. The request for an additional position for RESJ implies that this topic is not pervasive throughout the budget but is resident in specific analyst portfolios; please discuss The request for the additional RESJ position.**

Each Fiscal and Policy Analyst (FPA) is assigned a portfolio of departments and subject areas, including operating and capital budgets. Part of their analysis on fiscal, budget, and policy issues includes a review of RESJ, climate change, effectiveness, and the fiscal impact of programs and issues in that portfolio. In addition, each analyst is responsible for special projects that arise within their portfolio assignment. As layers of analysis and complexity of subjects have increased, additional bandwidth is necessary for our FPAs to continue to successfully support the Executive and Council decision-making processes, as well as departmental management and budget issues. As such, an additional FPA is requested in order to be able to ensure each FPA has the appropriate portfolio of departments to be able to thoroughly review all budget and management requests from departments and special projects, including analysis related to RESJ, climate change, and the employee input initiative.

Council staff comment:

The RESJ efforts need effective coordination either at the OMB level, or within the CE’s office. **Adding \$94,956 for a Fiscal and Policy Analyst (FPA)** position does not ensure this coordination without a clear governance model for RESJ management across the enterprise. The Committee should be briefed in the Fall regarding this RESJ governance framework, as well as preliminary results from the application of the BET tool.

- 2. Please provide expected implementation, required funding and management structure required to implement the CE’s Employee Input Initiative.**

All County employees were invited to submit ideas on new initiatives for funding, re-allocation opportunities, cost savings measures, how the County spends money, how money can be better spent, and how business can be conducted differently and more efficiently.

Employees could submit up to five (5) ideas each and were encouraged to categorize their ideas to the best of their ability among the following categories:

IDEA CATEGORIES

- Improving Customer Service
- Making County Government Better
- New Initiatives
- Saving the County Money
- Smarter Spending

COST CATEGORIES

- Low-Cost
- No-Cost

A total 125 ideas were submitted by 74 employees representing 20 different Montgomery County government departments. Once submitted, an OMB team reviewed, sorted, and categorized the ideas to make sure the designation was appropriate and to determine which department would be responsible for implementing the idea. The team audited each participating member's ranking.

All Montgomery County government employees were presented with the opportunity to vote on ideas submitted. Voters could indicate whether they thought the idea should be pursued/implemented and if they thought was it a great idea.

Seventy-nine ideas were selected to be more fully expanded and considered in an Ideation Workshop (these ideas needed more brainstorming) to provide clarification and fully vet the ideas with other employees. Workshop participants provided a written summary of the Ideation Workshop discussion along with any modifications or clarifying information to the OMB team.

OMB uploaded the employee ideas, the employee commentary from the Ideation Workshops; the review team scores, and the employee voting percentiles into OMB's budget development/decision support system to share with OMB analysts and incorporate the ideas into the budget review process with department directors and the County Executive. This allowed the ideas to accompany department budget requests and for the ideas to be included in the budget discussions of the department that would be responsible for implementing the idea.

Some employee ideas are currently being implemented within departments, while others require more analysis and work on implementation. OMB continues to work with departments on implementation of ideas where feasible. The implementation would rest with the respective department and its management structure, but the focus at the time remains on implementation of low-cost or no-cost ideas.

For a full explanation of the process, please refer to the *We Want Your Input! Employee Input Initiative* Chapter of the FY23 County Executive’s Recommended Budget publication – p. 77-1 to 77-4.

Council staff comment:

The referenced section “We want your Input” in the budget book contains the following outcome phrase:

“... March 2022 Some employee ideas are currently being implemented within departments. OMB continues to work with departments on implementation of ideas where feasible...”

It is difficult to surmise just what benefits this entire exercise produced since no specific program or summary of program is reflected. It would be useful to the Committee to be briefed on actual outcomes of the Employee Input Initiative once implementation is mature enough.

3. Climate change analysis is difficult at local levels; how do you plan to evaluate programs and launch new ones when so much is regional if not national and global in scope? And what is the budget allocated to this important topic across the enterprise?

For the FY23 recommended operating budget, departmental requests for funding related to climate change enhancements were evaluated by OMB in conjunction with the County’s Climate Change Officer and an interdepartmental team focusing on climate change. The ideas were evaluated based on implementation, alignment with the Climate Action Plan (CAP), and alignment with Executive priorities. The submissions were placed into the following buckets and ranked according to priority:

- Addressing flooding issues;
- Enhancing adaptation and preparedness capacity;
- Community engagement approaches to prioritize vulnerable communities in the creation of policies;
- Support for the implementation of Building Energy Performance Standards (BEPS);
- Support for greenhouse gas (GHG) reduction and adaptation measures;
- Enhancing the County’s climate governance capacity;
- Accelerating nature-based carbon sequestration initiatives;
- Supporting GHG reduction in existing residential buildings;
- Implementing equitable climate economy recommendations;
- Supporting GHG reduction in the transportation sector;
- Supporting clean energy efforts; and
- Public communications and engagement.

These ideas were presented to the Executive at an overview session where each idea was outlined and explained how it fits within the CAP. In addition, each idea was also reviewed in individual departmental budget meetings with the Executive.

For the FY23 capital budget development season, climate change was part of the discussion at the budget meetings with OMB, the County's Climate Change Officer, the Department of

Environmental Protection, departments, and the County Executive as recommendations were developed and before decisions were made.

As part of the capital budget development, the Office of Management and Budget, the County's Climate Change Officer, and the Department of Environmental Protection provided assistance to departments in applying a climate change lens to the process to bring conscious attention to climate change before budget decisions are made. Departments were asked to include the following in their budget submission:

- indicate the projects' impact on greenhouse gas emissions;
- identify how the project will increase the use or generation of renewable energy;
- identify aspects of the project that will help the County withstand future impacts of climate change (e.g., high heat days, severe storms, flooding, and high winds);
- indicate if the project is pursuing or has earned a green building certification (e.g., International Green Construction Code (which includes a number of alternative compliance pathways, including LEED (Leadership, in Energy and Environmental Design); NDGS (National Green Building Standard); PHIUS+ (Passive House Institute US); BREEAM (Building Research Establishment Environmental Assessment Method); or Green Globes; and
- identify its Climate Change Ambassador who will mobilize staff to green their department's day-to-day operations, build resiliency among vulnerable community members, and work as a team with other department Ambassadors to facilitate deep emission reductions across all departments.

Based on our analysis, \$254.2 million of the County Executive's FY23 operating and capital budgets support climate change efforts. Please refer to the *Climate Change* chapter in the FY23 recommended operating budget publication – p. 74-1 to 74-6, for a full description of how funds are allocated for climate change efforts.



Management and Budget

RECOMMENDED FY23 BUDGET

\$6,880,700

FULL TIME EQUIVALENTS

43.25

✧ JENNIFER R. BRYANT, DIRECTOR

MISSION STATEMENT

The Office of Management and Budget (OMB) offers a broad-based, objective perspective on public policies, fiscal policies, and performance management to the County Executive, County Council, and other County partners. The analytical work performed in OMB provides policymakers with data and options to make informed decisions and supports the goals of advancing Racial Equity and Social Justice as well as addressing climate change. The Office supports and enhances the effective operation of County government, ensuring funds are spent in the most fiscally prudent and socially responsible way, and that performance objectives are achieved. OMB also ensures that County expenditures are made in accordance with Executive polices and Council appropriations, consistent with the County Charter.

BUDGET OVERVIEW

The total recommended FY23 Operating Budget for the Office of Management and Budget is \$6,880,700, an increase of \$462,263 or 7.20 percent from the FY22 Approved Budget of \$6,418,437. Personnel Costs comprise 95.90 percent of the budget for 43 full-time position(s) and one part-time position(s), and a total of 43.25 FTEs. Total FTEs may include seasonal or temporary positions and may also reflect workforce charged to or from other departments or funds. Operating Expenses account for the remaining 4.10 percent of the FY23 budget.

COUNTY PRIORITY OUTCOMES

While this program area supports all seven of the County Executive's Priority Outcomes, the following is emphasized:

✦ Effective, Sustainable Government

INITIATIVES

- ★ Provide funding for an additional Administrative Services Coordinator position to expand the Shared Services Team. The Shared Services Team continues to provide direct, hands-on assistance to 12 departments throughout County government in contracts and human resources transactions, budgeting and fiscal planning, and other administrative tasks.
- ★ Provide funding for an additional Fiscal and Policy Analyst position to further incorporate racial equity, climate change, and other analytical lenses into the budget and policy development processes.
- ★ During the development of the FY23 County Executive's Recommended Budget, the Office of Management and Budget planned and executed seven operating budget forums to provide residents an opportunity to have their voices heard. For the first time in history, one budget forum was conducted in Spanish making these forums more accessible and interactive.
- ★ Along with the County Executive's Innovation and Civic Design Team, implemented the County Executive's Employee Input Initiative that encouraged employees to submit ideas that make work easier, improve customer service, make outcomes better, save money, contribute to smarter spending, and make government better. The submitted ideas were evaluated for implementation level of effort, value for money, staffing needs, feasibility, and benefit. In total, 125 ideas were submitted by 74 employees in 20 departments.

INNOVATIONS AND PRODUCTIVITY IMPROVEMENTS

- ✦ Designed, developed, and implemented a new Position Budgeting System (BASIS -Workforce) to replace the onerous legacy workforce system that has been in existence since 2011. The new system is more user-friendly, integrates seamlessly with OMB systems and other Countywide fiscal and personnel systems, and provides a more accurate approach to salary and benefits calculations.
- ✦ Coordinated interdepartmental efforts on the tracking and usage of Federal COVID-19 assistance - this included coordinating the compilation of the extensive documentation required to submit eligible emergency expenditures for reimbursement from the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA), as well as coordinating Federal Coronavirus Relief Funds and Federal American Rescue Plan Act Funds to ensure accurate reporting to the U.S. Treasury Department on use of the funds.
- ✦ Incorporated racial equity and social justice analysis as well as climate change analysis into the budget development and decision-making process for both the FY23 County Executive's recommended operating and capital budgets, including the development of interactive mapping tools to help inform the County's ongoing equity work.
- ✦ Maintained the County's public-facing Covid-19 dashboard, keeping the public informed on the metrics related to the pandemic, including case rates, hospitalization data, and vaccination rates.
- ✦ In partnership with the Office of Legislative Oversight, the Office of Intergovernmental Relations, Montgomery County Public Schools, and County Council staff, worked to improve State legislation and regulations to generate \$82.5 million in increased State Aid for School Construction. This includes over \$300 million in Built to Learn funding.

PROGRAM CONTACTS

Contact Chris Mullin of the Office of Management and Budget at 240.777.2772 for more information regarding this department's operating budget.

PROGRAM PERFORMANCE MEASURES

Performance measures for this department are included below (where applicable). The FY22 estimates reflect funding based on the FY22 Approved Budget. The FY23 and FY24 figures are performance targets based on the FY23 Recommended Budget and funding for comparable service levels in FY24.

Measure	Actual FY20	Actual FY21	Estimated FY22	Target FY23	Target FY24
Program Measures					
Public engagement with budget: Attendance at budget forums ¹	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Overall Government Finance Officers Association (GFOA) Distinguished Budget Presentation Award ratings: Percent rated outstanding or proficient ²	96.8%	97.7%	96.8%	96.8%	96.8%
Percent of staff satisfied with usefulness of OMB IT systems ³	N/A	N/A	N/A	90%	95%

¹ In person budget forums were suspended in 2020 due to social distancing restrictions related to COVID-19, and budget forums transitioned to an online platform.

² The fiscal year shown for GFOA rating corresponds to the fiscal year during which the budget was prepared (e.g. FY20 GFOA results apply to FY21 budget document, which was prepared during FY20).

³ Survey was not administered in FY20-22 due to Covid-19 and implementation of the BASIS-Workforce system

PROGRAM DESCRIPTIONS

✦ Fiscal, Policy, and Performance Analysis

The Fiscal, Policy, and Performance Analysis Program is comprised of three teams: the Fiscal and Policy Analysis Team, the Performance Analysis Team (CountyStat), and the Shared Services Team. Together, these teams ensure prudent management of County resources and services to achieve desired outcomes. Staff on the Fiscal and Policy Analysis Team prepare the County's Operating and Capital Budgets, Public Services Program, and Capital Improvement Program ensuring compliance with the County Charter and the decisions of elected officials. The Performance Analysis Team provides data analytics services to improve performance and support for ongoing monitoring the

effectiveness of County government services to improve performance, reinforce accountability, and focus on results. The Shared Services Team promotes the efficient use of County resources by providing core administrative and business functions to smaller County departments and offices, thereby allowing those departments and offices to focus their duties directly on their core missions and functions.

BUDGET SUMMARY

	Actual FY21	Budget FY22	Estimate FY22	Recommended FY23	%Chg Bud/Rec
COUNTY GENERAL FUND					
EXPENDITURES					
Salaries and Wages	4,048,381	4,962,657	4,464,628	5,362,025	8.1 %
Employee Benefits	1,032,115	1,174,474	1,126,693	1,236,645	5.3 %
County General Fund Personnel Costs	5,080,496	6,137,131	5,591,321	6,598,670	7.5 %
Operating Expenses	325,359	281,306	142,539	282,030	0.3 %
County General Fund Expenditures	5,405,855	6,418,437	5,733,860	6,880,700	7.2 %
PERSONNEL					
Full-Time	41	41	41	43	4.9 %
Part-Time	1	1	1	1	---
FTEs	41.25	41.25	41.25	43.25	4.9 %

FY23 RECOMMENDED CHANGES

	Expenditures	FTEs
COUNTY GENERAL FUND		
FY22 ORIGINAL APPROPRIATION	6,418,437	41.25
Changes (with service impacts)		
Add: Fiscal and Policy Analyst Position [Fiscal, Policy, and Performance Analysis]	94,956	1.00
Add: Administrative Services Coordinator Position for Shared Services [Fiscal, Policy, and Performance Analysis]	94,956	1.00
Other Adjustments (with no service impacts)		
Increase Cost: Elimination of One-Time Items Approved in FY22	127,615	0.00
Increase Cost: Annualization of FY22 Compensation Increases	99,003	0.00
Increase Cost: FY23 Compensation Adjustment	60,624	0.00
Increase Cost: Printing and Mail Adjustment	724	0.00
Decrease Cost: Retirement Adjustment	(15,615)	0.00
FY23 RECOMMENDED	6,880,700	43.25

CHARGES TO OTHER DEPARTMENTS

Charged Department	Charged Fund	FY22 Total\$	FY22 FTEs	FY23 Total\$	FY23 FTEs
COUNTY GENERAL FUND					
Human Resources	Employee Health Self Insurance	99,619	0.50	99,619	0.50

FUNDING PARAMETER ITEMS

CE RECOMMENDED (\$000S)

Title	FY23	FY24	FY25	FY26	FY27	FY28
COUNTY GENERAL FUND						
EXPENDITURES						
FY23 Recommended	6,881	6,881	6,881	6,881	6,881	6,881
No inflation or compensation change is included in outyear projections.						
Annualization of Positions Recommended in FY23	0	16	16	16	16	16
New positions in the FY23 budget are generally assumed to be filled at least two months after the fiscal year begins. Therefore, the above amounts reflect annualization of these positions in the outyears.						
Labor Contracts	0	206	206	206	206	206
These figures represent the estimated annualized cost of general wage adjustments, service increments, and other negotiated items.						
Subtotal Expenditures	6,881	7,103	7,103	7,103	7,103	7,103

ANNUALIZATION OF FULL PERSONNEL COSTS

	FY23 Recommended		FY24 Annualized	
	Expenditures	FTEs	Expenditures	FTEs
Fiscal and Policy Analyst Position	94,956	1.00	103,056	1.00
Administrative Services Coordinator Position for Shared Services	94,956	1.00	103,056	1.00
Total	189,912	2.00	206,112	2.00

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK



omb

Office of Management and Budget

