

DA.11
Office of Administrative Hearings

Operating Budget Data

(\$ in Thousands)

	FY 01	FY 02	FY 03		% Change
	<u>Actual</u>	<u>Working</u>	<u>Allowance</u>	<u>Change</u>	<u>Prior Year</u>
General Fund	\$24	\$25	\$0	(\$25)	(100.0%)
Special Fund	7	6	6	0	0.0%
Reimbursable Fund	<u>10,440</u>	<u>10,798</u>	<u>10,924</u>	<u>126</u>	<u>1.2%</u>
Total Funds	\$10,471	\$10,829	\$10,930	\$101	0.9%

- No general funds are budgeted in the fiscal 2003 allowance. This expenditure is absorbed by reimbursable funds.
- The allowance includes \$113,000 for security services and \$140,903 of reductions for fulfilling consulting contract and phone system lease terms.

Personnel Data

	FY 01	FY 02	FY 03	
	<u>Actual</u>	<u>Working</u>	<u>Allowance</u>	<u>Change</u>
Regular Positions	142.00	141.00	141.00	0.00
Contractual FTEs	<u>0.00</u>	<u>0.00</u>	<u>0.00</u>	<u>0.00</u>
Total Personnel	142.00	141.00	141.00	0.00

Vacancy Data: Regular Positions

Budgeted Turnover: FY 03	11.69	8.29%
Positions Vacant as of 12/31/01	11.50	8.16%

- The budgeted turnover rate was increased from 4.50% to 8.29%, resulting in \$385,300 in additional savings to the State. This increase aligns the Office of Administrative Hearings' (OAH) expected turnover with actual performance in previous years.

Note: Numbers may not sum to total due to rounding.

For further information contact: Michèle L. Mellott

Phone: (410) 946-5530

Analysis in Brief

Issues

Delivery of Case Management System (CMS) Upgrade Overdue: One calendar year has passed without a deliverable, and another year is likely to pass before the upgrade is completed. OAH will require an additional \$330,541 to complete the project at its new cost of \$508,000. This balance will be funded through fiscal 2002 cost containment savings. **The Department of Legislative Services recommends that committees direct OAH to submit a report documenting the progress made to date on the CMS upgrade and the use of funds resulting from fiscal 2002 cost containment actions.**

Recommended Actions

	<u>Funds</u>	<u>Positions</u>
1. Delete four positions, each vacant for more than twelve months.		4.0
2. Report progress of case management system (CMS) upgrade.		
Total Reductions		4.0

Updates

Salary Grade Increases for Certain Positions Due to Joint Chairmen's Report Findings: OAH staff attorneys and entry-level administrative law judges receive salary grade increases to make their salaries comparable with those received by staff attorneys and Assistant Attorneys General at the Office of the Attorney General.

Documentation of Actual Annual Caseload and Cost Allocation Calculations: OAH fulfilled a fiscal 2002 budget bill mandate requiring it to submit with its budget allowance an accounting of its actual annual caseload and calculation methods used to allocate costs to agencies that utilize OAH's services.

DA.11
Office of Administrative Hearings

Operating Budget Analysis

Program Description

The Office of Administrative Hearings (OAH) holds hearings in contested cases involving State agencies. The office was created in 1989 to centralize the hearing functions in various units of State government. Cases are heard by administrative law judges (ALJs). ALJs also receive continuous training due to the variety of cases over which they preside. The majority of OAH cases originate from the Motor Vehicle Administration (MVA); the Inmate Grievance Office (IGO); the Department of Health and Mental Hygiene (DHMH); the Department of Human Resources (DHR); the Department of Labor, Licensing and Regulation (DLLR); and the Department of Budget and Management (DBM). Funding primarily comes from those agencies that use OAH services. These agencies reimburse the OAH based on the proportion of time spent on their cases.

The Chief Administrative Law Judge is the administrative head of the agency. The State Advisory Council on Administrative Hearings oversees all activities of the agency and provides guidance and direction to the Chief Administrative Law Judge.

Fiscal 2002 Actions

OAH is not required to contribute to cost containment actions. However, OAH expects to save \$696,000 in fiscal 2002 due to the hiring freeze and other nonpersonnel expense reductions. Of these savings, \$247,400 will be applied toward the acquisition of a Case Management System (CMS) upgrade, while the remainder is expected to revert back to the general fund. Fiscal 2003 cost containment actions consist of \$415,741 in savings due to the hiring freeze and \$17,000 of nonpersonnel operating expense savings.

Governor's Proposed Budget

Changes between the fiscal 2002 working appropriation and the fiscal 2003 allowance are highlighted in **Exhibit 1**. OAH's allowance is \$10.9 million, increasing \$100,650 or 0.9%, over the working appropriation. Personnel-related expenses are \$8.8 million in the fiscal 2003 allowance and represent 81% of the agency's budget. A \$65,739 increase in personnel expenses accounts for two-thirds of the overall change between the working appropriation and the allowance. The turnover expectancy rate increases from 4.50% to 8.29%, resulting in a \$385,300 reduction from OAH's allowance in fiscal 2003. The turnover rate increase represents an alignment of OAH's projection to previous years actual turnover rates.

Exhibit 1

DA.11 - Office of Administrative Hearings

**Governor's Proposed Budget
Office of Administrative Hearings
(\$ in Thousands)**

How Much It Grows:	<u>General Fund</u>	<u>Special Fund</u>	<u>Federal Fund</u>	<u>Reimb. Fund</u>	<u>Total</u>
2002 Working Appropriation	\$25	\$6	\$0	\$10,798	\$10,829
2003 Governor's Allowance	0	6	0	10,924	10,930
Amount Change	(\$25)	\$0	\$0	\$126	\$101
Percent Change	(100.0)%	0.0%	0.0%	1.2%	0.9%

Where It Goes:

Personnel Expenses

Annualize fiscal 2002 general salary increase	\$144
Retirement contribution cost increase	89
Fiscal 2003 increments	87
Reductions in deferred and workers' compensation; retirement surcharge goes away; increase for employee transit expenses; and other adjustments	57
Employee and retiree health insurance cost increase	54
Fiscal 2003 turnover	(365)

Other Changes

Funds for a metal detector and security personnel	133
Office supplies and fixed charges increased to reflect actual 2001 expenditures	38
Small changes in various contractual services, travel, fuel, and utilities	19
Computer maintenance contract increases	15
Motor vehicle pool cost decreases due to the disposal of two older vehicles and the one-time cost of an executive sedan purchase in fiscal 2002	(12)
Contractual agreement for Internet projects fulfilled in fiscal 2002	(66)
Fulfilled lease obligations for a phone system and computers purchased in 1998	(92)

Total **\$101**

Note: Numbers may not sum to total due to rounding.

DA.11 - Office of Administrative Hearings

Reimbursable Funds

Reimbursable funds comprise 100% of OAH's fiscal 2003 allowance. OAH receives reimbursable funds from agencies that refer contested cases for OAH resolution. These agencies receive an appropriation based upon billing information provided to DBM by OAH. During the last session, budget bill language was adopted requiring OAH to begin submitting with its annual budget request an accounting of caseload and case hours attributable to each agency from which it receives funds. Additionally, OAH must submit documentation of the calculations used to determine each agency's cost allocation. OAH has complied with this legislation.

Exhibit 2 shows the breakdown of cases, case hours, and cost allocations for each agency that remits funds to OAH. Also included are two columns that display how much the case hours and reimbursable funds changed from the 2002 appropriation by agency. The formula below illustrates how OAH will bill agencies in fiscal 2003. The amounts are based on actual fiscal 2001 cases.

$$\text{Agency Charge} = \frac{(\text{avg. case time per case in hours} \times \# \text{ fiscal 2001 cases}) \times \text{fiscal 2003 expenditures}}{\text{sum of all agencies' case hours}}$$

Overall, caseloads declined by 8.41% between fiscal 2000 and 2001. Agencies with caseloads that decreased or increased significantly were allocated a corresponding decreased or increased amount of reimbursable funds. However, agencies with small changes in their caseloads, more often than not, experienced substantial increases in their allocations. This phenomena occurs for two reasons: 1) the approach employed by OAH to allocate costs; and 2) the growth in OAH's budget.

Agencies are billed according to how many case hours they contributed to the total case hours (i.e. relative to other agencies) in the second prior year, not their absolute contribution. As OAH does not utilize an hourly billable rate, agencies cannot be allocated costs based on the total number of hours their cases contribute to OAH's caseload. This approach thus leads to occasions whereby an agency may be overcharged one year if their actual case contribution is less than what it was two years earlier and vice versa.

Exhibit 2 also illustrates that total reimbursable funds are increasing by 0.54% over the fiscal 2002 allowance. This growth is attributable to the growth in OAH's expenditures and explains why nearly all agencies' cost allocations have risen despite an overall decline in caseloads. Eighty-one percent of OAH's budget is allocated to personnel costs. Therefore, if salary or cost-of-living-adjustment (COLA) increases occur, increments are provided, or health insurance and/or retirement rates rise, then reimbursable funds must be adjusted upward to reflect such changes.

DA.11 - Office of Administrative Hearings

Exhibit 2

**Caseload and Reimbursable Fund Distribution
Office of Administrative Hearings
Fiscal 2003 Allowance**

	<u>Cases</u>	<u>Total Case Hrs</u>	<u>% Total Case Hrs</u>	<u>Reimb. Funds</u>	<u>% Tot. Reimb. Funds</u>	<u>% Chg. Over FY02 Case Hrs</u>	<u>% Chg. Over FY02 Reimb. Funds</u>
Attorney General	2	40	0.08%	\$9,212	0.08%	-69.70%	-66.74%
Board of Public Works	1	26	0.05%	5,988	0.05%	0.00%	9.77%
Budget and Management	300	3,138	6.62%	722,672	6.62%	-2.58%	6.94%
Department of Education	462	5,382	11.35%	1,239,459	11.35%	-0.72%	8.98%
Environment	6	300	0.63%	69,089	0.63%	-45.45%	-40.13%
Health and Mental Hygiene	1,915	4,301	9.07%	990,507	9.07%	0.73%	10.56%
Human Relations Commission	2	120	0.25%	27,636	0.25%	-71.43%	-68.64%
Human Resources	1,137	13,182	27.79%	3,035,775	27.79%	-14.52%	-6.17%
Inmate Grievances -- DPSCS	724	1,086	2.29%	250,103	2.29%	107.25%	127.71%
Labor, Licensing and Regulation	277	6,531	13.77%	1,504,070	13.77%	-15.06%	-6.76%
MD Insurance Administration	429	644	1.36%	148,311	1.36%	-23.52%	-16.05%
MD State Police	32	80	0.17%	18,424	0.17%	9.59%	20.29%
Natural Resources	39	117	0.25%	26,945	0.25%	-56.99%	-52.70%
Retirement and Pension	28	560	1.18%	128,966	1.18%	-12.50%	-3.95%
Transportation	23,528	11,927	25.14%	2,746,753	25.14%	-2.93%	6.56%
Total	28,882	47,434	100.00%	\$10,923,909	100.00%	-8.41%	0.54%

Source: Office of Administrative Hearings

Performance Analysis: Managing for Results

Significant Improvements Made to Managing for Results Submission

Exhibit 3 contains highlights from OAH's Managing for Results (MFR) document, which improved significantly from last year. The fiscal 2002 MFR was criticized for being too heavily focused on the efficiency with which OAH processed cases. Additionally, generic objectives failed to capture the complexity of cases that OAH hears. This fiscal year, existing goals, objectives, and strategies were greatly expanded and succinctly defined, and six new goals were added. These improvements address the breadth and quality of work OAH performs and together provide a feasible, well-rounded working plan for the agency.

Efficiency continues to be a major area of focus for OAH. However, rather than place emphasis on each step of the administrative hearing process in general as it did in the past, OAH redirects its attention to how timely it processes the variety of cases it receives. The time necessary to adjudicate an agency's case depends on such factors as relevant legislation, laws, regulations, and the case's complexity. Disaggregating the hearing process by case type results in a more accurate view and measure of how efficiently OAH performs.

OAH's MFR continues to concentrate on the professionalism and competency of ALJs. In previous years, objectives for this goal consisted of three very general participant rating targets based on the results of OAH's customer satisfaction survey. This fiscal year, seven new objectives consist of specific target percentages that cover issues related to ALJs:

- time management of proceedings;
- preparation for and organization of proceedings;
- promptness and clarity of rulings;
- attentiveness and courtesy;
- fairness of proceedings;
- maintenance of orderly decorum; and
- ability to conduct themselves within their role.

Six new performance-oriented goals also are included with this year's MFR. Two of these goals center around other functions that OAH performs: Alternative Dispute Resolution (methods of settling cases with OAH assistance but without going to trial) and the provision of information regarding hearing proceedings to participants. Two other goals focus on the location of proceedings (accessibility and appropriate physical environment). The fifth goal is to ensure that decisions reached by ALJs accurately address and resolve issues raised by hearing participants. Maintaining the currency of ALJs' training is the final goal added to this fiscal year's MFR.

DA.11 - Office of Administrative Hearings

Exhibit 3

Program Measurement Data
Office of Administrative Hearings
Fiscal 2001 through 2003

	<u>Bench mark</u>	<u>Actual 2001</u>	<u>Est. 2002</u>	<u>Est. 2003</u>
Goal 1 - Timely and Efficient Administrative Hearings				
<i>DHMH cases</i> - Average number of days between date appeal received to date of disposition	30.00	31.21	30.00	30.00
<i>DHR cases</i> - Average number of days between date appeal received to date of disposition	100.00	110.76	100.00	100.00
<i>MVA cases</i> - Average number of days between date appeal received to date of disposition	54.00	57.85	54.00	54.00
<i>MSDE cases</i> - Average number of days between date appeal received to date of disposition	38.00	38.09	38.00	38.00
Goal 2 - Use of Alternative Dispute Resolution				
Percentage of cases resolved using Alternative Dispute Resolution techniques	70.00%	66.42%	70.00 %	70.00 %
Goal 3 - Prompt and Accurate Information				
Percent of participants that rate <i>written materials</i> as satisfactory or excellent	75.00%	70.10%	75.00 %	75.00 %
Goals 4 & 5 - Geographic Accessibility & Appropriate Hearing Environment				
Percent of participants that rate <i>convenience of location</i> as satisfactory or excellent	70.00%	75.88%	82.00 %	82.00 %
Percent of participants that rate <i>physical environment</i> as satisfactory or excellent	88.00%	87.27%	88.00 %	88.00 %
Goal 6 - Professional and Competent Administrative Hearings				
Percent of participants that rate the <i>preparation for and organization of proceedings</i> as satisfactory or excellent	88.00%	87.19%	88.00 %	88.00 %
Percent of participants that rate the <i>promptness and clarity of rulings</i> as satisfactory or excellent	82.00%	88.65%	82.00 %	82.00 %
Percent of participants that rate the <i>attentiveness and courtesy of ALJs</i> as satisfactory or excellent	91.00%	90.20%	91.00 %	91.00 %
Goal 7 - Accurate Issue Resolution				
Percent of participants that rate the <i>decision</i> as satisfactory or excellent	84.00%	83.04%	84.00 %	84.00 %
Goal 8 - Currency of ALJ Legal Knowledge				

DA.11 - Office of Administrative Hearings

	<u>Bench mark</u>	<u>Actual 2001</u>	<u>Est. 2002</u>	<u>Est. 2003</u>
Percent of ALJ in attendance at monthly training sessions	90.00%	91.00%	91.00 %	91.00 %

Source: Office of Administrative Hearings

None of the existing or new goals and objectives explicitly addresses administrative oversight or performance evaluations. However, OAH's improvements to its MFR begin to implicitly capture performance in these areas. The goals to which OAH strives cannot be realized without effective administration and knowledgeable, productive staff and ALJs.

The Department of Legislative Services (DLS) recommends that OAH begin utilizing its new MFR to track its performance. Rather than make more major changes to its MFR, OAH should adjust benchmarks and estimates on an as-needed basis.

Performance Analysis: Caseload Processing Efficiency Measures

Data representing OAH's annual caseload is provided in **Exhibit 4**. Overall, cases carried over from the previous year have reached a three-year high of 8,510 in fiscal 2001. Cases carried forward into the following year also have risen by 7.1% since 1999; yet OAH projects a decline in cases carried forward into fiscal 2003 and 2004. Based on the historical trend, it is not clear what the basis for future declines might be. Cases received will remain at fiscal 2002 levels, while case disposition efficiency is expected to decline by 0.1%. Taken together, these estimates indicate that OAH will not process cases as efficiently in fiscal 2003 as in the recent past.

Exhibit 4

**Efficiency Performance Measurement
Office of Administrative Hearings
Fiscal 1998 through 2003**

	<u>Actual 1998</u>	<u>Actual 1999</u>	<u>Actual 2000</u>	<u>Actual 2001</u>	<u>Est. 2002</u>	<u>Est. 2003</u>	<u>Ann. Chg. 99-01</u>	<u>Ann. Chg. 01-03</u>
Cases carried over	6,997	7,109	6,346	8,510	7,284	6,284	9.4%	-14.1%
Cases received	41,088	41,754	44,501	51,904	53,000	53,000	11.5%	1.1%
Cases disposed	40,976	42,517	42,337	53,130	54,000	53,000	11.8%	-0.1%
Cases carried forward	7,109	6,346	8,510	7,284	6,284	6,284	7.1%	-7.1%

DA.11 - Office of Administrative Hearings

<u>Actual</u> <u>1998</u>	<u>Actual</u> <u>1999</u>	<u>Actual</u> <u>2000</u>	<u>Actual</u> <u>2001</u>	<u>Est.</u> <u>2002</u>	<u>Est.</u> <u>2003</u>	<u>Ann.</u> <u>Chg.</u> <u>99-01</u>	<u>Ann.</u> <u>Chg.</u> <u>01-03</u>
------------------------------	------------------------------	------------------------------	------------------------------	----------------------------	----------------------------	--	--

Note: Numbers may not sum due to rounding.

Source: Office of Administrative Hearings

What remains to be seen is whether this loss in efficiency will have a positive or negative impact on OAH's entire performance. OAH's MFR improvements include outcome measures that will capture how effectively it provides services. OAH will now be able to determine the quality of its services relative to how quickly it performs them.

DLS recommends that OAH discuss the increase in cases carried over and cases carried forward since 1999, particularly with respect to projections for fiscal 2002 and 2003. Given the agency's actual experience, it is not apparent why these measures will decline.

Issues

1. Delivery of Case Management System Upgrade Overdue

The data used to report OAH's performance are derived from an improved customer satisfaction survey and its current Case Management System (CMS). In fiscal 2001, OAH proposed to upgrade its CMS from a MS-DOS platform to a Windows-based operating system. The upgrade was necessary since the vendor was discontinuing technical support for the DOS-based system. The upgrade would cost \$177,000. OAH received an adjustment of \$135,000 to its fiscal 2001 base budget, which it encumbered for the CMS upgrade. Delivery of the system was anticipated to occur December 2001.

In fiscal 2002, OAH applied \$42,000 toward the balance remaining on the purchase cost of the CMS upgrade before being informed by the Office of Information Technology that it would not be allowed to sole-source the project. Additionally, OAH would have to solicit bids from a group of vendors that was awarded a statewide information technology service contract. As required, OAH wrote a Request For Proposal (RFP) and received two bids, the lower of which was valued at \$508,000. However, OAH had already reallocated the remainder of the \$135,000 adjustment toward financing computer equipment (\$83,100) and other items (\$9,900) and therefore could not apply it toward the new CMS upgrade. Furthermore, none of these changes were reported to the committees during the 2001 session.

The balance remaining on the new project cost is \$330,541. OAH originally intended to request a deficiency for its fiscal 2002 budget. However, DBM determined that OAH could fund the balance of the upgrade cost through fiscal 2002 cost containment savings. Specific cost savings are as follows:

- \$230,441 of projected savings in fiscal 2002 personnel expenditures due to the hiring freeze and other related costs;
- \$17,000 of nonpersonnel cost containing savings; and
- \$83,100 that OAH reallocated to finance computer equipment purchases. The funding for the lease was available, but the lease had not been executed.

One calendar year has passed without a deliverable. According to OAH's fiscal 2003 Information Technology Master Plan, development and implementation of the CMS upgrade is now expected to begin in fiscal 2002, which means that another calendar year is likely to pass before the completion of the upgrade. The committees should have been fully apprised of the entire situation.

To ensure that the committees are kept informed on the progress of the CMS upgrade implementation, DLS recommends that the following narrative be adopted:

Report Progress of Case Management System (CMS) Upgrade: The scope and cost of OAH's CMS upgrade has changed significantly, causing the delivery date to be pushed back by at least one calendar year. Based on OAH's fiscal 2003 Information Technology Master Plan, another year is expected to pass without a deliverable product. These changes occurred without any legislative oversight. The committees direct OAH to submit a report on August 1, 2002, detailing the progress it has made toward developing

DA.11 - Office of Administrative Hearings

and implementing the CMS upgrade; the amount of funds that have been and will be applied toward the balance of the purchase cost; and the amount and justification of other purchases made utilizing the fiscal 2002 cost containment savings if not applied toward the CMS upgrade.

Recommended Actions

	<u>Amount Reduction</u>	<u>Position Reduction</u>
1. Delete the following four positions, which have been vacant for more than twelve months:		4.0

<u>Position</u>	<u>PIN No.</u>	<u>Vacate Date</u>	<u>Mos. Vacant</u>
Administrative Law Judge II	029121	09/20/00	16
Administrative Law Judge III	060374	10/03/00	15
Paralegal II	012697	07/31/00	18
Paralegal II	032866	09/05/00	16

The Office of Administrative Hearings' (OAH) predicts that caseloads will decline by 7.1% from fiscal 2001. Given that OAH was able to adjudicate cases in the current and previous fiscal years without the benefit of the above positions, these positions should be deleted.

2. Adopt the following narrative:

Report Progress of Case Management System (CMS) Upgrade: The scope and cost of OAH's CMS upgrade has changed significantly, causing the delivery date to be pushed back by at least one calendar year. Based on OAH's fiscal 2003 Information Technology Master Plan, another year is expected to pass without a deliverable product. These changes occurred without any legislative oversight. The committees direct OAH to submit a report on August 1, 2002, detailing the progress it has made toward developing and implementing the CMS upgrade; the amount of funds that have been and will be applied toward the balance of the purchase cost; and the amount and justification of other purchases made utilizing the fiscal 2002 cost containment savings if not applied toward the CMS upgrade.

Information Request	Authors	Due Date
Report documenting progress made to date on the CMS upgrade and the use of funds resulting from fiscal 2002 cost containment actions.	OAH	August 1, 2002

Updates

1. Salary Grade Increases for Certain Positions Due to JCR Findings

Language in the fiscal 2002 budget required DBM to submit a report comparing the salary grades for lawyers employed by the Office of the Public Defender and OAH. The budget committees later requested the analysis be expanded to include salaries of lawyers in other State agencies including the Office of the Attorney General (OAG), the Office of the State Prosecutor (OSP), the Public Service Commission, the Workers' Compensation Commission, and the Board of Contract Appeals.

The impact of the report's findings as they relate to OAH follows:

- Reclassify two staff attorney positions with administrative titles at the same grades as those for staff attorneys employed by OAG. Specifically, entry-level, intermediate, and full-performance staff attorneys will now be classified at grades 17, 18, and 19, respectively.
- Increase the salary grade of Administrative Law Judge I from Grade 19 to Grade 20. This action will make the grade scale comparable with that used by OAG to determine salaries for entry-level Assistant Attorneys General.
- As salary grades for intermediate ALJs (Grade 21) and full performance ALJs (Grade 22) already equal the salary grades for their Assistant Attorney General counterparts, no other action is required.

2. Documentation of Actual Annual Caseload and Cost Allocation Calculations

The fiscal 2002 budget bill contained language mandating OAH to submit with its annual budget allowance an accounting of actual annual case hours attributable to each agency from which it receives reimbursable funds and the methods used to calculate each agency's allocation. The fiscal 2003 allowance submission fulfills this requirement. An analysis of this data is discussed in the *Reimbursable Funds* section of this document.

Current and Prior Year Budgets

**Current and Prior Year Budgets
Office of Administrative Hearings
(\$ in Thousands)**

	<u>General Fund</u>	<u>Special Fund</u>	<u>Federal Fund</u>	<u>Reimb. Fund</u>	<u>Total</u>
Fiscal 2001					
Legislative Appropriation	\$24	\$6	\$0	\$10,258	\$10,288
Deficiency Appropriation	0	0	0	0	0
Budget Amendments	0	1	0	182	183
Reversions and Cancellations	0	0	0	0	0
Actual Expenditures	\$24	\$7	\$0	\$10,440	\$10,471
Fiscal 2002					
Legislative Appropriation	\$25	\$6	\$0	\$10,798	\$10,829
Budget Amendments	0	0	0	0	0
Working Appropriation	\$25	\$6	\$0	\$10,798	\$10,829

Note: Numbers may not sum to total due to rounding.

DA.11 - Office of Administrative Hearings

Fiscal 2001 Amendments and Reversions

Reimbursable Funds

Funds for increments, and COLA and ASR increases	\$93,500
Department of Education grants to fund hearings, training, and clerical support related to Special Education Programs	88,000

DA.11 - Office of Administrative Hearings

Appendix 2

Object/Fund Difference Report
Office of Administrative Hearings

Object/Fund	FY01	FY02	FY03	FY02 - FY03	Percent Change
	Actual	Working Appropriation	Allowance	Amount Change	
Positions					
01 Regular	142.00	141.00	141.00	0	0%
Total Positions	142.00	141.00	141.00	0	0%
Objects					
01 Salaries and Wages	\$ 8,115,437	\$ 8,755,026	\$ 8,820,765	\$ 65,739	0.8%
02 Technical & Spec Fees	72,847	0	0	0	0.0%
03 Communication	208,303	223,403	148,115	(75,288)	(33.7%)
04 Travel	119,376	87,841	93,872	6,031	6.9%
06 Fuel & Utilities	79,379	88,838	91,603	2,765	3.1%
07 Motor Vehicles	57,261	59,610	47,921	(11,689)	(19.6%)
08 Contractual Services	712,949	554,136	646,590	92,454	16.7%
09 Supplies & Materials	181,130	120,871	154,700	33,829	28.0%
10 Equip - Replacement	0	83,100	83,100	0	0%
11 Equip - Additional	83,625	17,655	0	(17,655)	(100.0%)
13 Fixed Charges	840,252	838,779	843,243	4,464	0.5%
Total Objects	\$ 10,470,559	\$ 10,829,259	\$ 10,929,909	\$ 100,650	0.9%
Funds					
01 General Fund	\$ 24,000	\$ 25,000	\$ 0	(\$ 25,000)	(100.0%)
03 Special Fund	6,980	6,000	6,000	0	0%
09 Reimbursable Fund	10,439,579	10,798,259	10,923,909	125,650	1.2%
Total Funds	\$ 10,470,559	\$ 10,829,259	\$ 10,929,909	\$ 100,650	0.9%

Note: Full-time and contractual positions and salaries are reflected for operating budget programs only.