



**Thomas A. Schweich**  
Missouri State Auditor

---

## ADMINISTRATION

# Information Technology Services Division

---

July 2012

Report No. 2012-73



---

<http://auditor.mo.gov>



**Thomas A. Schweich**  
Missouri State Auditor

# CITIZENS SUMMARY

## Findings in the audit of the Office of Administration, Information Technology Services Division

Unified Communication Expenditures	<p>The Office of Administration (OA) - Information Technology Services Division (ITSD) provides information technology (IT) services to state agencies. The legislature appropriated monies to a dedicated revolving trust fund to pay expenses and equipment for the centralized telephone system, but the ITSD used over \$2.6 million in state General Revenue Fund monies for Unified Communication (UC) system costs and lease/purchase payments. It appears the ITSD used General Revenue Fund monies to make the August 2011 UC lease payment because the dedicated revolving fund did not have a sufficient balance to cover the payment. However, the ITSD created this shortage by not including UC lease payments when estimating expenditures, so billing rates were not set high enough to cover the costs of the UC system. ITSD management stated it has no plans to reimburse the General Revenue Fund for these expenditures. Had the ITSD properly billed users, state agencies may have recovered as much as \$1.274 million in federal reimbursements. The ITSD also did not include \$2.6 million in UC system expenditures in management reports, resulting in the understatement of operating losses.</p>
State Data Center Equipment Lease	<p>The ITSD created an invoice for services that were not performed and then issued a credit to reverse the transaction to prevent General Revenue Fund appropriation spending authority from lapsing. The ITSD made an advance lease payment of \$883,420 for computer equipment purchased for the State Data Center (SDC). The ITSD wanted to use \$288,000 from a General Revenue Fund appropriation to help fund the payment, so an invoice was created for SDC services which had not been performed. The advance lease payment saved the state future interest payments, but the method used was deceptive and circumvented the legislative appropriation process.</p>
Service Level Agreements	<p>The ITSD does not have current agreements with state agencies the division serves, so ITSD management does not have minimum performance targets and cannot determine if the IT services it provides meet the needs and expectations of state agency customers. We noted similar conditions in audit reports released in 2009 and 2011.</p>

In the areas audited, the overall performance of this entity was **Fair**.\*

---

American Recovery and  
Reinvestment Act  
(Federal Stimulus)

During the year ended June 30, 2011, the ITSD was awarded Federal Stimulus monies of \$6,573,382, of which it spent \$71,598 for the purpose of Rural Broadband Development. Additionally, the ITSD was appropriated \$5,644,613, of which it expended \$1,944,169 to meet grant matching requirements of the Rural Broadband Development Grants. Also, the ITSD was appropriated \$7,905,226 from other state agencies' ARRA awards of which it spent \$4,077,703, to support those state agencies' business functions and computer systems.

During the year ended June 30, 2010, the ITSD was appropriated \$34,355,387 of which it spent \$1,118,212, to meet grant matching requirements related to Rural Broadband Grants, and was appropriated \$4,107,640, of which it expended \$4,107,634, to fund general operations of the division. Also, the ITSD was appropriated \$441,541 from other state agencies' ARRA awards, all of which it expended to support those state agencies' business functions and computer systems.

\*The rating(s) cover only audited areas and do not reflect an opinion on the overall operation of the entity. Within that context, the rating scale indicates the following:

- Excellent:** The audit results indicate this entity is very well managed. The report contains no findings. In addition, if applicable, prior recommendations have been implemented.
- Good:** The audit results indicate this entity is well managed. The report contains few findings, and the entity has indicated most or all recommendations have already been, or will be, implemented. In addition, if applicable, many of the prior recommendations have been implemented.
- Fair:** The audit results indicate this entity needs to improve operations in several areas. The report contains several findings, or one or more findings that require management's immediate attention, and/or the entity has indicated several recommendations will not be implemented. In addition, if applicable, several prior recommendations have not been implemented.
- Poor:** The audit results indicate this entity needs to significantly improve operations. The report contains numerous findings that require management's immediate attention, and/or the entity has indicated most recommendations will not be implemented. In addition, if applicable, most prior recommendations have not been implemented.

**All reports are available on our website: <http://auditor.mo.gov>**

---

# Information Technology Services Division

## Table of Contents

---

State Auditor's Report	2
------------------------	---

---

Management Advisory Report - State Auditor's Findings	1. Unified Communication Expenditures .....4 2. State Data Center Equipment Lease .....8 3. Service Level Agreements..... 10
---	--

---

Organization and Statistical Information	12
---	----

Appendixes

A	Comparative Statement of Receipts, 2 Years Ended June 30, 2011.....	14
B	Comparative Statement of Appropriations and Expenditures, 2 Years Ended June 30, 2011.....	16
C	Comparative Statement of Expenditures (From Appropriations), 5 Years Ended June 30, 2011.....	32



# THOMAS A. SCHWEICH

## Missouri State Auditor

Honorable Jeremiah W. (Jay) Nixon, Governor  
and  
Douglas E. Nelson, Acting Commissioner  
Office of Administration  
and  
Tim Robyn, Acting Chief Information Officer  
Information Technology Services Division  
Jefferson City, Missouri

We have audited certain operations of the Office of Administration, Information Technology Services Division, in fulfillment of our duties under Chapter 29, RSMo. The scope of our audit included, but was not necessarily limited to, the 2 years ended June 30, 2011. The objectives of our audit were to:

1. Evaluate the division's internal controls over significant management and financial functions.
2. Evaluate the division's compliance with certain legal provisions.
3. Evaluate the economy and efficiency of certain management practices and operations, including certain financial transactions.

Our methodology included reviewing minutes of meetings, written policies and procedures, financial records, and other pertinent documents; interviewing various personnel of the division, as well as certain external parties; and testing selected transactions. We obtained an understanding of internal controls that are significant within the context of the audit objectives and assessed whether such controls have been properly designed and placed in operation. We tested certain of those controls to obtain evidence regarding the effectiveness of their design and operation. We also obtained an understanding of legal provisions that are significant within the context of the audit objectives, and we assessed the risk that illegal acts, including fraud, and violations of contract, grant agreement, or other legal provisions could occur. Based on that risk assessment, we designed and performed procedures to provide reasonable assurance of detecting instances of noncompliance significant to those provisions.

We conducted our audit in accordance with the standards applicable to performance audits contained in *Government Auditing Standards*, issued by the Comptroller General of the United States. Those standards require that we plan and perform our audit to obtain sufficient, appropriate evidence to provide a reasonable basis for our findings and conclusions based on our audit objectives. We believe that the evidence obtained provides such a basis.

The accompanying Organization and Statistical Information is presented for informational purposes. This information was obtained from the division's management and was not subjected to the procedures applied in our audit of the division.

For the areas audited, we identified (1) deficiencies in internal controls, (2) no significant noncompliance with legal provisions, and (3) the need for improvement in management practices and procedures. The accompanying Management Advisory Report presents our findings arising from our audit of the Office of Administration, Information Technology Services Division.



Thomas A. Schweich  
State Auditor

The following auditors participated in the preparation of this report:

Deputy State Auditor:	Harry J. Otto, CPA
Director of Audits:	John Luetkemeyer, CPA
Audit Manager:	Jeffrey Thelen, CPA
In-Charge Auditor:	Patrick M. Pullins, M.Acct., CISA
Audit Staff:	Erica Joannes

---

# Information Technology Services Division

## Management Advisory Report

### State Auditor's Findings

---

#### **1. Unified Communication Expenditures**

The Office of Administration (OA) - Information Technology Services Division (ITSD) used state General Revenue Fund (GRF) monies to support the purchase, implementation, and operation of the Unified Communication (UC) system project. UC lease payments were not included in the calculations used to establish user billing rates, resulting in the potential loss of federal matching funds from unbilled costs. In addition, the ITSD has not accurately recorded all UC system expenditures, resulting in the understatement of UC system operating losses.

#### Background

In fiscal year 2010, the ITSD entered into a contract to upgrade the current communication systems to combine separate voice, video, and data systems to operate on an existing computer network. The UC system offers tools to enhance employee efficiency, including the capability to bring both audio and video functionality to the desktop and the addition of telepresence<sup>1</sup> rooms across the state, according to ITSD management. In addition, a significant majority of the state telecommunications infrastructure will be rebuilt. The telepresence hardware was a negotiated feature of the UC contract and was provided by the vendor at no cost to the state, according to ITSD management. According to estimates provided to the ITSD from the vendor, the UC system will result in projected cost savings of approximately \$32 million over a 10-year period. The projected savings include a reduction in costs associated with telephone equipment and related facilities, voice connectivity, employee travel, and other costs. The ITSD entered into a lease/purchase agreement with a financial services provider to obtain funding to finance the purchase of the UC system.

The ITSD provides information technology (IT) services, including telecommunication services, to users (state agencies). These services were funded through the OA Revolving Administrative Trust Fund (RATF)<sup>2</sup> and the related costs allocated and billed to users. According to state law<sup>3</sup>, the RATF "shall contain moneys transferred or paid to the Office of Administration in return for goods or services provided by the Office of Administration to any governmental entity or to the public". Billing rates for telecommunication services are established annually by ITSD management. The rates are calculated based on the estimated expenditures and usage of each identified service over the next year and are intended to cover all costs of operations. Funds collected from user billings were deposited in the

---

<sup>1</sup> A component of the UC system which provides high definition video conferencing capabilities. Telepresence rooms have been installed in Jefferson City, St. Louis, and Kansas City.

<sup>2</sup> Effective in fiscal year 2012, funding for ITSD operations was moved from the OA RATF to the newly created Revolving Information Technology Trust Fund. Funding for the operations of other OA services, such as the Division of Facilities Management, Design, and Construction, and the State Printing Center remained in the OA RATF.

<sup>3</sup> Section 37.005.10 RSMo



Information Technology Services Division  
Management Advisory Report - State Auditor's Findings

RATF and used by the ITSD to pay vendors for equipment and services needed to provide telecommunication services.

## 1.1 General Revenue Fund support

During our review of the UC system procurement, we identified expenditures from the GRF in fiscal years 2011 and 2012 (through November 2011) of over \$2.6 million for lease payments and UC system operations. As shown in Table 1, the ITSD either expended monies from a GRF appropriation or initially expended funds from a RATF appropriation but subsequently authorized accounting entries to change the funding source to the GRF.

Table 1: General Revenue expenditures for the UC system

Description	Amount
Payments made from the GRF	
August 2011 Lease Payment	\$ 493,931
Payments made from the RATF and changed to the GRF	
February 2011 Lease Payment	493,931
May 2011 Lease Payment	493,931
Computer Support Services (1)	1,118,687
<b>Total General Revenue Expenditures</b>	<b>\$ 2,600,480</b>

(1) Includes five separate transactions to a single vendor ranging from \$1 to over \$465,000  
Source: SAO Review of ITSD expenditure records

The ITSD generally uses GRF for personal service expenditures, such as programming, and for expense and equipment expenditures, such as computer purchases in support of agency computer operations. According to management, the ITSD can use GRF appropriations for any IT services or equipment deemed necessary. However, prior to fiscal year 2012, the legislature specifically appropriated RATF monies to fund expense and equipment for the centralized telephone system. Therefore, it appears the intent of the legislature was to pay telecommunication expenses, including UC system costs, from the RATF, not the GRF.

Beginning in fiscal year 2012, the legislature appropriated funds from the Revolving Information Technology Trust Fund for payment of debt service related to the UC system. However, ITSD management made the August 2011 quarterly lease payment (the first scheduled payment of fiscal year 2012) from the GRF. According to ITSD management, the August 2011 lease payment was made from the GRF because the revolving fund did not have a sufficient balance to cover the payment. This shortage was caused by the ITSD not including UC lease payments in the estimated expenditure amounts used to establish user billing rates. As a result, billing rates were not set high enough to cover the total costs of the UC system. ITSD management said the ITSD has no plans to reimburse the GRF for the expenditures made to subsidize the purchase, implementation, and operation of the UC system.



---

Information Technology Services Division  
Management Advisory Report - State Auditor's Findings

---

Potential loss of federal  
matching funds

Based on our analysis of the \$15.8 million of user payments to the ITSD for telecommunications services in fiscal year 2011, about \$7.1 million or 49 percent were paid by user agencies from various federal funds. These agencies were then able to claim federal reimbursement for a portion of the telecommunication service charges. Since UC expenditures of \$2.6 million (\$1.274 million federal share) paid from the GRF were not billed, federal fund participation in these UC system costs did not occur. As a result, the state did not receive federal reimbursement for the UC system costs not billed.

## 1.2 Cost reporting

The profit and loss reports prepared by the ITSD did not include UC system expenditures of \$2.6 million charged to the GRF. The state accounting system (Statewide Advantage for Missouri or SAM II) includes certain data fields for users to code expenditures to specific sources such as projects, grants, or programs. Use of specific codes can enhance accounting capabilities, thereby facilitating the reporting and classification of expenditures. The ITSD assigned specific codes for use in tracking and reporting expenditures related to the UC system. An internal profit and loss summary report is prepared to present total revenues and expenditures for each major communications category, including the UC system.

In addition to changing the funding source from the RATF to the GRF, the accounting entries also removed the code assigning the transactions to the UC system. As a result, these expenditures were no longer included in reports prepared by management and were not included in the UC system operating profit or loss calculations. According to ITSD management, the internal profit and loss report was designed to include only expenditures from the RATF.

According to ITSD management, the loss reported per the ITSD reports through November 2011 occurred because the UC system lease payments are made early each quarter while the revenue to recover that payment is billed and collected over all 3 months of the quarter. As a result, the system operates at a loss early in the quarter and should reflect a profit by the end of the quarter. This operating pattern will continue until the finance lease is repaid.

According to accepted standards<sup>4</sup>, all IT costs should be identified and mapped to IT services to support a transparent cost model. Actual costs should be captured and allocated according to the enterprise cost model (cost allocation plan), allowing IT services to be linked to business

---

<sup>4</sup> "COBIT Framework for IT Governance and Control,"  
<<http://www.isaca.org/Knowledge-Center/COBIT/Pages/Overview.aspx>>, accessed March 6, 2012.



Information Technology Services Division  
Management Advisory Report - State Auditor's Findings

processes to aid in identifying service billing levels. Variances between forecasts and actual costs should be analyzed and reported. In addition, organizations should regularly review and benchmark the appropriateness of the cost/recharge model to maintain the plan relevance and appropriateness to the evolving business and IT activities.

Without accurately recording all UC system transactions and including all applicable costs and expenditures in financial reports and cost allocation plans, management does not have all information necessary to make decisions on the cost effectiveness and efficiency of a system or project.

## Recommendations

- 1.1 The ITSD ensure UC system costs are allocated to and paid from the revolving fund and are fully charged to users. In addition, the ITSD should bill users \$2,600,480 and use the proceeds to reimburse the GRF.
- 1.2 The ITSD identify, capture, and allocate all costs associated with the UC system to accurately report UC system profit or loss.

## Auditee's Response

- 1.1 *The use of general revenue funds to upgrade the state's communication systems was within its appropriation authority. ITSD complied with legal requirements as there are no restrictions against using general revenue appropriated to ITSD for the expenditures noted in the report. ITSD is currently in the process of finalizing the allocation of Unified Communications and all other communications costs for FY 2013. ITSD intends to identify and allocate all costs associated with the state's communication system in this plan.*

*The Office of Administration has significant concerns that billing the users and using the proceeds to reimburse the general revenue fund may violate federal regulations from OMB Circular A-87, as recommended by the audit. Attachment C. Part G, Number 4 states, "Adjustments to allocated central services will not be permitted where the total amount of the adjustment for a particular service (Federal share and non-Federal) share exceeds \$500,000." This regulation does not allow for a partial allocation adjustment.*

## Auditor's Comment

The ITSD response acknowledges federal reimbursement of allowable costs has not occurred because the ITSD did not properly allocate UC system costs. It's the ITSD's duty to state taxpayers to contact the appropriate federal agency to clarify this issue before forfeiting the chance to obtain federal reimbursement. In addition, approximately 51 percent of telecommunications costs in fiscal year 2011 were paid by user agencies from various state funds (such as the Public Service Commission Fund and



Information Technology Services Division  
Management Advisory Report - State Auditor's Findings

the Parks Sales Tax Fund), which are not subject to OMB Circular A-87 requirements.

1.2 *ITSD intends to identify, capture, and allocate all costs associated with the state's communication system in this cost allocation plan, as well as, account for any profit or loss that may occur in the FY 2013 Communications Cost Allocation Plan.*

## 2. State Data Center Equipment Lease

ITSD management created an invoice to bill for services that were not performed, and then issued a State Data Center (SDC) credit to reverse the transaction in the following year. The transaction appears to circumvent the legislative appropriation process, and was initiated to prevent GRF appropriation spending authority from lapsing.

The SDC provides mainframe data processing services and resources to meet the business requirements of state agency customers. ITSD management develops an annual cost allocation plan to project costs to operate the SDC and allocates and bills those costs to end users based on service usage. Funds received from SDC billings were credited to the RATF. Expenditures to support SDC operations were then made by the ITSD from the RATF.

### Advance payment

In March 2010, the ITSD entered into a lease to finance the purchase of computer equipment for the SDC. In late June 2010, the ITSD made an advance lease payment of \$883,420. Pursuant to the terms of the lease, the advance payment effectively eliminated 1 year of the term of the lease. The ITSD projected that making this early payment would save interest costs of more than \$60,000 over the life of the lease.

According to email documentation dated June 24, 2010, the ITSD wanted to expend funds remaining in a GRF appropriation to fund part of the advance payment. The ITSD created an invoice in June 2010, to bill a user within the ITSD \$288,000 for "SDC Services Provided". ITSD management wrote on the supporting documentation that the invoice "should look like an SDC bill." The ITSD processed the payment from a GRF appropriation and the funds were deposited into the RATF. According to SDC billing system reports, this user was billed about \$490 and \$1,400 for SDC services provided in May and June 2010, respectively. However, there are no records to support the \$288,000 billing invoice.

In May 2011, ITSD management offset the use of \$288,000 from the GRF by issuing credits to other ITSD users to reduce SDC billing amounts. However, the credits were not issued to the user that was billed and were applied in a subsequent fiscal year. ITSD management said the billing credits were issued to reverse the impact of the GRF transaction. Since the ITSD users were funded by the GRF, there was no net impact on the fund



---

Information Technology Services Division  
Management Advisory Report - State Auditor's Findings

---

balance. According to the SDC cost allocation plan, each customer should be treated in an equitable manner and billing rates are based on the amount of resources used.

The OA has not established specific guidelines to determine when it is appropriate to make payments before they are due to expend appropriations before they lapse. Such a policy is necessary to specifically establish the criteria for expending funds from the current operating budget on future obligations and to establish documentation requirements to ensure processing transparency. According to OA management, the OA has discussed establishing a policy regarding the acceptable use of expending current operating funds on future obligations.

While the advance lease payment saved the state future interest payments of approximately \$70,000, the method used for processing the transaction circumvented the legislative appropriation process, and appears to have been initiated to prevent GRF appropriation spending authority from lapsing.

## Recommendation

The ITSD facilitate transparent transaction processing and the proper use of resources by ensuring the payment for services is supported by approved funding sources and charges for service usage are identifiable and measurable. In addition, the ITSD should work with the OA to establish a policy for use in determining when it is acceptable to make early lease payments and the documentation requirements to ensure transparency and compliance with the policy.

## Auditee's Response

*In the first audit finding, ITSD paid unallocated charges from the GRF, and the audit recommends that these charges be allocated back through the allocation plan to reimburse GR. In this recommendation, ITSD allocated charges back through an allocation plan in order to make a payment on debt directly related to the allocated costs. This action saved the state \$70,000 as noted in the audit.*

*ITSD believes the payment of debt in order to save interest demonstrates prudent financial management. OA is supportive of reducing interest costs and reducing the balance of outstanding obligations when possible. This activity is consistent with Missouri's conservative approach to financing and the State's AAA bond rating.*

*OA recognizes there is not an established policy to determine the process by which to make early lease payments and what documentation should be required to ensure transparency. In order to lend direction to the mechanism by which these types of transactions are processed uniformly, OA will review what policy or practice can be established.*



---

## Auditor's Comment

It is never appropriate for a government entity to prepare false documents. ITSD's contention that it allocated costs appropriately is inaccurate. As noted in the finding, the ITSD manipulated the process by billing one user for services that were not provided, but crediting other users in the subsequent fiscal year.

---

### 3. Service Level Agreements

The ITSD does not have current agreements documenting the terms of the partnerships between the ITSD and the state agencies the division serves. As a result, ITSD management does not have minimum performance targets for IT services and cannot determine if the services provided meet the needs and expectations of state agency customers.

A Service Level Agreement (SLA) is a document used by organizations entering into a partnership for the provision of IT services. According to accepted standards<sup>5</sup>, the SLA should document the agreements reached regarding:

- Technical and administrative support to be provided by the service provider
- Service support requirements, including availability, reliability, performance, and capacity for growth
- Roles and responsibilities of each party, including responsibility for oversight
- Backup, recovery, and security responsibilities of each party
- Quantitative and/or qualitative metrics for measuring service
- Funding arrangements
- Customer commitments

According to the Information Systems Control Journal,<sup>6</sup> a "SLA is a necessity between a service provider and service beneficiary because a service can be called "bad" or "good" only if this service is clearly described. Moreover, it formalizes the needs and expectations of the organization and serves as a kind of guarantee for both parties. In this way, potential misunderstandings are reduced and a clear view is given on the priorities of the service and its delivery. . . A balanced SLA is a compromise between the needs, expectations and requirements of the organization (user group) and the service provision capabilities and promises of the service provider. At the same time, it must protect the service provider by limiting

---

<sup>5</sup> "COBIT Framework for IT Governance and Control," <<http://www.isaca.org/Knowledge-Center/COBIT/Pages/Overview.aspx>>, accessed March 6, 2012.

<sup>6</sup> Grembergen, Wim Van, Ph.D., Steven De Haes and Isabelle Amelinckx. "Using COBIT and the Balanced Scorecard as Instruments for Service Level Management." Information Systems Control Journal, Volume 4 (2003): 56-62.



---

Information Technology Services Division  
Management Advisory Report - State Auditor's Findings

---

liability, identifying responsibilities and rationally managing user expectations."

According to ITSD management, a new SLA document is being drafted for one state agency. Upon completion, this document will be used as a model SLA for other state agencies.

Similar conditions  
previously reported

Similar conditions were noted in prior audit reports. In our 2009 report on the state's IT consolidation<sup>7</sup>, we noted that ITSD management was working on updating the SLAs created by the prior administration. A 2011 report<sup>8</sup> noted the ITSD still had not completed the process of implementing new SLAs with state agency customers. As of March 2012, ITSD management stated the process of drafting a new SLA was still ongoing.

Recommendations

The ITSD should finalize the development of new Service Level Agreements that specify and adequately measure levels of agency user satisfaction.

Auditee's Response

*ITSD is working with agencies to develop meaningful Service Level Agreements that satisfy both agency and ITSD needs.*

---

<sup>7</sup> SAO Audit Report 2009-112, *Office of Administration - Information Technology Consolidation*, issued October 2009.

<sup>8</sup> SAO Audit Report 2011-056, *Department of Revenue - Taxation Division Security Controls*, issued September 2011.

---

# Information Technology Services Division

## Organization and Statistical Information

---

The Information Technology Services Division (ITSD) is a division of the Office of Administration (OA). The ITSD was formed in January 2005 to consolidate information technology (IT) staff and funding for executive branch agencies.

The ITSD is responsible for coordinating and providing IT services to executive branch agencies. Services provided by the division include the operation of the State Data Center to provide a centralized computer facility used by state agencies and elected officials; operation of the state telecommunications network; desktop support; web, mainframe, and other communication platform and application development and maintenance; data management and database support; email services; help desk and desktop support; cyber security; and an IT education center for state employees.

The ITSD directly supports the following executive offices and state agencies: Agriculture; Corrections; Economic Development; Elementary and Secondary Education; Governor's Office; Health and Senior Services; Higher Education; Insurance, Financial Institutions & Professional Registration; Labor and Industrial Relations; Lieutenant Governor's Office; Mental Health; Natural Resources; Office of Administration; Public Safety; Revenue; and Social Services.

Tim Robyn was appointed acting Chief Information Officer in January 2012. Doug Young served as the Chief Information Officer from November 2009 through December 2011. Bill Bryan was the Chief Information Officer from January 2009 through October 2009. At June 30, 2011, the division had 1,014 employees.

### American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (Federal Stimulus)

During the year ended June 30, 2011, the ITSD was awarded \$6,573,382 and expended \$71,598 of American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) of 2009 monies for the purpose of Rural Broadband Development. These monies were appropriated to the division from the Federal Stimulus - OA Fund. Additionally, the division received appropriations of \$5,644,613 and expended \$1,944,169 from the Federal Budget Stabilization - Education 18% Fund to meet grant matching requirements of the Rural Broadband Development Grants. During the year ended June 30, 2010, the division was appropriated \$34,355,387 and expended \$1,118,212, for the matching requirements related to Rural Broadband Grants.

During the years ended June 30, 2011 and 2010, the division was appropriated \$7,905,226 and \$441,541, respectively, from other state agencies' ARRA awards to support those agencies' business functions and computer systems. These monies were appropriated to the division from the Federal Budget Stabilization - Education 18% Fund and the Federal Stimulus - OA Fund. Expenditures from these appropriations totaled



Information Technology Services Division  
Organization and Statistical Information

---

\$4,077,703 and \$441,541 during the years ended June 30, 2011 and 2010, respectively.

The division was also appropriated \$4,107,640 and expended \$4,107,634 of ARRA monies during the year ended June 30, 2010, from the Federal Budget Stabilization - Medicaid Reimbursement Fund to fund general operations of the division.

A summary of the division's financial activity is presented in the following appendixes.

Appendix A

Office of Administration  
 Information Technology Services Division  
 Comparative Statement of Receipts

	Year Ended June 30,	
	2011	2010
<b>GENERAL REVENUE FUND</b>		
Vendor refunds	\$ 30,128	9,234
Overpayments	0	69
Cost reimbursements	509	0
Sales and commissions	893,850	867,816
Rebates	25	4
Total General Revenue Fund	<u>924,512</u>	<u>877,123</u>
<b>OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATION INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY FEDERAL FUND</b>		
Federal grants	48,317,836	50,398,458
Vendor refunds	4,775	16,896
Overpayments	566	79
Cost Reimbursements	0	480,880
Rebates	1,520	2,760
Miscellaneous	0	20,674
Interagency receipts - Reimbursements	17,869	370,907
Total Office of Administration Information Technology Federal Fund	<u>48,342,566</u>	<u>51,290,654</u>
<b>MISSOURI PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICES FUND</b>		
Sales and commissions	0	303,882
Cost reimbursements	448,569	0
Rebates	41	0
Interagency receipts - Reimbursements	0	20,387
Total Missouri Public Health Services Fund	<u>448,610</u>	<u>324,269</u>
<b>OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATION REVOLVING ADMINISTRATIVE TRUST FUND</b>		
Sales and commissions	14,203	18,483
Vendor refunds	75,809	22,603
Rebates	2,817	3,532
Loan proceeds	15,395,703	0
Overpayments	392	2,753
Interagency Receipts - Computing	21,853,477	21,752,267

Appendix A

Office of Administration  
 Information Technology Services Division  
 Comparative Statement of Receipts

	Year Ended June 30,	
	2011	2010
Interagency Receipts - Reimbursements	3,362,597	2,449,527
Interagency Receipts - Telecommunications	29,721,124	29,656,876
Interagency Receipts - Training	238,832	406,029
Total Office of Administration Administrative Revolving Trust Fund	<u>70,664,954</u>	<u>54,312,070</u>
 FEDERAL STIMULUS - OA FUND		
American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA)	2,397,481	594,797
Total Federal Stimulus - OA Fund	<u>2,397,481</u>	<u>594,797</u>
Total All Funds	<u>\$ 122,778,123</u>	<u>107,398,913</u>

Appendix B

Office of Administration  
 Information Technology Services Division  
 Comparative Statement of Appropriations and Expenditures

	Year ended June 30,					
	2011			2010		
	Appropriation Authority	Expenditures	Lapsed Balances	Appropriation Authority	Expenditures	Lapsed Balances
<b>GENERAL REVENUE FUND</b>						
General Revenue IT Consolidation Personal Service	\$ 21,426,444	20,737,370	689,074	23,015,469	21,989,434	1,026,035
General Revenue IT Consolidation Expense and Equipment	15,499,062	15,498,853	209	15,129,658	13,052,865	2,076,793
DOR IT Consolidation HC Personal Service	1,907,017	1,829,201	77,816	2,239,237	1,938,027	301,210
DOR IT Consolidation HC Expense and Equipment	3,656,612	3,115,840	540,772	4,687,975	4,290,035	397,940
Total General Revenue Fund	42,489,135	41,181,264	1,307,871 *	45,072,339	41,270,361	3,801,978 *
<b>DEPARTMENT OF LABOR AND INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS ADMINISTRATIVE FUND</b>						
Federal DOLIR IT Consolidation Personal Service	3,528,766	3,331,626	197,140	3,528,766	3,204,981	323,785
Federal DOLIR IT Consolidation Expense and Equipment	419,981	337,750	82,231	569,981	537,069	32,912
Total Department of Labor and Industrial Relations Administrative Fund	3,948,747	3,669,376	279,371	4,098,747	3,742,050	356,697
<b>OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATION INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY FEDERAL AND OTHER FUND</b>						
Federal IT Consolidation Personal Service	13,796,627	11,162,803	2,633,824	13,801,549	11,433,916	2,367,633
Federal IT Consolidation Expense & Equipment	53,991,744	33,435,085	20,556,659	53,876,822	35,338,917	18,537,905
Total Office of Administration Information Technology Federal and Other Fund	67,788,371	44,597,888	23,190,483	67,678,371	46,772,833	20,905,538
<b>CHILD SUPPORT ENFORCEMENT FUND</b>						
DSS IT Consolidation Personal Service	521,528	521,211	317	521,528	521,455	73
DSS IT Consolidation Expense and Equipment	1,229,528	1,229,528	0	1,229,528	1,229,528	0
Total Child Support Enforcement Fund	1,751,056	1,750,739	317	1,751,056	1,750,983	73

Appendix B

Office of Administration  
 Information Technology Services Division  
 Comparative Statement of Appropriations and Expenditures

	Year ended June 30,					
	2011			2010		
	Appropriation Authority	Expenditures	Lapsed Balances	Appropriation Authority	Expenditures	Lapsed Balances
<b>HEALTH CARE TECHNOLOGY FUND</b>						
DHSS IT Consolidation Laboratory Management Information System Personal Service	0	0	0	82,244	43,080	39,164
DHSS IT Consolidation Expense and Equipment	0	0	0	407,307	14,449	392,858
DHSS IT Consolidation Laboratory Management Information System Expense and Equipment	0	0	0	767,756	207,390	560,366
Total Health Care Technology Fund	0	0	0	1,257,307	264,919	992,388 *
<b>ELEVATOR SAFETY FUND</b>						
DPS IT Consolidation Expense and Equipment	9,215	5,091	4,124	9,215	8,950	265
Total Elevator Safety Fund	9,215	5,091	4,124	9,215	8,950	265
<b>MISSOURI ARTS COUNCIL TRUST FUND</b>						
DED IT Consolidation Expense and Equipment	23,060	2,336	20,724	23,060	4,157	18,903
Total Missouri Arts Council Trust Fund	23,060	2,336	20,724	23,060	4,157	18,903
<b>MISSOURI COMMISSION FOR THE DEAF BOARD OF CERTIFICATION OF INTERPRETERS FUND</b>						
DESE IT Consolidation Expense and Equipment	8,000	0	8,000	8,000	223	7,777
Total Missouri Commission for the Deaf Board of Certification of Interpreters Fund	8,000	0	8,000	8,000	223	7,777
<b>NURSING FACILITY QUALITY OF CARE FUND</b>						
DHSS IT Consolidation Personal Service	416,162	141,011	275,151	416,162	267,547	148,615
DHSS IT Consolidation Expense and Equipment	104,048	1,648	102,400	104,048	92,682	11,366
Total Nursing Facility Quality of Care Fund	520,210	142,659	377,551	520,210	360,229	159,981

Appendix B

Office of Administration  
 Information Technology Services Division  
 Comparative Statement of Appropriations and Expenditures

	Year ended June 30,					
	2011			2010		
	Appropriation Authority	Expenditures	Lapsed Balances	Appropriation Authority	Expenditures	Lapsed Balances
<b>DIVISION OF TOURISM SUPPLEMENTAL REVENUE FUND</b>						
DED IT Consolidation Expense and Equipment	55,704	6,151	49,553	55,704	10,929	44,775
Total Division of Tourism Supplemental Revenue Fund	55,704	6,151	49,553	55,704	10,929	44,775
<b>HEALTH INITIATIVES FUND</b>						
DSS IT Consolidation Personal Service	5,494	5,328	166	5,494	5,328	166
DHSS IT Consolidation Expense and Equipment	57,000	9,686	47,314	2,100	1,977	123
DSS IT Consolidation Expense and Equipment	67	65	2	67	65	2
Total Health Initiatives Fund	62,561	15,079	47,482 *	7,661	7,370	291 *
<b>HEALTH ACCESS INCENTIVE FUND</b>						
DHSS IT Consolidation Expense and Equipment	7,700	7,323	377	13,700	12,535	1,165
Total Health Access Incentive Fund	7,700	7,323	377 *	13,700	12,535	1,165 *
<b>LOTTERY PROCEEDS FUND</b>						
DESE IT Consolidation Expense and Equipment	113,480	104,445	9,035	113,480	109,413	4,067
Total Lottery Proceeds Fund	113,480	104,445	9,035 *	113,480	109,413	4,067 *
<b>ANIMAL HEALTH LABORATORY FEES FUND</b>						
MDA IT Consolidation Personal Service	5,390	0	5,390	5,390	5,390	0
MDA IT Consolidation Expense and Equipment	5,936	5,467	469	5,936	2,303	3,633
Total Animal Health Laboratory Fees Fund	11,326	5,467	5,859	11,326	7,693	3,633
<b>MAMMOGRAPHY FUND</b>						
DHSS IT Consolidation Expense and Equipment	4,640	1,457	3,183	4,640	4,456	184
Total Mammography Fund	4,640	1,457	3,183	4,640	4,456	184

Appendix B

Office of Administration  
 Information Technology Services Division  
 Comparative Statement of Appropriations and Expenditures

	Year ended June 30,					
	2011			2010		
	Appropriation Authority	Expenditures	Lapsed Balances	Appropriation Authority	Expenditures	Lapsed Balances
<b>ANIMAL CARE RESERVE FUND</b>						
MDA IT Consolidation Personal Service	7,013	0	7,013	7,013	4,194	2,819
MDA IT Consolidation Expense and Equipment	9,403	894	8,509	9,403	9,361	42
Total Animal Care Reserve Fund	16,416	894	15,522	16,416	13,555	2,861
<b>ELDERLY HOME-DELIVERED MEALS TRUST FUND</b>						
DOR IT Consolidation Expense and Equipment	10,970	10,970	0	10,970	10,970	0
Total Elderly Home-Delivered Meals Trust Fund	10,970	10,970	0	10,970	10,970	0
<b>MISSOURI PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICES FUND</b>						
DHSS IT Consolidation Expense and Equipment	741,493	383,634	357,859	741,493	165,652	575,841
DHSS IT Consolidation Personal Service	131,420	97,682	33,738	131,420	74,925	56,495
Total Missouri Public Health Services Fund	872,913	481,316	391,597	872,913	240,577	632,336
<b>LIVESTOCK BRANDS FUND</b>						
MDA IT Consolidation Personal Service	232	0	232	232	232	0
MDA IT Consolidation Expense and Equipment	3,010	2,866	144	3,010	697	2,313
Total Livestock Brands Fund	3,242	2,866	376	3,242	929	2,313
<b>VETERANS' COMMISSION CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT TRUST FUND</b>						
DPS IT Consolidation Expense and Equipment	39,000	38,068	932	39,000	37,234	1,766
Total Veterans' Commission Capital Improvement Trust Fund	39,000	38,068	932	39,000	37,234	1,766
<b>COMMODITY COUNCIL MERCHANDISING FUND</b>						
MDA IT Consolidation Personal Service	341	0	341	341	341	0
MDA IT Consolidation Expense and Equipment	781	32	749	781	67	714
Total Commodity Council Merchandising Fund	1,122	32	1,090	1,122	408	714

Appendix B

Office of Administration  
 Information Technology Services Division  
 Comparative Statement of Appropriations and Expenditures

	Year ended June 30,					
	2011			2010		
	Appropriation Authority	Expenditures	Lapsed Balances	Appropriation Authority	Expenditures	Lapsed Balances
<b>FEDERAL SURPLUS PROPERTY FUND</b>						
OA IT Consolidation Expense and Equipment	12,642	1,027	11,615	12,642	2,801	9,841
Total Federal Surplus Property Fund	12,642	1,027	11,615	12,642	2,801	9,841
<b>SINGLE-PURPOSE ANIMAL FACILITIES LOAN GUARANTEE FUND</b>						
MDA IT Consolidation Personal Service	428	0	428	428	428	0
MDA IT Consolidation Expense and Equipment	1,162	65	1,097	1,162	134	1,028
Total Single-Purpose Animal Facilities Loan Guarantee Fund	1,590	65	1,525	1,590	562	1,028
<b>STATE FAIR FEES FUND</b>						
MDA IT Consolidation Personal Service	12,083	0	12,083	12,083	10,394	1,689
MDA IT Consolidation Expense and Equipment	9,704	2,805	6,899	9,704	1,310	8,394
Total State Fair Fees Fund	21,787	2,805	18,982	21,787	11,704	10,083
<b>MISSOURI VETERANS HOMES FUND</b>						
DPS IT Consolidation PS	405,793	361,860	43,933	405,793	403,903	1,890
DPS IT Consolidation Expense and Equipment	542,839	422,347	120,492	542,839	440,268	102,571
Total Missouri Veterans Homes Fund	948,632	784,207	164,425	948,632	844,171	104,461
<b>DNR COST ALLOCATION FUND</b>						
DNR IT Consolidation Personal Service	2,850,215	2,318,456	531,759	2,797,597	2,411,024	386,573
DNR IT Consolidation Expense and Equipment	4,302,150	2,585,022	1,717,128	4,354,768	2,507,992	1,846,776
Total DNR Cost Allocation Fund	7,152,365	4,903,478	2,248,887	7,152,365	4,919,016	2,233,349

Appendix B

Office of Administration  
 Information Technology Services Division  
 Comparative Statement of Appropriations and Expenditures

	Year ended June 30,					
	2011			2010		
	Appropriation Authority	Expenditures	Lapsed Balances	Appropriation Authority	Expenditures	Lapsed Balances
<b>STATE FACILITY MAINTENANCE AND OPERATIONS FUND</b>						
OA IT Consolidation Personal Service	91,590	91,078	512	91,590	88,662	2,928
OA IT Consolidation Expense and Equipment	231,274	229,430	1,844	144,274	106,787	37,487
Total State Facility Maintenance and Operations Fund	<u>322,864</u>	<u>320,508</u>	<u>2,356</u>	<u>235,864</u>	<u>195,449</u>	<u>40,415</u>
<b>DIFP ADMINISTRATIVE FUND</b>						
DIFP IT Consolidation Personal Service	99,367	47,184	52,183	99,367	47,184	52,183
DIFP IT Consolidation Expense and Equipment	24,336	4,653	19,683	24,336	6,164	18,172
Total DIFP Administrative Fund	<u>123,703</u>	<u>51,837</u>	<u>71,866</u>	<u>123,703</u>	<u>53,348</u>	<u>70,355</u>
<b>OA REVOLVING ADMINISTRATIVE TRUST FUND</b>						
OA IT Consolidation Personal Service	6,443,034	5,515,541	927,493	6,443,034	5,835,782	607,252
OA IT Consolidation Expense and Equipment	23,044,014	21,109,626	1,934,388	23,044,014	18,581,065	4,462,949
Centralized Telephone Billing System Expense and Equipment	43,505,000	35,176,283	8,328,717	30,005,000	27,283,144	2,721,856
Total OA Revolving Administrative Trust Fund	<u>72,992,048</u>	<u>61,801,450</u>	<u>11,190,598</u>	<u>59,492,048</u>	<u>51,699,991</u>	<u>7,792,057</u>
<b>WORKING CAPITAL REVOLVING FUND</b>						
DOC IT Consolidation Personal Service	63,364	52,200	11,164	63,364	52,200	11,164
DOC IT Consolidation Expense and Equipment	170,410	104,607	65,803	170,410	94,338	76,072
Total Working Capital Revolving Fund	<u>233,774</u>	<u>156,807</u>	<u>76,967</u>	<u>233,774</u>	<u>146,538</u>	<u>87,236</u>
<b>INMATE REVOLVING FUND</b>						
DOC IT Consolidation Expense and Equipment	9,517,088	3,712,169	5,804,919	10,469,380	3,468,481	7,000,899
Total Inmate Revolving Fund	<u>9,517,088</u>	<u>3,712,169</u>	<u>5,804,919</u>	<u>10,469,380</u>	<u>3,468,481</u>	<u>7,000,899</u> *

Appendix B

Office of Administration  
 Information Technology Services Division  
 Comparative Statement of Appropriations and Expenditures

	Year ended June 30,					
	2011			2010		
	Appropriation Authority	Expenditures	Lapsed Balances	Appropriation Authority	Expenditures	Lapsed Balances
<b>DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL SERVICES</b>						
<b>ADMINISTRATIVE TRUST FUND</b>						
DSS IT Consolidation Expense and Equipment	402,972	87,003	315,969	402,972	0	402,972
Total Department of Social Services Administrative Trust Fund	402,972	87,003	315,969	402,972	0	402,972
<b>DED ADMINISTRATIVE FUND</b>						
DED IT Consolidation Personal Service	681,935	304,963	376,972	681,935	485,964	195,971
DED IT Consolidation Expense and Equipment	1,278,197	35,224	1,242,973	1,128,197	55,235	1,072,962
Total DED Administrative Fund	1,960,132	340,187	1,619,945	1,810,132	541,199	1,268,933
<b>DIVISION OF CREDIT UNIONS FUND</b>						
DIFP IT Consolidation Expense and Equipment	6,611	1,738	4,873	6,611	1,516	5,095
Total Division of Credit Unions Fund	6,611	1,738	4,873	6,611	1,516	5,095
<b>DIVISION OF FINANCE FUND</b>						
DIFP IT Consolidation Personal Service	51,248	46,050	5,198	51,248	45,984	5,264
DIFP IT Consolidation Expense and Equipment	99,552	93,431	6,121	99,552	80,807	18,745
Total Division of Finance Fund	150,800	139,481	11,319	150,800	126,791	24,009
<b>INSURANCE EXAMINERS FUND</b>						
DOI IT Consolidation Expense and Equipment	121,628	63,151	58,477	156,628	65,950	90,678
Total Insurance Examiners Fund	121,628	63,151	58,477	156,628	65,950	90,678
<b>DEAF RELAY SERVICE AND EQUIPMENT DISTRIBUTION PROGRAM FUND</b>						
DESE IT Consolidation Expense and Equipment	13,000	1,951	11,049	13,000	202	12,798
Total Deaf Relay Service and Equipment Distribution Program Fund	13,000	1,951	11,049	13,000	202	12,798

Appendix B

Office of Administration  
 Information Technology Services Division  
 Comparative Statement of Appropriations and Expenditures

	Year ended June 30,					
	2011			2010		
	Appropriation Authority	Expenditures	Lapsed Balances	Appropriation Authority	Expenditures	Lapsed Balances
<b>PROFESSIONAL AND PRACTICAL NURSING STUDENT LOAN AND NURSE LOAN REPAYMENT FUND</b>						
DHSS IT Consolidation Expense and Equipment	5,600	2,783	2,817	7,600	6,761	839
DHSS IT Consolidation Personal Service	10,000	1,393	8,607	0	0	0
Total Professional and Practical Nursing Student Loan and Nurse Loan Repayment Fund	15,600	4,176	11,424	7,600	6,761	839
<b>INSURANCE DEDICATED FUND</b>						
DOI IT Consolidation Personal Service	600,093	437,350	162,743	600,093	497,322	102,771
DOI IT Consolidation Expense and Equipment	403,019	227,919	175,100	368,019	222,871	145,148
Total Insurance Dedicated Fund	1,003,112	665,269	337,843	968,112	720,193	247,919
<b>LIVESTOCK SALES &amp; MARKETS FEES FUND</b>						
MDA IT Consolidation Personal Service	390	0	390	390	390	0
MDA IT Consolidation Expense and Equipment	262	4	258	262	67	195
Total Livestock Sales & Markets Fees Fund	652	4	648	652	457	195
<b>CHEMICAL EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS FUND</b>						
DPS IT Consolidation Expense and Equipment	11,500	10,183	1,317	11,500	6,850	4,650
Total Chemical Emergency Preparedness Fund	11,500	10,183	1,317	11,500	6,850	4,650
<b>MOTOR VEHICLE COMMISSION FUND</b>						
DOR IT Consolidation Personal Service	19,784	15,693	4,091	19,784	17,946	1,838
DOR IT Consolidation Expense and Equipment	37,805	37,805	0	37,805	37,805	0
Total Motor Vehicle Commission Fund	57,589	53,498	4,091	57,589	55,751	1,838
<b>MISSOURI JOB DEVELOPMENT FUND</b>						
DED IT Consolidation Expense and Equipment	7,000	0	7,000	7,000	1,462	5,538
Total Missouri Job Development Fund	7,000	0	7,000	7,000	1,462	5,538

Appendix B

Office of Administration  
 Information Technology Services Division  
 Comparative Statement of Appropriations and Expenditures

	Year ended June 30,					
	2011			2010		
	Appropriation Authority	Expenditures	Lapsed Balances	Appropriation Authority	Expenditures	Lapsed Balances
<b>CONSERVATION COMMISSION FUND</b>						
DOR IT Consolidation Expense and Equipment	33,198	33,198	0	33,198	33,198	0
Total Conservation Commission Fund	33,198	33,198	0	33,198	33,198	0
<b>DEPARTMENT OF REVENUE INFORMATION FUND</b>						
DOR IT Consolidation Personal Service	194,849	157,654	37,195	194,849	193,864	985
DOR IT Consolidation Expense and Equipment	58,180	18,515	39,665	58,180	37,628	20,552
DOR IT Consolidation Replacement Systems Expense and Equipment	11,991,918	113,074	11,878,844	11,991,918	142,043	11,849,875
Total Department of Revenue Information Fund	12,244,947	289,243	11,955,704	12,244,947	373,535	11,871,412
<b>BLIND PENSION FUND</b>						
DSS IT Consolidation Expense and Equipment	29,591	29,591	0	29,591	29,591	0
Total Blind Pension Fund	29,591	29,591	0	29,591	29,591	0
<b>STATE HIGHWAYS AND TRANSPORTATION DEPARTMENT FUND</b>						
DOR IT Consolidation Personal Service	861,791	819,733	42,058	861,791	835,937	25,854
DOR IT Consolidation Expense and Equipment	2,794,899	2,710,769	84,130	2,794,899	2,711,052	83,847
Total State Highways and Transportation Department Fund	3,656,690	3,530,502	126,188 *	3,656,690	3,546,989	109,701 *
<b>MILK INSPECTION FEES FUND</b>						
MDA IT Consolidation Personal Service	1,481	0	1,481	1,481	1,481	0
MDA IT Consolidation Expense and Equipment	4,963	1,217	3,746	4,963	2,241	2,722
Total Milk Inspection Fees Fund	6,444	1,217	5,227	6,444	3,722	2,722

Appendix B

Office of Administration  
 Information Technology Services Division  
 Comparative Statement of Appropriations and Expenditures

	Year ended June 30,					
	2011			2010		
	Appropriation Authority	Expenditures	Lapsed Balances	Appropriation Authority	Expenditures	Lapsed Balances
<b>DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND SENIOR SERVICES</b>						
<b>DOCUMENT SERVICES FUND</b>						
DHSS IT Consolidation Personal Service	20,000	246	19,754	0	0	0
DHSS IT Consolidation Expense and Equipment	108,356	22,718	85,638	108,356	57,473	50,883
Total Department of Health and Senior Services Document Services Fund	128,356	22,964	105,392	108,356	57,473	50,883
<b>GRAIN INSPECTION FEES FUND</b>						
MDA IT Consolidation Personal Service	10,359	0	10,359	10,359	9,060	1,299
MDA IT Consolidation Expense and Equipment	33,851	26,849	7,002	33,851	24,093	9,758
Total Grain Inspection Fees Fund	44,210	26,849	17,361	44,210	33,153	11,057
<b>EXCELLENCE IN EDUCATION FUND</b>						
DESE IT Consolidation Expense and Equipment	20,000	20,000	0	20,000	12,102	7,898
Total Excellence In Education Fund	20,000	20,000	0	20,000	12,102	7,898
<b>WORKERS COMPENSATION FUND</b>						
DOLIR IT Consolidation EE	5,327,737	257,544	5,070,193	5,327,737	322,690	5,005,047
DOLIR IT Consolidation Personal Service	283,250	36,165	247,085	283,250	33,777	249,473
Total Workers Compensation Fund	5,610,987	293,709	5,317,278	5,610,987	356,467	5,254,520
<b>DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH - DONATED FUND</b>						
DHSS IT Consolidation Personal Service	117,031	390	116,641	107,031	27,872	79,159
DHSS IT Consolidation Expense and Equipment	20,543	7,849	12,694	48,443	48,091	352
Total Department of Health-Donated Fund	137,574	8,239	129,335	155,474	75,963	79,511
<b>PETROLEUM INSPECTION FUND</b>						
MDA IT Consolidation Personal Service	83,493	65,744	17,749	83,493	78,528	4,965
MDA IT Consolidation Expense and Equipment	48,045	17,031	31,014	48,045	14,197	33,848
Total Petroleum Inspection Fund	131,538	82,775	48,763	131,538	92,725	38,813

Appendix B

Office of Administration  
 Information Technology Services Division  
 Comparative Statement of Appropriations and Expenditures

	Year ended June 30,					
	2011			2010		
	Appropriation Authority	Expenditures	Lapsed Balances	Appropriation Authority	Expenditures	Lapsed Balances
<b>HAZARDOUS WASTE FUND</b>						
DHSS IT Consolidation Expense and Equipment	14,000	2,000	12,000	7,000	6,453	547
Total Hazardous Waste Fund	14,000	2,000	12,000	7,000	6,453	547
<b>SAFE DRINKING WATER FUND</b>						
DHSS IT Consolidation Expense and Equipment	3,500	3,394	106	0	0	0
Total Safe Drinking Water Fund	3,500	3,394	106	0	0	0
<b>CRIME VICTIMS COMPENSATION FUND</b>						
DPS IT Consolidation Expense and Equipment	4,001	635	3,366	4,001	787	3,214
DPS/DOLIR IT Consolidation Expense and Equipment	21,558	8,704	12,854	21,558	2,097	19,461
Total Crime Victims Compensation Fund	25,559	9,339	16,220	25,559	2,884	22,675
<b>AGRICULTURE BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT FUND</b>						
MDA IT Consolidation Expense and Equipment	2,501	0	2,501	2,501	1,284	1,217
Total Agriculture Business Development Fund	2,501	0	2,501	2,501	1,284	1,217
<b>PROFESSIONAL REGISTRATION FEES FUND</b>						
DIFP IT Consolidation Personal Service	304,838	280,867	23,971	304,838	287,918	16,920
DIFP IT Consolidation Expense and Equipment	919,791	195,152	724,639	919,791	527,848	391,943
Total Professional Registration Fees Fund	1,224,629	476,019	748,610	1,224,629	815,766	408,863
<b>CHILDREN'S TRUST FUND</b>						
OA IT Consolidation Expense and Equipment	1,100	382	718	1,100	316	784
Total Children's Trust Fund	1,100	382	718	1,100	316	784

Appendix B

Office of Administration  
 Information Technology Services Division  
 Comparative Statement of Appropriations and Expenditures

	Year ended June 30,					
	2011			2010		
	Appropriation Authority	Expenditures	Lapsed Balances	Appropriation Authority	Expenditures	Lapsed Balances
<b>MISSOURI COMMISSION FOR THE DEAF AND HARD OF HEARING FUND</b>						
DESE IT Consolidation Expense and Equipment	1,000	720	280	1,000	0	1,000
Total Missouri Commission for the Deaf and Hard of Hearing Fund	1,000	720	280	1,000	0	1,000
<b>BOILER AND PRESSURE VESSELS SAFETY FUND</b>						
DPS IT Consolidation Expense and Equipment	14,040	13,441	599	14,040	14,031	9
Total Boiler and Pressure Vessels Safety Fund	14,040	13,441	599	14,040	14,031	9
<b>MISSOURI RX PLAN FUND</b>						
DSS IT Consolidation Expense and Equipment	15,000	15,000	0	15,000	15,000	0
Total Missouri Rx Plan Fund	15,000	15,000	0	15,000	15,000	0
<b>PUTATIVE FATHER REGISTRY FUND</b>						
DHSS IT Consolidation Expense and Equipment	12,600	2,649	9,951	12,600	5,471	7,129
Total Putative Father Registry Fund	12,600	2,649	9,951	12,600	5,471	7,129
<b>MISSOURI WINE AND GRAPE FUND</b>						
MDA IT Consolidation Personal Service	6,362	0	6,362	6,362	4,459	1,903
MDA IT Consolidation Expense and Equipment	10,217	2,411	7,806	8,787	2,773	6,014
Total Missouri Wine And Grape Fund	16,579	2,411	14,168	15,149	7,232	7,917
<b>ORGAN DONOR PROGRAM FUND</b>						
DHSS IT Consolidation Personal Service	9,025	89	8,936	9,025	6,658	2,367
DHSS IT Consolidation Expense and Equipment	50,000	27,677	22,323	334,500	329,905	4,595
Total Organ Donor Program Fund	59,025	27,766	31,259	343,525	336,563	6,962

Appendix B

Office of Administration  
 Information Technology Services Division  
 Comparative Statement of Appropriations and Expenditures

	Year ended June 30,					
	2011			2010		
	Appropriation Authority	Expenditures	Lapsed Balances	Appropriation Authority	Expenditures	Lapsed Balances
<b>CHILD LABOR ENFORCEMENT FUND</b>						
DOLIR IT Consolidation EE	15,000	855	14,145	15,000	196	14,804
Total Child Labor Enforcement Fund	15,000	855	14,145	15,000	196	14,804
<b>EARLY CHILDHOOD DEVELOPMENT, EDUCATION, AND CARE FUND</b>						
DHSS IT Consolidation Expense and Equipment	54,279	34,461	19,818	36,279	35,126	1,153
DSS IT Consolidation Personal Service	1,482	1,438	44	1,482	1,435	47
Total Early Childhood Development, Education, and Care Fund	55,761	35,899	19,862 *	37,761	36,561	1,200 *
<b>GUARANTY AGENCY OPERATING FUND</b>						
DHE IT Consolidation Personal Service	631,606	379,922	251,684	651,606	413,397	238,209
DHE IT Consolidation Expense and Equipment	271,938	250,608	21,330	251,938	155,807	96,131
Total Guaranty Agency Operating Fund	903,544	630,530	273,014	903,544	569,204	334,340
<b>CHILDHOOD LEAD TESTING FUND</b>						
DHSS IT Consolidation Expense and Equipment	13,037	3,001	10,036	13,037	196	12,841
Total Childhood Lead Testing Fund	13,037	3,001	10,036	13,037	196	12,841
<b>AGRICULTURE DEVELOPMENT FUND</b>						
MDA IT Consolidation Personal Service	1,079	0	1,079	1,079	1,079	0
MDA IT Consolidation Expense and Equipment	879	97	782	879	201	678
Total Agriculture Development Fund	1,958	97	1,861	1,958	1,280	678
<b>UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION ADMINISTRATION FUND</b>						
DOLIR IT Consolidation EE	798,281	145,243	653,038	798,281	389,380	408,901
Total Unemployment Compensation Administration Fund	798,281	145,243	653,038	798,281	389,380	408,901

Appendix B

Office of Administration  
 Information Technology Services Division  
 Comparative Statement of Appropriations and Expenditures

	Year ended June 30,					
	2011			2010		
	Appropriation Authority	Expenditures	Lapsed Balances	Appropriation Authority	Expenditures	Lapsed Balances
<b>SPECIAL EMPLOYMENT SECURITY FUND</b>						
DOLIR IT Consolidation EE	110,000	5	109,995	110,000	209	109,791
Total Special Employment Security Fund	110,000	5	109,995	110,000	209	109,791
<b>FEDERAL BUDGET STABILIZATION - MEDICAID REIMBURSEMENT FUND</b>						
ITSD Consolidation Expense and Equipment	0	0	0	4,107,640	4,107,634	6
Total Federal Budget Stabilization - Medicaid Reimbursement Fund	0	0	0	4,107,640	4,107,634	6
<b>FEDERAL BUDGET STABILIZATION - EDUCATION 18% FUND</b>						
Rural Broadband Grant Matches	5,425,500	1,770,483	3,655,017	34,306,937	1,069,762	33,237,175
Healthcare Information Technology Grant Matches	1,680,000	1,629,600	50,400	0	0	0
Rural Broadband Grant Matches Personal Service	219,113	173,686	45,427	48,450	48,450	0
Total Federal Budget Stabilization - Education 18% Fund	7,324,613	3,573,769	3,750,844 *	34,355,387	1,118,212	33,237,175 *
<b>FEDERAL STIMULUS - OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATION FUND</b>						
Rural Broadband Grants	23,632,556	71,598	23,560,958	150,000,000	0	150,000,000
Healthcare Information Technology Grants	3,490,568	2,135,608	1,354,960	408,609	408,609	0
Unemployment Compensation Personal Service	0	0	0	32,932	32,932	0
DHE Public Computing Centers Personal Service	12,482	12,481	1	0	0	0
DHE Public Computing Centers Expense and Equipment	2,722,176	300,014	2,422,162	0	0	0
Total Federal Stimulus-Office of Administration Fund	29,857,782	2,519,701	27,338,081	150,441,541	441,541	150,000,000
Total All Funds	\$ 275,327,001	176,924,923	98,402,078	418,340,547	169,984,298	248,356,249

Appendix B

Office of Administration  
 Information Technology Services Division  
 Comparative Statement of Appropriations and Expenditures

\* The lapsed balances include the following withholdings made at the Governor's request:

	Year Ended June 30,	
	2011	2010
<b>GENERAL REVENUE FUND</b>		
General Revenue IT Consolidation Personal Service	\$ 673,543	1,025,851
General Revenue IT Consolidation Expense and Equipment	0	2,073,109
DOR IT Consolidation HC Personal Service	65,011	300,177
DOR IT Consolidation HC Expense and Equipment	540,772	397,940
Total General Revenue Fund	<u>1,279,326</u>	<u>3,797,077</u>
<b>HEALTH CARE TECHNOLOGY FUND</b>		
DHSS IT Consolidation Laboratory Management Information System Personal Service	0	16,599
DHSS IT Consolidation Expense and Equipment	0	335,107
DHSS IT Consolidation Laboratory Management Information System Expense and Equipment	0	560,266
Total Health Care Technology Fund	<u>0</u>	<u>911,972</u>
<b>HEALTH INITIATIVES FUND</b>		
DSS IT Consolidation Personal Service	165	165
DHSS IT Consolidation Expense and Equipment	60	60
DSS IT Consolidation Expense and Equipment	2	2
Total Health Initiatives Fund	<u>227</u>	<u>227</u>
<b>LOTTERY PROCEEDS FUND</b>		
DESE IT Consolidation Expense and Equipment	3,404	3,404
Total Lottery Proceeds Fund	<u>3,404</u>	<u>3,404</u>
<b>HEALTH ACCESS INCENTIVE FUND</b>		
DHSS IT Consolidation Expense and Equipment	231	231
Total Health Access Incentive Fund	<u>231</u>	<u>231</u>

Appendix B

Office of Administration  
 Information Technology Services Division  
 Comparative Statement of Appropriations and Expenditures

	Year Ended June 30,	
	2011	2010
<b>INMATE REVOLVING FUND</b>		
DOC IT Consolidation Expense and Equipment	0	952,292
Total Inmate Revolving Fund	0	952,292
<b>STATE HIGHWAYS AND TRANSPORTATION DEPARTMENT FUND</b>		
DOR IT Consolidation Personal Service	25,854	25,854
DOR IT Consolidation Expense and Equipment	83,847	83,847
Total State Highways and Transportation Department Fund	109,701	109,701
<b>EARLY CHILDHOOD DEVELOPMENT, EDUCATION AND CARE FUND</b>		
DHSS IT Consolidation Expense and Equipment	728	728
DSS IT Consolidation Personal Service	44	44
Total Early Childhood Development, Education, and Care Fund	772	772
<b>FEDERAL BUDGET STABILIZATION - EDUCATION 18% FUND</b>		
Rural Broadband Grant Matches	1,883,460	33,237,174
Healthcare Information Technology Grant Matches	50,400	0
Total Federal Budget Stabilization - Education 18% Fund	1,933,860	33,237,174
Total All Funds	\$ 3,327,521	39,012,850

Appendix C

Office of Administration  
 Information Technology Services Division  
 Comparative Statement of Expenditures (From Appropriations)

	Year Ended June 30,				
	2011	2010	2009	2008	2007
Personal services	\$ 48,946,416	51,362,884	52,834,590	49,421,995	40,664,016
Travel, in-state	147,560	227,004	337,976	308,016	292,367
Travel, out-of-state	10,540	54,488	111,940	109,941	50,190
Fuel and utilities	21,864	18,035	148	1,161	158
Supplies	1,053,846	2,226,775	1,506,321	1,391,627	895,299
Professional development	188,989	424,783	853,284	992,135	520,236
Communication services and supplies	5,160,907	5,171,391	5,443,849	5,898,206	5,397,650
Services:					
Professional	33,819,375	45,577,703	49,956,128	39,129,935	38,734,174
Janitorial	0	45	404	1,498	492
Maintenance and repair	20,854,442	19,220,345	22,176,258	19,076,818	10,524,720
Equipment:					
Computer	27,221,430	8,386,890	25,427,604	18,685,543	17,628,386
Motorized	0	22,609	34,184	37,198	2,308
Office	2,026,543	490,519	184,099	419,145	99,887
Other	477,843	61,278	295,204	161,566	186,492
Property and improvements	0	907	117,333	14,832	8,332
Debt service	2,585,829	2,792,965	2,521,678	248,630	20,597
Real property rentals and leases	95,905	85,342	5,046	36,277	111,397
Equipment rental and leases	4,140,587	4,514,581	4,446,861	6,085,119	248,119
Miscellaneous expenses	44,173	87,952	111,283	121,904	94,366
Rebillable expenses	29,831,609	29,257,802	28,745,642	27,530,833	25,866,588
Program distributions	297,065	0	25,025	0	0
Total Expenditures	\$ <u>176,924,923</u>	<u>169,984,298</u>	<u>195,134,857</u>	<u>169,672,379</u>	<u>141,345,774</u>