Table of Contents [1]

1 Table of contents introduced for ease of navigation on the web.

Section 1: Budget Recommendation Summary
Section 2: Maintenance Level
- Recommendation Summary
- Decision Packages
  - M2-8P Postage Rate Adjustments
  - M2-8S Microsoft Enterprise Licensing Agmt
  - M2-8T Electronic Records Vault - EVault
  - M2-8V Building Access Control System
  - M2-9G Workers Comp Base Correction
  - M2-9T Transfers

ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES

Administration and Supporting Services

Program 110

DSHS Budget Division

110 – Section 1
Recommendation Summary

Recommendation Summary

DSHS Budget Division

State of Washington
Department of Social and Health Services

Recommendation Summary

Budget Period:2013-15

Version: K3 - 110 2013-15 Final 2015 Sup

Budget Level Criteria: ALL

Dollars in Thousands		Agency Priority	Annual Avg FTEs	General Fund State	Other Funds	Total Funds
M2 - Inflation and Other Rate Changes						
8P	Postage Rate Adjustments	0	0.0	18	2	20
8S	Microsoft Enterprise Licensing Agmt	0	0.0	264	58	322
8T	Electronic Records Vault - EVault	0	0.0	249	55	304
8V	Building Access Control System	0	0.0	2	0	2
9G	Workers Comp Base Correction	0	0.0	21	4	25
9T	Transfers	0	0.0	453	96	549
		SubTotal M2	**0.0**	**1,007**	**215**	**1,222**
		Cumulative Total Thru M2	**0.0**	**1,007**	**215**	**1,222**
Total Proposed Budget			**0.0**	**1,007**	**215**	**1,222**

Maintenance Level

DSHS Budget Division

State of Washington
Department of Social and Health Services

Recommendation Summary

Budget Period:2013-15

Version: K3 - 110 2013-15 Final 2015 Sup

Budget Level Criteria: ALL

Dollars in Thousands		Agency Priority	Annual Avg FTEs	General Fund State	Other Funds	Total Funds
M2 - Inflation and Other Rate Changes						
8P	Postage Rate Adjustments	0	0.0	18	2	20
8S	Microsoft Enterprise Licensing Agmt	0	0.0	264	58	322
8T	Electronic Records Vault - EVault	0	0.0	249	55	304
8V	Building Access Control System	0	0.0	2	0	2
9G	Workers Comp Base Correction	0	0.0	21	4	25
9T	Transfers	0	0.0	453	96	549
	SubTotal M2		**0.0**	**1,007**	**215**	**1,222**
	Cumulative Total Thru M2		**0.0**	**1,007**	**215**	**1,222**
Total Proposed Budget			**0.0**	**1,007**	**215**	**1,222**

DP Code/Title: M2-8P Postage Rate Adjustments
Program Level - 110 Admin & Supporting Svcs

Budget Period: 2013-15 Version: K3 110 2013-15 Final 2015 Sup

Recommendation Summary Text:

The Department of Social Health and Services (DSHS) requests funding for the 6.52 percent postage rate increase which went into effect January 27, 2014. By funding this request, DSHS is expected to meet its postal obligations to customers, clients, and constituents.

Fiscal Detail:

Operating Expenditures	FY 1	FY 2	Total
Overall Funding			
001-1 General Fund - Basic Account-State	0	18,000	18,000
001-C General Fund - Basic Account-Medicaid Federal	0	2,000	2,000
Total Cost	**0**	**20,000**	**20,000**

Staffing

Package Description:

Problem Statement

The United States Postal Services (USPS) increased its postal rate for first-class mail from $0.46 to $0.49 (6.52 percent increase) on January 27, 2014. The USPS increase impacts all DSHS programs.

Communication between clients and programs are a routine and essential part of doing business. Clients expect written responses to their inquiries and concerns. Other areas impacted by this postage rate increase are payments to clients and notices to clients required by law.

The USPS mail services are considered accessible to all clients and it is an efficient means of communication. Other forms of communication or remittance of payments such as electronic banking and e-mail are not accessible to the majority of the department's clients or may require revisions to state laws.

Proposed Solution

DSHS requests $553,000 ($372,000 GF-State) for a postal rate adjustment so that all the DSHS programs can meet its current postal obligations.

Agency Contact: Don Petrich (360) 902-7831

Narrative Justification and Impact Statement

What specific performance outcomes does the agency expect?

By funding this decision package, DSHS will continue meeting its obligations and statutory requirements to ensure all clients receive their proper information in a timely manner without negative impacts to other client services.

Performance Measure Detail

Agency Level

Activity: K001 Administration and Supporting Services	Incremental Changes FY 1	FY 2

DP Code/Title: M2-8P Postage Rate Adjustments
Program Level - 110 Admin & Supporting Svcs

Budget Period: 2013-15 Version: K3 110 2013-15 Final 2015 Sup

No measures linked to package	0.00	0.00

Is this decision package essential to implement a strategy identified in the agency's strategic plan?

The budget request supports DSHS Goal 5: Public Trust - Strong management practices will be used to ensure quality and efficiency.

Does this decision package provide essential support to one of the Governor's priorities?

This decision package supports the Results Washington Goal 5: Effective, Efficient and Accountable Government - Fostering a Lean culture that drives accountability and results for the people of Washington.

Ensure efficiency and performance to the public by providing transparency and accountability in state agency operations and:
--Increase Washington State government's transparency.
--Increase customer satisfaction.
--Increase on-time delivery for state services.

Does this decision package make key contributions to statewide results? Would it rate as a high priority in the Priorities of Government process?

This decision package supports the Results Washington goals to:

Ensure efficiency, performance, and accountability to the public by providing transparency and accountability in state agency operations and:
--Increase Washington State government's transparency.
--Increase the number of Results Washington outcome measures and leading indicators.
--Increase customer satisfaction.
--Increase Washington State as an employer of choice.
--Increase on-time delivery for state services.

What are the other important connections or impacts related to this proposal?

None

What alternatives were explored by the agency, and why was this alternative chosen?

The request cannot be absorbed within existing resources. Funds supporting other client services would need to be diverted if funding for this USPS rate increase is not provided.

What are the consequences of not funding this package?

Not funding this request will have a negative impact to the agency's ability to communicate with clients and hamper its ability to remain responsive to constituent needs. If not approved, funds will have to be diverted from other program activities and/or services to cover the cost increase.

What is the relationship, if any, to the state's capital budget?

This request has no impact on the capital budget.

What changes would be required to existing statutes, rules, or contracts, in order to implement the change?

This request has no impact to existing statutes, rules or contracts.

State of Washington
Decision Package
Department of Social and Health Services

FINAL

DP Code/Title: M2-8P Postage Rate Adjustments
Program Level - 110 Admin & Supporting Svcs

Budget Period: 2013-15 Version: K3 110 2013-15 Final 2015 Sup

Expenditure and revenue calculations and assumptions

See attachment: AW M2-8P Postage Rate Adjustments.xlsx

Which costs and functions are one-time? Which are ongoing? What are the budget impacts in future biennia?

These costs are ongoing and will carry forward into future biennia.

Object Detail		FY 1	FY 2	Total
Overall Funding				
E	Goods\Other Services	0	10,000	10,000
T	Intra-Agency Reimbursements	0	10,000	10,000
	Total Objects	**0**	**20,000**	**20,000**

DSHS Source Code Detail

Overall Funding		FY 1	FY 2	Total
Fund 001-1, General Fund - Basic Account-State				
Sources	Title			
0011	General Fund State	0	18,000	18,000
	Total for Fund 001-1	**0**	**18,000**	**18,000**
Fund 001-C, General Fund - Basic Account-Medicaid Federal				
Sources	Title			
19UL	Title XIX Admin (50%)	0	2,000	2,000
	Total for Fund 001-C	**0**	**2,000**	**2,000**
	Total Overall Funding	**0**	**20,000**	**20,000**

2015 Supplemental Budget
AW M2-8P Postage Rate Adjustment

Department of Social and Health Services

Rounded =Round(link,-3)

Program	Year		ISSD - TZ		Total
	2015		2015		2015
010	19,000		6,000		25,000
020	2,000		1,000		3,000
030	5,000		3,000		8,000
040	9,000		4,000		13,000
050	13,000		4,000		17,000
060	445,000		15,000		460,000
100	4,000		1,000		5,000
110	10,000		10,000		20,000
135	1,000		1,000		2,000
150	45,000		(45,000)		0
Total	553,000		0		553,000

State/Other Split

Program	State		Other		Total
	2015		2015		2015
010	23,000		2,000		25,000
020	3,000		0		3,000
030	8,000		0		8,000
040	9,000		4,000		13,000
050	11,000		6,000		17,000
060	293,000		167,000		460,000
100	5,000		0		5,000
110	18,000		2,000		20,000
135	2,000		0		2,000
150	0		0		0
Total	372,000		181,000		553,000

State of Washington
Decision Package
Department of Social and Health Services

FINAL

DP Code/Title: M2-8S Microsoft Enterprise Licensing Agmt
Program Level - 110 Admin & Supporting Svcs

Budget Period: 2013-15 Version: K3 110 2013-15 Final 2015 Sup

Recommendation Summary Text:

The Services and Enterprise Support Administration (SESA), Information System Services Division (ISSD) requests funding to move from the standard Microsoft Client Access License (CAL) to the Enterprise Client Access License (ECAL) Suite. By funding this request, SESA is expected to reduce future ongoing costs while improving services; support a more productive workforce; keep the Microsoft service platform efficient, nimble, and cost-effective; and improve service and provide increased options to partners and clients.

Fiscal Detail:

Operating Expenditures	FY 1	FY 2	Total
Overall Funding			
001-1 General Fund - Basic Account-State	0	264,000	264,000
001-C General Fund - Basic Account-Medicaid Federal	0	58,000	58,000
Total Cost	**0**	**322,000**	**322,000**

Staffing

Package Description:

Problem Statement:

Currently, the Department of Social and Health Services (DSHS) has only the basic licenses for the primary business tools used across the agency. With the upgrade to the Enterprise CAL Suite, the agency can realize the full business productivity features of SharePoint, Office, Lync and applications we develop using the Microsoft environment.

Without this upgrade, the department is unable to utilize such features as delivering key performance indicators on SharePoint dashboards, enhanced search of documents, and automated document routing and approvals, which could reduce time to delivery of services. Currently there is no ability to integrate Office documents and Business Analytics Reporting. This prevents the use of intelligent dashboards for making better business decisions and tracking performance indicators. In addition, the department will incur additional licensing and other fees for the use of Lync conferencing service.

The Enterprise CAL Suite is a critical prerequisite to moving to a cloud service such as Office 365 which includes Exchange e-mail, SharePoint, and Lync. At a minimum, the enterprise CAL positions DSHS to take advantage of Office 365 licensing which would reduce the overall number of licenses. Office 365 moves DSHS from per device licensing to a per user licensing method for some products. In field offices, this means that fewer licenses are likely to be required. This will position DSHS stakeholders to access critical e-mails, schedules, tasks, etc. from anywhere, thereby increasing productivity.

Proposed Solution:

DSHS would upgrade approximately 18,500 user licenses from the current basic license of the Microsoft Enterprise Agreement to the Enterprise CAL Suite.

CTS Consultation:

Consults were completed with CTS for hosting services. The results of these consults were used in the requested amounts where needed.

Agency Contact: Don Petrich (360) 902-7831
Program Contact: Sue Langen (360) 902-7714

DP Code/Title: M2-8S Microsoft Enterprise Licensing Agmt
Program Level - 110 Admin & Supporting Svcs

Budget Period: 2013-15 Version: K3 110 2013-15 Final 2015 Sup

Narrative Justification and Impact Statement

What specific performance outcomes does the agency expect?

Procurement of Microsoft Enterprise CAL Suite license upgrade will produce the following outcomes:
- Provide SharePoint, Lync, and other features with the ability to implement improvements such as management dashboards tied to key indicators (providing real time decision data)
- Search for documents across all DSHS SharePoint sites (improving ability to locate documents for public disclosure and the like)
- Direct editing of files from SharePoint web pages (improving productivity and reducing duplication of files)
- Availability of Lync conferencing (reducing the need for travel costs and time)
- As well as many other features that will improve DSHS computing abilities

Performance Measure Detail

Agency Level

Activity:		Incremental Changes FY 1	FY 2
K001	**Administration and Supporting Services**		
	No measures linked to package	0.00	0.00

Is this decision package essential to implement a strategy identified in the agency's strategic plan?

The budget request supports DSHS Goal 5: Public Trust - Strong management practices will be used to ensure quality and efficiency.

Does this decision package provide essential support to one of the Governor's priorities?

This decision package supports the Results Washington goal to:

Ensure efficiency and performance to the public by providing transparency and accountability in state agency operations and:
- Increase Washington State government's transparency.
- Increase customer satisfaction.
- Increase Washington State as an employer of choice.
- Increase on-time delivery for state services.

Does this decision package make key contributions to statewide results? Would it rate as a high priority in the Priorities of Government process?

This decision package supports the Results Washington goals to:

Ensure efficiency, performance, and accountability to the public by providing transparency and accountability in state agency operations and:
--Increase Washington State government's transparency.
--Increase the number of Results Washington outcome measures and leading indicators.
--Increase customer satisfaction.
--Increase Washington State as an employer of choice.
--Increase on-time delivery for state services.

DP Code/Title: M2-8S Microsoft Enterprise Licensing Agmt
Program Level - 110 Admin & Supporting Svcs

Budget Period: 2013-15 Version: K3 110 2013-15 Final 2015 Sup

What are the other important connections or impacts related to this proposal?

The stakeholders are the DSHS users who will benefit from the ECAL. Some of the agencies that DSHS interacts/partners with have developed applications that require ECAL to be able to connect and use. CTS is implementing Lync communication services which require users to have ECAL. ECAL procurement will enhance the work efficiency of our internal stakeholders by providing the ability to use document workflow for initiating, tracking, document review and approval, issue tracking, and signature collection. DSHS stakeholders will have access to Systems Center Data Protection Manager to secure their desktops.

What alternatives were explored by the agency, and why was this alternative chosen?

The request cannot be absorbed within existing resources due to the negative impact of taking funds away from other client service programs.

What are the consequences of not funding this package?

Not adopting this request will result in not improving services, limiting the capabilities of the workforce, reducing platform efficiency, reducing the agencies abilities to make real time decisions, and limiting the agency's ability to interact with some of the agency's partners.

What is the relationship, if any, to the state's capital budget?

This request has no impact on the capital budget.

What changes would be required to existing statutes, rules, or contracts, in order to implement the change?

This request has no impact to existing statutes, rules or contracts.

Expenditure and revenue calculations and assumptions

Total of $322,000 for upgrade to the Microsoft ECAL suite as a part of the enterprise agreement (will pay for four months of service).

The cost for the Microsoft ECAL suite is $967,000 per year. DSHS current contract with Microsoft expires in February 2015. DSHS will enter into a new contract with Microsoft and that contract begins March 1, 2015.

Which costs and functions are one-time? Which are ongoing? What are the budget impacts in future biennia?

The request of $322,000 for FY2015 is one-time. However, in the 2015-17 Biennium request, DSHS requested $967,000 per year for the Microsoft ECAL suite. The annual cost of $967,000 per year is on-going.

Object Detail	FY 1	FY 2	Total
Overall Funding			
E Goods\Other Services	0	322,000	322,000

State of Washington
Decision Package
Department of Social and Health Services

FINAL

DP Code/Title: M2-8S Microsoft Enterprise Licensing Agmt
Program Level - 110 Admin & Supporting Svcs

Budget Period: 2013-15 Version: K3 110 2013-15 Final 2015 Sup

DSHS Source Code Detail

Overall Funding		FY 1	FY 2	Total
Fund 001-1, General Fund - Basic Account-State				
Sources	**Title**			
0011	General Fund State	0	264,000	264,000
	Total for Fund 001-1	**0**	**264,000**	**264,000**
Fund 001-C, General Fund - Basic Account-Medicaid Federal				
Sources	**Title**			
19UL	Title XIX Admin (50%)	0	58,000	58,000
	Total for Fund 001-C	**0**	**58,000**	**58,000**
	Total Overall Funding	**0**	**322,000**	**322,000**

Information Technology Addendum

Recsum Code and Title **M2-8S Microsoft Enterprise License Agreement**

Brief Description: The Department of Social and Health Services requests an annual increase over the basic Microsoft Enterprise Agreement license to include the Office 365 (O-365) Hybrid licensing with Enterprise Client Access License (ECAL), amounting to $322,000 for FY 2015. Program areas have requested the expansion of the licensing agreement to support management of documents within their workflow processes, and other cloud features that the O-365 ECAL Suite provides to meet their business needs. These other features include enabling business analytics integration into management dashboards, streamlining approval processes, and enhancing security of the collaboration environment.

If this investment includes the use of servers, do you plan to use the state data center?

☐ **Yes** ☐ **No, waiver received** ☐ **No, waiver not received** ☒ **Does not apply**

Security

Security: How does this investment affect the state's security posture? Have the proper security considerations been made? Does the investment itself actually improve infrastructure security? What, if any, security concerns are there?

The investment enhances the security of the DSHS business productivity/collaboration environment and improves infrastructure security by acquiring required licensing for data protection and recovery on the Department's workstations.

Feasibility/Risk

Cultural readiness/organizational capacity: Does this investment require significant institutional change within the agency, and is the agency prepared for that change? Is there committed and proven leadership? Is there a record of successful projects? Does the agency foster a culture of creative problem solving?

The agency has been culturally ready to improve its workforce collaboration, performance metrics reporting, and open government/transparency but has not had the available tools.

Technical complexity: Can the investment realistically be completed within the proposed framework of time, budget and resources?

The investment upgrades existing software licensing and can realistically be completed within the stated cost.

Urgency: Is the investment urgent or can wait until a future funding cycle? Must the investment be completed all at once, or can we break it into incremental pieces?

This investment is urgent and should be completed as soon as possible. Currently, DSHS has only basic licenses for the primary business tools used across the agency. The capabilities accessible with the basic licenses are limiting the program area's abilities to move to a shared

service cloud model, improve communications between staff and across programs, their effectiveness in communicating metrics, and their ability to support more workflow automation. Current limitations in our licensing model are impeding productivity due to the absence of features that will allow for business intelligence for the use of scorecards and trending analysis using real time information.

License contract terms are three years and payments are made incrementally on an annual basis.

Impact of not doing: What are the potential impacts to the state, agency, or the public if this investment is not completed?

Without this upgrade, the Department is unable to utilize such features as:

- Shared services would not be possible without the cloud features of O-365.
- Automated document routing and approval workflows, which could reduce time for delivering services.
- Improved communications between staff and across programs through tools such as Lync conferencing service (without incurring additional licensing and other fees)
- Collaboration between SharePoint and other applications such as Microsoft Dynamics CRM
- Intelligent dashboards for making better business decisions and tracking performance indicators.
- Enhanced search and electronic discovery of documents for improved efficiencies in work processes and in response to public disclosure and investigative requests

Technology Strategy Alignment

Agile value: Is the investment broken into incremental steps that provide customer-facing value and allow periodic assessment of progress?

N/A

Modernization of state government: Will the investment result in replacing legacy systems that are no longer solving business problems with modern, appropriate technology solutions?

This investment won't replace legacy systems but will enhance and modernize our current desktop productivity tools and allow for a more efficient and secure computing environment. It will also increase the availability of business analytical tools to all staff for improved decision making.

Mobility: Does the investment help state employees conduct business "any time, anywhere"? Does it improve mobile access to services for customers?

This investment does not directly improve mobile access to services for customers.

Transparency: Does it increase public visibility of services provided with public funds? Does this investment increase public access to searchable public data and information?

This investment does not increase public visibility of services provided with public funds.

Accountability: Are the investment's goals well articulated? How will "success" be determined or measured?

The investment's goals for procuring Microsoft Enterprise CALS include:

- reducing future ongoing costs while improving services;
- supporting a more productive workforce;
- keeping the Microsoft service platform efficient, nimble, and cost-effective;
- improving service and providing increased options to partners and clients.

The functionality resulting from productivity software licensing at the Enterprise CAL Suite level includes improved communication, collaboration, presence, synchronous communications (instant messaging) , information rights management, client workstation security, server and Web security, client and server real-time monitoring and updates, conferencing, Web-based forms solutions, and business data connectors, among many other features.

Sample performance outcomes include:

- Time/productivity gains through improved ability to locate documents across current information boundaries and overcome lack of search features across sister organizations (without which documents are unnecessarily duplicated and cause increased IT storage requirements and costs)
- Reduced travel time and associated costs by using multi-point group video conferencing through Lync, and eliminating the need to pay for additional licenses for WebEx, GoToMeeting, or other conferencing services currently used in the Department
- Better/faster decision-making as a result of access to real-time decision support through key performance indicators highlighted in management dashboards posted on SharePoint webpages or sent via e-mails directly to management wherever they can access Outlook
- Improved collaboration and productivity, and reduced duplication of files, through direct editing of files from SharePoint webpages

Sample performance measures include:

- Improved response times for public disclosure requests as a result of better document search capabilities
- Reduction in IT storage costs for documents as a result of reduced duplication of files
- Reduction in license costs for WebEx, GoToMeeting and other conferencing services as a result of using Lync conferencing included in the Microsoft Enterprise CAL Suite of products.

Financial

Financial risk of not doing: Are there potential financial consequences for not completing this investment, such as fines for noncompliance with legal requirements or a loss of federal funding?

Due to licensing regulations, we could face a compliance issue that could result in fines.

Cost Reduction: Does this investment prevent or reduce expenses, such as the cost of maintaining labor-intensive systems that could be automated, repairs or maintenance to obsolete or outdated infrastructure, or specialty expertise required for legacy technologies?

This investment could eliminate the need for additional agreements with other software vendors (McAfee; WebEx) which could result in a cost savings of over $150,000 per year. This will also reduce the number of CRM licenses required as the ECAL would allow reports to be generated from CRM data and viewed in SharePoint. Users could view these reports via the SharePoint site, eliminating the need of an explicit CRM license.

Revenue Generation: Does this investment generate new revenue, or capture additional revenue left "on the table" by current solutions?

This investment does not generate new revenue or capture additional revenue left "on the table" by current solutions.

Business Case/Agency Mission Priority

Mission priority: Does this investment help the agency better deliver its mission?

As more demands are made on the agency, we need to keep up with current technologies. There is an increasing need for the added features of the ECAL, especially in the SharePoint environment. Additionally, this will:

- Reduce duplicative storage costs
- Lower the amount of effort associated with public disclosure requests
- Provide a uniform tool to view data
- Prepare us for an enterprise-wide System Center Suite Solution for desktop data protection.
- Enable use of the full features of Lync for improved communications and conferencing services
- Improve service delivery with document tracking and workflow

This investment supports DSHS Goal 5:
Public Trust – Strong management practices will be used to ensure quality and efficiency.

This request supports the *Results Washington* Goal 5:
Effective, efficient and accountable government

Business case: Is there a clear problem with the status quo, and does this investment clearly solve that business problem?

By moving to the ECAL suite we will obtain additional features that will allow us to enhance our services.

- There is an increasing need for the SharePoint ECAL as part of the SharePoint 2013 Project. These features include:
  - Business Intelligence to allow for enterprise wide use of scorecards and trending analysis, using real time data.
  - Enterprise Search features to allow for more efficient response to discovery requests.
  - Could be cost offsets from current BI expenditures.
- As we move towards an Enterprise System Center Configuration Manager solution we will require the System Center Suite CAL, included with the ECAL, in order to better manage workstations.
- Exchange Enterprise benefits:
  - Help support the mobility initiative by giving us the ability to apply advanced ActiveSync policies, which will give a higher level of management of mobile devices.
  - Data Loss Prevention will provide the Department with the ability to control the release of sensitive data, such as PII, credit cards, or any data determined to be sensitive.
  - If we were to move from the current CTS Shared Service we would need the ECAL in order to do e-discovery and set custom retention policies.

DP Code/Title: M2-8T Electronic Records Vault - EVault
Program Level - 110 Admin & Supporting Svcs

Budget Period: 2013-15 Version: K3 110 2013-15 Final 2015 Sup

Recommendation Summary Text:

The Service and Enterprise Supporting Administration (SESA) requests funding for migrating the Department of Social and Health Services (DSHS) email to the Washington State Electronic Records Vault (WaSERV a.k.a. Vault) managed by Consolidated Technology Services (CTS) as part of the shared enterprise messaging service. By funding this request, SESA is expected to cover the cost of migrating all DSHS email to the Electronic Records Vault.

Fiscal Detail:

Operating Expenditures	FY 1	FY 2	Total
Overall Funding			
001-1 General Fund - Basic Account-State	0	249,000	249,000
001-C General Fund - Basic Account-Medicaid Federal	0	55,000	55,000
Total Cost	**0**	**304,000**	**304,000**

Staffing

Package Description:

Problem Statement:

In alignment with former Governor's Directive 09-02, DSHS completed its migration to the shared e-mail service in November 2012. DSHS employees create, send, and receive well over two-hundred and fifty thousand e-mails every working day. The Shared Services Exchange environment is not designed as storage or records management system; this is the function of the Vault.

The Shared Services Enterprise Vault is intended to store and retrieve email messages in compliance with agency records retention requirements, and facilitate identification, retrieval, and production of email for public records requests and litigation purposes. The Vault provides a single repository for agency email locking email documents into set required retention periods allowing a comprehensive search for email documents related to specific public records or litigation discovery requests. DSHS is migrating all DSHS email to the Shared Services Vault. The effort to move active mailboxes into the Vault will complete in Fiscal Year 2015. In Fiscal Year 2015 and extending into Fiscal Year 2016, DSHS will begin moving locally stored Personal Storage Tables (PST) files, also known as personal folders to the Vault.

With its large daily email volume, DSHS has historically encouraged personnel to use PSTs as an alternate method of storing and managing emails. Currently, PSTs are mainly stored in network servers and local drives, rather than on a centralized storage location, presenting significant management challenges and business risks. In addition, PSTs pose a high impact in network server storage and backup, can elude DSHS retention policies, and are prone to data loss or corruption.

While the Vault un-duplicates e-mails and compresses files to reduce storage needs, overall storage costs will increase dramatically based on published rates. DSHS does not have discretionary funds to pay the increased storage costs.

Proposed Solution:

The Legislature appropriates funds to cover the costs for services rendered by CTS.

CTS Consultation:

Consults were completed with CTS for hosting services. The results of these consults were used in the requested amounts where needed.

DP Code/Title: M2-8T Electronic Records Vault - EVault
Program Level - 110 Admin & Supporting Svcs

Budget Period: 2013-15 Version: K3 110 2013-15 Final 2015 Sup

Agency Contact: Don Petrich (360) 902-7831
Program Contact: Sue Langen (360) 902-7714

Narrative Justification and Impact Statement

What specific performance outcomes does the agency expect?

Migrating to EVault will achieve the following outcomes:
- Centralize storage of email into a single location instead of 200 plus locations.
- Improve agency compliance with state records retention requirements, ensuring email is properly stored, maintained and available on request
- Minimize the risk of email data loss or corruption
- Minimize the risk of prematurely or intentionally deleting email that needs to be retained
- Minimize per user storage expense by providing a common storage location that uses modern efficiency and compression technology to limit additional expenditures and provide 'economy of scale'
- Minimize the complexity of producing email records for public disclosure requests and litigation proceedings

Performance Measure Detail

Agency Level

Activity:		Incremental Changes FY 1	FY 2
K001	**Administration and Supporting Services**		
	No measures linked to package	0.00	0.00

Is this decision package essential to implement a strategy identified in the agency's strategic plan?

The budget request supports DSHS Goal 5: Public Trust - Strong management practices will be used to ensure quality and efficiency.

Does this decision package provide essential support to one of the Governor's priorities?

This decision package supports the Results Washington Goal 5: Effective, Efficient and Accountable Government - Fostering a Lean culture that drives accountability and results for the people of Washington.

Ensure efficiency and performance to the public by providing transparency and accountability in state agency operations and:
-Increase Washington State government's transparency.
-Increase customer satisfaction.
-Increase Washington State as an employer of choice.
-Increase on-time delivery for state services.

Does this decision package make key contributions to statewide results? Would it rate as a high priority in the Priorities of Government process?

This decision package supports the Results Washington goals to:

Ensure efficiency, performance, and accountability to the public by providing transparency and accountability in state agency operations and:
--Increase Washington State government's transparency.
--Increase the number of Results Washington outcome measures and leading indicators.
--Increase customer satisfaction.
--Increase Washington State as an employer of choice.
--Increase on-time delivery for state services.

DP Code/Title: M2-8T Electronic Records Vault - EVault
Program Level - 110 Admin & Supporting Svcs

Budget Period: 2013-15 Version: K3 110 2013-15 Final 2015 Sup

What are the other important connections or impacts related to this proposal?

Without additional appropriated funding, impacts on administrations will vary, but diversion of existing funds will impact client services.

What alternatives were explored by the agency, and why was this alternative chosen?

The request cannot be absorbed within existing resources due to the negative impact of taking dollars away from other client services.

What are the consequences of not funding this package?

Not adopting this request will cause DSHS to shift funding from client services in order to meet the requirements of Governor's Directive 09-02.

What is the relationship, if any, to the state's capital budget?

This request has no impact on the capital budget.

What changes would be required to existing statutes, rules, or contracts, in order to implement the change?

This request has no impact to existing statutes, rules or contracts.

Expenditure and revenue calculations and assumptions

See attachment: SESA M2-8T Electronic Records Vault - EVault.xlsx

Which costs and functions are one-time? Which are ongoing? What are the budget impacts in future biennia?

These costs are ongoing and will carry forward into future biennia.

Object Detail	FY 1	FY 2	Total
Overall Funding			
E Goods\Other Services	0	304,000	304,000

DSHS Source Code Detail

Overall Funding	FY 1	FY 2	Total
Fund 001-1, General Fund - Basic Account-State			
Sources Title			
0011 General Fund State	0	249,000	249,000
Total for Fund 001-1	**0**	**249,000**	**249,000**
Fund 001-C, General Fund - Basic Account-Medicaid Federal			
Sources Title			
19UL Title XIX Admin (50%)	0	55,000	55,000
Total for Fund 001-C	**0**	**55,000**	**55,000**
Total Overall Funding	**0**	**304,000**	**304,000**

2013-15 Supplemental Budget
M2-8T Electronic Records Vault - EVault

Department of Social and Health Services

Rate per GB $ 1.27

ADMIN/PROGRAM AREA	NUMBER OF MAILBOXES	ALL ITEM SIZE (in MBs)	35% COMPRESSION (in MBs)	TOTAL ITEM SIZE WITH 35% COMPRESSION (in MBs)	TOTAL MONTHLY VAULT STORAGE COST
ADSA	8,532	1,418,059	496,321	921,738	**$1,171**
CA	2,874	1,302,898	456,014	846,884	**$1,076**
ESA	3,581	749,901	262,465	487,436	**$619**
ESA-DCS	1,259	245,027	85,759	159,268	**$202**
JRA	975	265,361	92,876	172,485	**$219**
Secretary	1,207	364,536	127,588	236,948	**$301**
DVR	528	94,903	33,216	61,687	**$78**
ODHH	20	5,437	1,903	3,534	**$4**
SCC (already in Vault - storage includes PSTs)*	417			1,043,000	**$1,325**
DSHS TOTAL	**19,393**	**4,446,122**	**1,556,143**	**3,932,979**	**$4,995**

ADMIN/PROGRAM AREA	NUMBER OF MAILBOXES	ALL ITEM SIZE (in GBs)	35% COMPRESSION (in GBs)	TOTAL ITEM SIZE WITH 35% COMPRESSION (in GBs)	TOTAL MONTHLY VAULT STORAGE COST	Annual Cost
ADSA	8,532	1,418	496	922	$1,171	$14,047
CA	2,874	1,303	456	847	$1,076	$12,907
ESA	3,581	750	262	487	$619	$7,429
ESA-DCS	1,259	245	86	159	$202	$2,427
JRA	975	265	93	172	$219	$2,629
Secretary	1,207	365	128	237	$301	$3,611
DVR	528	95	33	62	$78	$940
ODHH	20	5	2	4	$4	$54
SCC (already in Vault - storage includes PSTs)*	417			1,043	$1,325	$15,895
DSHS MAILBOX TOTAL	**19,393**	**4,446**	**1,556**	**3,933**	**$4,995**	**$59,939**
						0
PSTs *(from 2012 PST analysis)*	102,600	24,669	8,634	16,035	**$20,364**	**$244,369**
DSHS PSTs TOTAL	**102,600**	**24,669**	**8,634**	**16,035**	**$20,364**	**$244,369**
						0
TOTAL STORAGE AND COST		**29,115**	**10,190**	**19,968**	**$25,359**	**$304,308**

Information Technology Addendum

Recsum Code and Title **M2-8T Electronic Records Vault - EVault**

Brief Description: The Service and Enterprise Supporting Administration (SESA) requests funding for migrating the Department of Social and Health Services (DSHS) email to the Washington State Electronic Records Vault (WaSERV a.k.a. Vault) managed by Consolidated Technology Services (CTS) as part of the shared enterprise messaging service. By funding this request, SESA is expected to cover the cost of migrating all DSHS email to the Electronic Records Vault.

If this investment includes the use of servers, do you plan to use the state data center?

☐ **Yes** ☐ **No, waiver received** ☐ **No, waiver not received** ☒ **Does not apply**

Security

Security: How does this investment affect the state's security posture? Have the proper security considerations been made? Does the investment itself actually improve infrastructure security? What, if any, security concerns are there?

This request would provide the funding for DSHS to utilize the CTS e-Vault service. This environment has been deemed appropriate for all categories of data. In addition, DSHS has established a Business Associates Agreement with CTS regarding HIPAA data contained in various CTS managed data repositories.

Feasibility/Risk

Cultural readiness/organizational capacity: Does this investment require significant institutional change within the agency, and is the agency prepared for that change? Is there committed and proven leadership? Is there a record of successful projects? Does the agency foster a culture of creative problem solving?

Staff are already migrated, or will be migrated into the CTS managed Shared Messaging environment by the time we begin migrating PSTs into the Vault. As such, staff have, or will have familiarity with the Vault and its features. This effort will not require any additional cultural change beyond what is already in motion for using the Shared Messaging environment.

Technical complexity: Can the investment realistically be completed within the proposed framework of time, budget and resources?

Yes, the design of the injestion of the PSTs is taking into account the dispersed nature of the data, as well as the volumn of data. A similar methodology for gathering large amounts of dispersed data is being used currently to support existing litigation discovery requests.

Urgency: Is the investment urgent or can wait until a future funding cycle? Must the investment be completed all at once, or can we break it into incremental pieces?

The urgency of this request is driven by cost avoidance. Until the PSTs have successfully been injested into the Vault, the agency will be subject to increased liability due to the inability to always produce complete records for disclosure or discovery. The liability, and the costs associated with a more manual process will continue until this process is done (i.e. an investment is needed, before we can benefit from the advantages this effort will bring.) So while it can wait, it is at a cost that well exceeds the investment needed.

Impact of not doing: What are the potential impacts to the state, agency, or the public if this investment is not completed?

As noted above, that impact of not completing this effort is the continued costs associated with a more manual process, and the increased financial liability resulting from incomplete disclosure and discovery request responses. These costs are both monetary and political in nature.

Technology Strategy Alignment

Agile value: Is the investment broken into incremental steps that provide customer-facing value and allow periodic assessment of progress?

While the steps are incremental in nature, the customer-facing value is limited until the project is complete. Until complete, the data retrievable from the Vault may have limited value, depending upon the scope of the disclosure or discovery request.

Modernization of state government: Will the investment result in replacing legacy systems that are no longer solving business problems with modern, appropriate technology solutions?

Yes, this investment will upgrade older e-mail technology to a modern service that CTS implements and manages. This will replace current agency solutions that are distributed, which are causing business problems for disclosure and discovery, and which require multiple manual efforts to gather the appropriate data.

Mobility: Does the investment help state employees conduct business "any time, anywhere"? Does it improve mobile access to services for customers?

By centralizing the PST content, the agency is better able to support its mobile workforce. Remote access is a centralized service, so by centralizing all of the email content, staff are not dependent on links from the centralized service out to data sources in the field, which are subjected, to a greater degree, to outages and network conjestion.

Transparency: Does it increase public visibility of services provided with public funds? Does this investment increase public access to searchable public data and information?

As noted above, a key driver is providing increased, and more consistent access to email/data content for purposes of public disclosure and litigation discovery. This will increase public access to data (searches not subject to manual processes), while reducing State liability.

Accountability: Are the investment's goals well articulated? How will "success" be determined or measured?

Reduce number of service calls from e-mail data loss or corruption, or prematurely/intentionally deletion of e-mails. The DSHS Information System Services Division's (ISSD) incident ticket

tracking system will be used to measure the decreased number of tickets associated to e-mail corruption or data loss.
Improve the quality of email data searches for public disclosure requests and litigation proceedings. This performance outcome will be measured through dashboard reporting.

Financial

Financial risk of not doing: Are there potential financial consequences for not completing this investment, such as fines for noncompliance with legal requirements or a loss of federal funding?

This investment will enable the agency to reduce its liability risk from public disclosure and litigation discovery requests. The current process has resulted in multiple court findings against the State.

Cost Reduction: Does this investment prevent or reduce expenses, such as the cost of maintaining labor-intensive systems that could be automated, repairs or maintenance to obsolete or outdated infrastructure, or specialty expertise required for legacy technologies?

This investment will reduce the amount of staff time required to respond the disclosure and discovery request through centralization. The agency does not currently catalog the amount of time spent responding to disclosure and discovery requests.

Revenue Generation: Does this investment generate new revenue, or capture additional revenue left "on the table" by current solutions?

This investment does not generate or capture additional revenue.

Business Case/Agency Mission Priority

Mission priority: Does this investment help the agency better deliver its mission?

The funding will help transform lives by providing the data, in a timely fashion, to citizens for disclosure and discovery request. Having a complete and clear capture of data to support private and business needs is important to a transparent government.

Business case: Is there a clear problem with the status quo, and does this investment clearly solve that business problem?

The status quo is resulting in inconsistent, and sometimes inaccurate capture of data, that can be slow due to the decentralized collection of that data. This investment will result in the centralization of the data, providing more accurate and timely response to requests.

State of Washington
Decision Package
Department of Social and Health Services

FINAL

DP Code/Title: M2-8V Building Access Control System
Program Level - 110 Admin & Supporting Svcs

Budget Period: 2013-15 Version: K3 110 2013-15 Final 2015 Sup

Recommendation Summary Text:

The Department of Social and Health Services (DSHS) requests funding to replace the current failing and obsolete building access control systems in order to ensure the safety of staff and clients who utilize the state offices. By funding this request, DSHS is expected to replace all security/access operational technology systems from Windows XP operating systems to Windows 7 or higher.

Fiscal Detail:

Operating Expenditures	FY 1	FY 2	Total
Overall Funding			
001-1 General Fund - Basic Account-State	0	2,000	2,000
Total Cost	**0**	**2,000**	**2,000**

Staffing

Package Description:

Historically, building access control systems have been procured by the local tenant administration(s) on a site by site basis. Based on an assessment of the 200 plus agency sites, 34 of these security systems are still running on Windows XP operating systems and the hardware is malfunctioning. The system controls all entrances, employee badge database, and alarm systems. As of April 2014, Microsoft ended support for the Windows XP operating system.

By state policy (https://www.ocio.wa.gov/policies/142-windows-xp-end-life), all systems running Windows XP must be removed from state offices and from the state network. All remaining Windows XP devices must be removed and replaced with current Windows 7 or later system as soon as possible.

Narrative Justification and Impact Statement

What specific performance outcomes does the agency expect?

Procurement of these modern security systems will produce the following outcomes:

- Provide continued security even when the network connection is lost (there are local copies of the badge database, functionality continues, even when the network connection is down).
- Provide a more stable platform (current hardware is failing in a way that jeopardizes both building security as well as posing a potential fire hazard).
- Provide management of badges from any of the sites, improving options for support.
- Provide a single, but distributed database. Reducing the management of badges for staff who do this in addition to their full time jobs (currently, staff have to be removed from every location they have access to; with this improvement, they only have to be removed or added once).

Performance Measure Detail

Agency Level

Activity:	Incremental Changes FY 1	FY 2
K001 Administration and Supporting Services		
No measures linked to package	0.00	0.00

Is this decision package essential to implement a strategy identified in the agency's strategic plan?

DP Code/Title: M2-8V Building Access Control System
Program Level - 110 Admin & Supporting Svcs

Budget Period: 2013-15 Version: K3 110 2013-15 Final 2015 Sup

This request supports the following goals identified in the DSHS 2013-2015 Strategic Plan:

Public Trust - Strong management practices will be used to ensure quality and efficiency.

Does this decision package provide essential support to one of the Governor's priorities?

This package supports the Results Washington Goal:

Goal 4: Healthy and Safe Communities - Fostering the health of Washingtonians from a healthy start to a safe and supported future.
Goal 5: Effective, Efficient and Accountable Government - Fostering a Lean culture that drives accountability and results for the people of Washington.

Does this decision package make key contributions to statewide results? Would it rate as a high priority in the Priorities of Government process?

This decision package supports the Results Washington goals to:

Ensure efficiency, performance, and accountability to the public by providing transparency and accountability in state agency operations and:
--Increase Washington State government's transparency.
--Increase customer satisfaction.
--Increase Washington State as an employer of choice.
--Increase on-time delivery for state services.

What are the other important connections or impacts related to this proposal?

These systems ensure the safety of staff and clients who are visiting these state offices. Not addressing these issues pose both health and safety issues, and access to service issues, where an office may not be operational due to safety concerns.

What alternatives were explored by the agency, and why was this alternative chosen?

The request cannot be absorbed within existing resources due to the negative impact of taking funds away from other client service programs.

What are the consequences of not funding this package?

Not adopting this request will result in escalating information technology security risks and physical security risks due to failing systems.

What is the relationship, if any, to the state's capital budget?

This request has no impact on the capital budget.

What changes would be required to existing statutes, rules, or contracts, in order to implement the change?

This request has no impact to existing statutes, rules or contracts.

Expenditure and revenue calculations and assumptions

See attachment: AW M2-8V Building Access Control System.xlsx

State of Washington
Decision Package
Department of Social and Health Services

FINAL

DP Code/Title: M2-8V Building Access Control System
Program Level - 110 Admin & Supporting Svcs

Budget Period: 2013-15 Version: K3 110 2013-15 Final 2015 Sup

Which costs and functions are one-time? Which are ongoing? What are the budget impacts in future biennia?

These costs are one-time and will not carry forward.

Object Detail	FY 1	FY 2	Total
Overall Funding			
E Goods\Other Services	0	2,000	2,000

DSHS Source Code Detail

Overall Funding	FY 1	FY 2	Total
Fund 001-1, General Fund - Basic Account-State			
Sources Title			
0011 General Fund State	0	2,000	2,000
Total for Fund 001-1	**0**	**2,000**	**2,000**
Total Overall Funding	**0**	**2,000**	**2,000**

2015 Supplemental Budget
AW M2-8V Building Access Control System

Department of Social & Health Services

	State	Other	Total
Program			2015
010	$166,000	$17,000	$183,000
020	$1,000	$0	$1,000
040	$12,000	$8,000	$20,000
050	$27,000	$24,000	$51,000
060	$226,000	$135,000	$361,000
100	$51,000	$0	$51,000
110	$2,000	$0	$2,000
Total	**$485,000**	**$184,000**	**$669,000**

DP Code/Title: M2-9G Workers Comp Base Correction
Program Level - 110 Admin & Supporting Svcs

Budget Period: 2013-15 Version: K3 110 2013-15 Final 2015 Sup

Recommendation Summary Text:

The Department of Social and Health Services (DSHS) requests funding to correct the base funding level of premiums paid to Labor and Industries (L&I) for worker's compensation. By funding this request, DSHS will not have to divert funding from services to clients in order to cover the cost of this mandatory premium.

Fiscal Detail:

Operating Expenditures	FY 1	FY 2	Total
Overall Funding			
001-1 General Fund - Basic Account-State	0	21,000	21,000
001-C General Fund - Basic Account-Medicaid Federal	0	4,000	4,000
Total Cost	**0**	**25,000**	**25,000**

Staffing

Package Description:

A review of the funding for worker's compensation found two steps in previous biennial budgets that resulted in an inadequate amount of funding being provided for the premiums that are paid to L&I.

The first adjustment that needs to be made is in the calculation of the Worker's Compensation Changes for the 2011-13 Biennial Budget. The information provided for the calculation showed an Estimated Premium Paid of $25.2 million for the first year and $28.5 million for the second year. Using these amounts against the proposed estimated premium of $31.9 million per fiscal year resulted in an increase in funding of $6.7 million in the first year and $3.4 million in the second. The actual cost for the second year for the department was $24.7 million, instead of the $28.5 million above, a difference of $3.8 million for the increased cost in the second year.

The second adjustment is for the Carry Forward Level (CFL) adjustment in the 2013-15 Biennial Budget. The 2011-13 funding was placed into DSHS program Payments to Other Agencies (PTOA or Program 145). As part of the 2012 Supplemental Budget, the funding was transferred out of PTOA to the appropriate DSHS programs. When CFL was completed, Step G01 Transfers contained a reduction of $3.4 million for the 2011-13 Worker's Compensation Step. This step brought the first year funding to the second year level for the workers compensation portion of the transfer step. There should not have been a CFL adjustment for the Worker's Compensation Step, because the original step was done to bring the funding up to $31.9 million per Fiscal Year as estimated by L&I.

By funding this request the programs budgets will receive the funding necessary to cover the amounts that are being paid to L&I each quarter.

Agency contact: Bill Jordan (360) 902-8183.

Narrative Justification and Impact Statement

What specific performance outcomes does the agency expect?

By funding this mandatory payment requirement, DSHS will not have to divert other funds that currently support client services.

State of Washington
Decision Package
Department of Social and Health Services

FINAL

DP Code/Title: M2-9G Workers Comp Base Correction
Program Level - 110 Admin & Supporting Svcs

Budget Period: 2013-15 Version: K3 110 2013-15 Final 2015 Sup

Performance Measure Detail

Agency Level

Activity: K001 Administration and Supporting Services	Incremental Changes FY 1	FY 2
No measures linked to package	0.00	0.00

Is this decision package essential to implement a strategy identified in the agency's strategic plan?

This request supports the following goals identified in the DSHS 2013-2015 Strategic Plan:

Health - Each individual and each community will be healthy,

Public Trust - Strong management practices will be used to ensure quality and efficiency.

Does this decision package provide essential support to one of the Governor's priorities?

This package supports Results Washington Goal 5: Effective, Efficient and Accountable Government Fostering a Lean culture that drives accountability and results for the people of Washington.

Does this decision package make key contributions to statewide results? Would it rate as a high priority in the Priorities of Government process?

This decision package supports the Results Washington goals to:

Ensure that funding is used responsibly, and

Ensure efficiency, performance, and accountability to the public by providing transparency and accountability in state agency operations.

What are the other important connections or impacts related to this proposal?

None

What alternatives were explored by the agency, and why was this alternative chosen?

The request cannot be absorbed with existing resources without reducing the funding for services to clients.

What are the consequences of not funding this package?

Not funding this request would necessitate using funds for client services to cover the requirement premiums.

What is the relationship, if any, to the state's capital budget?

This request has no impact on the capital budget.

What changes would be required to existing statutes, rules, or contracts, in order to implement the change?

This request has no impact to existing statutes, rules or contracts.

Expenditure and revenue calculations and assumptions

See attachment: AW M2-9G Workers Comp Base Correction.xlsx.

DP Code/Title: M2-9G Workers Comp Base Correction
Program Level - 110 Admin & Supporting Svcs

Budget Period: 2013-15 Version: K3 110 2013-15 Final 2015 Sup

Which costs and functions are one-time? Which are ongoing? What are the budget impacts in future biennia?

L&I's cost for worker's compensation is an ongoing cost to the department.

Object Detail	FY 1	FY 2	Total
Overall Funding			
B Employee Benefits	0	25,000	25,000

DSHS Source Code Detail

Overall Funding	FY 1	FY 2	Total
Fund 001-1, General Fund - Basic Account-State			
Sources Title			
0011 General Fund State	0	21,000	21,000
Total for Fund 001-1	**0**	**21,000**	**21,000**
Fund 001-C, General Fund - Basic Account-Medicaid Federal			
Sources Title			
19UL Title XIX Admin (50%)	0	4,000	4,000
Total for Fund 001-C	**0**	**4,000**	**4,000**
Total Overall Funding	**0**	**25,000**	**25,000**

2015 Supplemental Budget
AW M2-9G Workers Comp Base Correction

Department of Social and Health Services

	Program	FY 15 OBJECT B	FY 15 FUNDING State	Other	Total
010	Children's Administration	137,000	124,000	13,000	137,000
020	Juvenile Rehabilitation Admin	231,000	231,000	-	231,000
030	Mental Heath Division	1,296,000	1,207,000	89,000	1,296,000
040	Developmental Disabilites Admin	1,698,000	1,002,000	696,000	1,698,000
050	Aging & Long-Term Support	70,000	36,000	34,000	70,000
060	Economic Services Admin	231,000	144,000	87,000	231,000
070	Alcohol & Substance Abuse	4,000	3,000	1,000	4,000
100	Division of Vocational Rehab	16,000	16,000	-	16,000
110	Administration	25,000	21,000	4,000	25,000
135	Special Commitment Center	116,000	116,000	-	116,000
TOTAL		3,824,000	2,900,000	924,000	3,824,000

DP Code/Title: M2-9T Transfers
Program Level - 110 Admin & Supporting Svcs

Budget Period: 2013-15 Version: K3 110 2013-15 Final 2015 Sup

Recommendation Summary Text:

The Department of Social and Health Services (DSHS) requests the shift of FTEs and funding among programs in the 2015 Supplemental Budget. This transfer will align FTEs and funds with the programs where the costs are incurred. The net impact is zero.

Fiscal Detail:

Operating Expenditures	FY 1	FY 2	Total
Overall Funding			
001-1 General Fund - Basic Account-State	0	453,000	453,000
001-C General Fund - Basic Account-Medicaid Federal	0	96,000	96,000
Total Cost	**0**	**549,000**	**549,000**

Staffing

Package Description:

DSHS requests internal transfers among several program budgets resulting in a net zero funding change for the department. This aligns program appropriations with planned expenditures. DSHS requests the following adjustments for the 2015 Supplemental Budget:

Information System Services Division (ISSD) Compensation Adjustment-
(Program 110 to Programs 010, 020, 030, 040, 050, 060, 100, 135):
Program 110 - Administration and Supporting Services (Administration) will transfer compensation adjustments for staff in the Information Systems Services Division (Program 150) to other DSHS programs. ISSD is a chargeback program where the funding resides in program's Sub-Object TZ budget. Administration will transfer ($214,000) GF-State to the other programs. The transfer will realign the funding with the correct DSHS programs to be charged by ISSD.

Consolidated Field Services (CFS) Compensation Adjustment -
(Program 110 to Programs 010, 020, 030, 040, 050, 060, 135):
Program 110 - Administration and Supporting Services (Administration) will transfer compensation adjustments for staff in Consolidated Field Services (Program 160) to other DSHS programs. CFS is a chargeback program where the funding resides in program's budget. Administration will transfer ($216,000) GF-State to the other programs. The transfer will realign the funding with the correct DSHS programs to be charged by CFS.

ISSD Chargeback Reallocation -
(Programs 010, 020, 030, 040, 050, 060, 070, 100, 110, 135):
The Financial Services Administration (FSA), in conjunction with program areas and ISSD, updated the chargeback methodology for services that are being provided. The methodology simplifies the categories of service, as well as the metrics used to fairly and efficiently distribute charges for services utilized. As a result of the methodology updates, the allocation of funding to the program area needs to be re-distributed to reflect the changes. This re-allocation will in essence hold harmless the program areas, so that all programs will be sufficiently funded for currently identified ISSD service needs.

Information Technology Savings (ITS) Adjustment-
(Program 145 to Programs 010, 020, 030, 040, 050, 060, 070, 100, 110):
Program 145 - Payments to Other Agencies (PTOA) will transfer the ITS reduction to other DSHS programs. The ITS step was placed into PTOA as part of the 2014 Supplemental budget. The PTOA will transfer ($676,000) GF-State to the other programs. The transfer will realign the reduction with the DSHS programs that incur the charges.

DP Code/Title: M2-9T Transfers

Program Level - 110 Admin & Supporting Svcs

Budget Period: 2013-15 Version: K3 110 2013-15 Final 2015 Sup

Office of Deaf and Hard of Hearing (ODHH) Compensation Adjustment-
(Program 100 to Program 050):
Program 100 - Division of Vocational Rehabilitation (DVR) will transfer compensation adjustments for ODHH staff to Program 050 - Aging and Long-Term Support Administration (ALTSA). ODHH was transferred from DVR to ALTSA in the 2014 Supplemental budget. This transfer is for the ODHH portion of the employee benefit steps that remains in program 050. DVR will transfer $12,000 to ALTSA. The transfer will realign the funding for the ODHH staff into the correct program.

Economic Services Administration (ESA) to Administration and Supporting Services (ADMIN) Transfer-
(Program 060 to Program 110):
Transfer of $45,000 in warehouse lease funding from ESA to ADMIN.

These transfers will realign the funding with the DSHS programs to be charged.

Agency contact: Bill Jordan 360-902-8183.

Narrative Justification and Impact Statement

What specific performance outcomes does the agency expect?

DSHS accounts for the wise use of public dollars by maximizing federal funding sources.

Performance Measure Detail

Agency Level

Activity: K001 Administration and Supporting Services	Incremental Changes FY 1	FY 2
No measures linked to package	0.00	0.00

Is this decision package essential to implement a strategy identified in the agency's strategic plan?

This request supports the following goals identified in the DSHS 2013-2015 Strategic Plan:

Health - Each individual and each community will be healthy,

Public Trust - Strong management practices will be used to ensure quality and efficiency.

Does this decision package provide essential support to one of the Governor's priorities?

This package supports Results Washington Goal 5: Effective, Efficient and Accountable Government Fostering a Lean culture that drives accountability and results for the people of Washington.

Does this decision package make key contributions to statewide results? Would it rate as a high priority in the Priorities of Government process?

This decision package supports the Results Washington goals to:

Ensure that funding is used responsibly, and

Ensure efficiency, performance, and accountability to the public by providing transparency and accountability in state agency operations.

DP Code/Title: M2-9T Transfers
Program Level - 110 Admin & Supporting Svcs

Budget Period: 2013-15 Version: K3 110 2013-15 Final 2015 Sup

What are the other important connections or impacts related to this proposal?

None

What alternatives were explored by the agency, and why was this alternative chosen?

The request transfers funding between programs so that the needs can be met within existing resources.

What are the consequences of not funding this package?

Funding would not be aligned with the programs that are incurring the costs.

What is the relationship, if any, to the state's capital budget?

This request has no impact on the capital budget.

What changes would be required to existing statutes, rules, or contracts, in order to implement the change?

This request has no impact to existing statutes, rules or contracts.

Expenditure and revenue calculations and assumptions

See attachment: AW M2-9T Transfers.xlsx.

Which costs and functions are one-time? Which are ongoing? What are the budget impacts in future biennia?

The transfer is one-time then all costs associated with it will be ongoing and will carry-forward into future biennia.

Object Detail		FY 1	FY 2	Total
Overall Funding				
B	Employee Benefits	0	108,000	108,000
E	Goods\Other Services	0	37,000	37,000
T	Intra-Agency Reimbursements	0	404,000	404,000
	Total Objects	**0**	**549,000**	**549,000**

DSHS Source Code Detail

Overall Funding		FY 1	FY 2	Total
Fund 001-1, General Fund - Basic Account-State				
Sources	**Title**			
0011	General Fund State	0	453,000	453,000
	Total for Fund 001-1	**0**	**453,000**	**453,000**
Fund 001-C, General Fund - Basic Account-Medicaid Federal				
Sources	**Title**			
19UL	Title XIX Admin (50%)	0	96,000	96,000
	Total for Fund 001-C	**0**	**96,000**	**96,000**
	Total Overall Funding	**0**	**549,000**	**549,000**

2015 Supplemental Budget
AW M2-9TTransfers

	Program	FTEs FY14	FTEs FY15	FTEs Total	FY 2014 001-1	FY 2014 Other	FY 2014 Total	FY 2015 001-1	FY 2015 Other	FY 2015 Total	2013-15 Biennium 001-1	2013-15 Biennium Other	2013-15 Biennium Total
010	**Children's Administration**												
	1. ISSD Compensation Adjustments			0.0			0	(18,000)		(18,000)	(18,000)	0	(18,000)
	2. CFS Compensation Adjustments			0.0			0	(6,000)		(6,000)	(6,000)	0	(6,000)
	3. ISSD Chargeback Reallocation			0.0			0	(501,000)	(24,000)	(525,000)	(501,000)	(24,000)	(525,000)
	4. ITS Adjustment			0.0			0	(73,000)		(73,000)	(73,000)	0	(73,000)
				0.0			0			0	0	0	0
	010 Total	**0.0**	**0.0**	**0.0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**(598,000)**	**(24,000)**	**(622,000)**	**(598,000)**	**(24,000)**	**(622,000)**
020	**Juvenile Rehabilitation**												
	1. ISSD Compensation Adjustments			0.0			0	(3,000)		(3,000)	(3,000)	0	(3,000)
	2. CFS Compensation Adjustments			0.0			0	(14,000)		(14,000)	(14,000)	0	(14,000)
	3. ISSD Chargeback Reallocation			0.0			0	140,000		140,000	140,000	0	140,000
	4. ITS Adjustment			0.0			0	(14,000)		(14,000)	(14,000)	0	(14,000)
				0.0			0			0	0	0	0
	020 Total	**0.0**	**0.0**	**0.0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**109,000**	**0**	**109,000**	**109,000**	**0**	**109,000**
030	**Mental Health**												
	1. ISSD Compensation Adjustments			0.0			0	(10,000)		(10,000)	(10,000)	0	(10,000)
	2. CFS Compensation Adjustments			0.0			0	(34,000)		(34,000)	(34,000)	0	(34,000)
	3. ISSD Chargeback Reallocation			0.0			0	532,000	39,000	571,000	532,000	39,000	571,000
	4. ITS Adjustment			0.0			0	(20,000)		(20,000)	(20,000)	0	(20,000)
				0.0			0			0	0	0	0
	030 Total	**0.0**	**0.0**	**0.0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**468,000**	**39,000**	**507,000**	**468,000**	**39,000**	**507,000**
040	**Developmental Disabilities Administration**												
	1. ISSD Compensation Adjustments			0.0			0	(12,000)		(12,000)	(12,000)	0	(12,000)
	2. CFS Compensation Adjustments			0.0			0	(35,000)		(35,000)	(35,000)	0	(35,000)
	3. ISSD Chargeback Reallocation			0.0			0	511,000	355,000	866,000	511,000	355,000	866,000
	4. ITS Adjustment			0.0			0	(40,000)		(40,000)	(40,000)	0	(40,000)
				0.0			0			0	0	0	0
	040 Total	**0.0**	**0.0**	**0.0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**424,000**	**355,000**	**779,000**	**424,000**	**355,000**	**779,000**
050	**Aging & Long-Term Support Admin**												
	1. ISSD Compensation Adjustments			0.0			0	(13,000)		(13,000)	(13,000)	0	(13,000)
	2. CFS Compensation Adjustments			0.0			0	(2,000)		(2,000)	(2,000)	0	(2,000)
	3. ISSD Chargeback Reallocation			0.0			0	12,000	12,000	24,000	12,000	12,000	24,000
	4. ITS Adjustment			0.0			0	(83,000)		(83,000)	(83,000)	0	(83,000)
	5. ODHH Compensation Adjustment			0.0			0	(12,000)		(12,000)	(12,000)	0	(12,000)
				0.0			0			0	0	0	0
	050 Total	**0.0**	**0.0**	**0.0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**(98,000)**	**12,000**	**(86,000)**	**(98,000)**	**12,000**	**(86,000)**
060	**Economic Services Administration**												
	1. ISSD Compensation Adjustments			0.0			0	(47,000)		(47,000)	(47,000)	0	(47,000)
	2. CFS Compensation Adjustments			0.0			0	(7,000)		(7,000)	(7,000)	0	(7,000)
	3. ISSD Chargeback Reallocation			0.0			0	(1,023,000)	(463,000)	(1,486,000)	(1,023,000)	(463,000)	(1,486,000)
	4. ITS Adjustment			0.0			0	(411,000)		(411,000)	(411,000)	0	(411,000)
	6. ESA to ADMIN Transfer			0.0			0	(29,000)	(16,000)	(45,000)	(29,000)	(16,000)	(45,000)
				0.0			0			0	0	0	0
	060 Total	**0.0**	**0.0**	**0.0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**(1,517,000)**	**(479,000)**	**(1,996,000)**	**(1,517,000)**	**(479,000)**	**(1,996,000)**
070	**Alcohol and Substance Abuse**												
	3. ISSD Chargeback Reallocation			0.0			0	2,000	1,000	3,000	2,000	1,000	3,000
	4. ITS Adjustment			0.0			0	(6,000)		(6,000)	(6,000)	0	(6,000)
				0.0			0			0	0	0	0
	070 Total	**0.0**	**0.0**	**0.0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**(4,000)**	**1,000**	**(3,000)**	**(4,000)**	**1,000**	**(3,000)**
100	**Division of Voc. Rehabilitation**												
	1. ISSD Compensation Adjustments			0.0			0	(2,000)		(2,000)	(2,000)	0	(2,000)
	2. CFS Compensation Adjustments			0.0			0			0	0	0	0
	3. ISSD Chargeback Reallocation			0.0			0	(35,000)		(35,000)	(35,000)	0	(35,000)
	4. ITS Adjustment			0.0			0	(15,000)		(15,000)	(15,000)	0	(15,000)
	5. ODHH Compensation Adjustment			0.0			0	12,000		12,000	12,000	0	12,000
				0.0			0			0	0	0	0
	100 Total	**0.0**	**0.0**	**0.0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**(40,000)**	**0**	**(40,000)**	**(40,000)**	**0**	**(40,000)**
110	**Administration & Supporting Services**												
	1. ISSD Compensation Adjustments			0.0			0	107,000		107,000	107,000	0	107,000
	2. CFS Compensation Adjustments			0.0			0	108,000		108,000	108,000	0	108,000
	3. ISSD Chargeback Reallocation			0.0			0	219,000	80,000	299,000	219,000	80,000	299,000
	4. ITS Adjustment			0.0			0	(10,000)		(10,000)	(10,000)	0	(10,000)
	6. ESA to ADMIN Transfer			0.0			0	29,000	16,000	45,000	29,000	16,000	45,000
				0.0			0			0	0	0	0
	110 Total	**0.0**	**0.0**	**0.0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**453,000**	**96,000**	**549,000**	**453,000**	**96,000**	**549,000**

2015 Supplemental Budget
AW M2-9TTransfers

	Program	FTEs			FY 2014			FY 2015			2013-15 Biennium		
		FY14	FY15	Total	001-1	Other	Total	001-1	Other	Total	001-1	Other	Total
135	**Special Commitment Center**												
	1. ISSD Compensation Adjustments			0.0			0	(2,000)		(2,000)	(2,000)	0	(2,000)
	2. CFS Compensation Adjustments			0.0			0	(10,000)		(10,000)	(10,000)	0	(10,000)
	3. ISSD Chargeback Reallocation			0.0			0	143,000		143,000	143,000	0	143,000
	4. ITS Adjustment			0.0			0	(4,000)		(4,000)	(4,000)	0	(4,000)
				0.0			0			0	0	0	0
	135 Total	**0.0**	**0.0**	**0.0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**127,000**	**0**	**127,000**	**127,000**	**0**	**127,000**
145	**Payments to Other Agencies**												
	4. ITS Adjustment			0.0			0	676,000		676,000	676,000	0	676,000
				0.0			0			0	0	0	0
	145 Total	**0.0**	**0.0**	**0.0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**676,000**	**0**	**676,000**	**676,000**	**0**	**676,000**
150	**Information System Services Division**												
	4. ITS Adjustment			0.0			0			0	0	0	0
				0.0			0			0	0	0	0
	150 Total	**0.0**	**0.0**	**0.0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**
160	**Consolidated Field Services**												
				0.0			0			0	0	0	0
	160 Total	**0.0**	**0.0**	**0.0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**
	Agency-Wide Total:	**0**	**0**	**0.0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**

NOTES:

1. **Information System Services Division (ISSD) compensation adjustments from Administration & Supporting Services (Admin). Item adjusts object TZ costs.**
2. **Consolidated Field Services (CFS) compensation adjustments from Adminstation & Supporting Services (Admin). Item adjusts object B.**
3. **Information System Services Divison (ISSD) reallocation of chargeback funding. Item adjusts object TZ costs.**
4. **Information Technology Savings from Payments to Other Agenices. Item adjust object E and TZ.**
5. **Office of Deaf and Hard of Hearing compensation adjustment from Division of Vocational Rehabilitation. Item adjusts object B.**
6. **ESA to ADMIN Transfer - transfer of warehouse lease funding from ESA to ADMIN. This transfer is for FY 15 only.**