



THE MARYLAND-NATIONAL CAPITAL PARK AND PLANNING COMMISSION

6611 Kenilworth Avenue • Riverdale, Maryland 20737

October 8, 2020

ACS 20-22

To: Prince George's County Planning Board
Montgomery County Planning Board

From: Asuntha Chiang-Smith, Executive Director *AC-S*
Anju A Bennett, Corporate Policy and Management Operations Director *AMB*
Katie Knaupe, Budget & Management Operations Chief *FLK*

Subject: FY22 Proposed Administration Fund Budgets
- Department of Human Resources and Management
- Central Administrative Services Support Services
- Merit System Board

Requested Action

We are requesting support for the FY22 proposed Department of Human Resources and Management (DHRM), Central Administrative Services (CAS) Support Services operations, and Merit System Board Administration Fund budgets.

The proposed budgets have been developed following an analysis of program needs along with wage and benefit projections provided by the Corporate Budget Office. Compensation projections are preliminary and will be updated as the Corporate Budget Office continues to refine projections. The FY22 salary marker is budgeted in non-departmental and not included in these budgets.

I. DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN RESOURCES AND MANAGEMENT

The Department of Human Resources and Management (DHRM) provides the programs that support our talented and diverse workforce as they serve county residents and agency patrons. The Department utilizes specialized expertise to effectively administer agency-wide programs and initiatives to ensure a fair and equitable workplace, transparent budgeting, and employee wellbeing and safety.

FY22 Priorities

Measuring our Performance: The Department is currently developing a robust set of metrics to measure overall agency performance. In FY22, we will focus on creating and standing up this system.

Succession Planning: The Department is currently performing Succession Planning analysis and will focus on implementing the results of the analysis in FY22. This implementation will include leadership development and specialized training to prepare staff members to transition into critical positions as they become vacant.

Labor Relations: The Department will continue to implement collective bargaining contracts and conduct negotiations with two collective bargaining units, including a full 3-year contract with the Municipal and County Government Employees Organization and a reopener with the Fraternal Order Police.

Classification and Compensation: The Department will continue its commitment to ensuring fair and equal pay through the ongoing Classification and Compensation study.

Communications Study: The Department is in the process of analyzing the agency's coordinated communications processes, which will assist agency Departments as they work together to effectively communicate with governmental agencies and officials, citizens, and patrons.

Proposed Budget Overview

The FY22 proposed base budget is \$5,668,365, which is a 0.4% decrease of \$21,167. This decrease is driven by the transfer of software maintenance costs to the Commission-wide Information Technology (CWIT) budget and adjustments to chargebacks, both detailed below.

Personnel Services: DHRM salaries and benefits have increased by 4.4% to account for allocations to the Group Insurance Fund and Risk Management Fund through chargebacks. In prior fiscal years, these allocations were expensed directly to the Internal Service Funds (ISF), however, these allocations will be transferred through chargebacks in FY22, which is a more consistent and appropriate budgeting of items.

Other Operating Charges: Discretionary costs for supplies, other services and charges are proposed to increase by 8.1% to support continuing operations including Park Police Promotional Testing, Labor Counsel, the Classification and Compensation study, Performance Metrics, Succession Planning and Communications. Maintenance fees for our Recruitment management system, NEOGOV have been transferred to CWIT in FY22 and contribute to an overall decrease in budget.

Chargebacks: This area reflects increase of 34%, which appears as a credit against expenses in the budget. This increase is due to utilizing chargebacks to allocate costs to ISFs instead of directly charging the expenses to the funds. Chargebacks are related to services which are directly delivered to specific programs or departments and include the following:

- **DHRM Salaries:** This calculation is a percentage of specific staff time allocated for additional services delivered directly to the Departments.
- **Executive Office Building (EOB):** Allocations of staff time to the EOB ISF have increased in order to accurately account for additional staff time needed to address COVID-19.
- **Risk Management and Group Insurance:** Allocations of staff time directly related to the Risk Management and Group Insurance program Funds.
- **Park Police Testing:** Managed by DHRM, this chargeback accounts for all expenses related to the Park Police Promotional Testing process for Parks and Recreation and Parks departments.
- **Labor Counsel:** Led by DHRM, these chargebacks cover expenses directly related to labor negotiations, addressing grievances, arbitration and mediation for Parks and Recreation and Parks departments.

Proposed New Initiatives

DHRM is proposing 2 changes to support current operations bringing the proposed budget to \$5,804,199, which is a 2.0% increase of \$114,667 compared to FY21 budget levels.

Adding an HR Specialist to the Employee and Labor Relations Team (\$108,234): The Employee and Labor Relations team is comprised of one Human Resources Manager and 2 Human Resources Specialists. This small team is the clearing house for all disciplinary actions, conducts complex investigations requiring extensive knowledge of federal and state regulations, delivers agency-wide trainings, provides guidance to field HR staff, and supports Collective Bargaining efforts. The number of complex investigations, employee consultations and grievances continue to climb, and we anticipate this trend to continue as we all adjust to the "new normal" due to the stressors that COVID-19 and civil unrest have placed on our communities.

Due to societal changes throughout the nation that impact our region and workforce, we need an additional HR specialist to proactively mitigate and address such situations in the workplace before they

become grievances and to educate managers and coworkers alike on what is acceptable in the work environment and in our ever-evolving communities. This position will also serve as a DHRM liaison to the Diversity Council and the Park Police to ensure Diversity, Equity and Inclusion efforts are being coordinated across the Commission and are tailored to suit the unique challenges different members of our workforce may face with internal and external stakeholders.

Supporting a CWIT Request – ERP Upgrade (\$27,600): The Department’s portion of the CWIT initiative to upgrade the agency’s Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) system.

Funding Allocation

The funding allocation for FY22 is 40.9% Montgomery and 59.1% Prince George’s, which is a shift of 0.70% from Montgomery to Prince George’s compared to the FY21 allocation. The total budget is allocated as follows:

- Montgomery: \$2,514,521, an increase of 2.3% from FY21.
- Prince George’s: \$3,289,678, an increase of 1.8% from FY21.

DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN RESOURCES & MANAGEMENT PRELIMINARY FY22 OPERATING BUDGET REQUEST					
	MC Admin Fund	PGC Admin Fund	DEPARTMENT TOTAL	% Change	Positions
FY21 Adopted Budget	\$ 2,457,267	\$ 3,232,265	\$ 5,689,532		
FY22 BASE BUDGET INCREASES					
Salaries	66,507	166,977	233,484		
Benefits	(923)	21,924	21,001		
Other Operating Changes	(93,842)	(259,503)	(353,345)		
Chargebacks	27,444	50,249	77,693		
FY21 One-time Expenses	-	-	-		
Subtotal Increase - Base Budget Request	\$ (814)	\$ (20,353)	\$ (21,167)	-0.4%	
Change to Base Between Counties from Labor Cost Allocation Change					
PROPOSED CHANGES					
CWIT REQUEST: ERP Upgrade	13,800	13,800	27,600		
NEW POSITION: HR Specialist	44,268	63,966	108,234		
Subtotal Proposed Changes	\$ 58,068	\$ 77,766	\$ 135,834	2.4%	1.00
Total Increase FY22 Proposed Budget Request	\$ 2,514,521	\$ 3,289,678	\$ 5,804,199	2.0%	1.00

II. CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT SERVICES BUDGET

This budget includes non-discretionary, shared operating expenses for the bi-county departments and units that make up Central Administrative Services (CAS).

FY22 Priorities

Records Digitization: Continue working with the State in ensuring compliance with records retention protocols to manage the agency’s public records.

Proposed Budget Overview

The FY22 proposed budget is \$1,558,075 which reflects a 6.1% increase of \$88,963. This increase is driven by the following factors:

Personnel Services: No positions are assigned to this budget. However, unemployment payments attributed to CAS departments and units are included in this budget. There is no change from FY21 levels.

Other Operating Charges: Discretionary costs for supplies, other services and charges including telecommunications, document duplication and digitization, postage, shredding, and Corporate Archives support remain flat.

The main cost driver for the budget is occupancy, which has increased 16% compared to FY21 levels due to:

Tenant Changes: Prince George's Parks and Recreation Information Technology and Communications Division is slated to move out of the EOB building before the start of FY22. Presumably, CAS will take over this space, which is reflected in an increased occupancy cost for FY22. To offset part of this significant increase, the purchase of additional shared technology will be delayed until FY23.

COVID-19 Response: Expenses for cleaning, personal protective equipment, supplies, building system maintenance, and necessary updates to the building to address COVID-19 are charged to CAS through rent.

Proposed New Initiatives

There are no new requests for FY22.

Funding Allocation

The funding allocation for FY22 is 44.4% Montgomery and 55.6% Prince George's, which remains the same compared to the FY21 allocation. The total budget is allocated as follows:

- Montgomery: \$693,073, an increase of 6.1% from FY21.
- Prince George's: \$865,002, an increase of 6.0% from FY21.

CAS SUPPORT SERVICES				
PRELIMINARY FY22 OPERATING BUDGET REQUEST				
	MC Admin Fund	PGC Admin Fund	DEPARTMENT TOTAL	% Change
FY21 Adopted Budget	\$ 653,092	\$ 816,020	\$ 1,469,112	
FY22 BASE BUDGET INCREASES				
Salaries	-	-	-	
Benefits	-	-	-	
Other Operating Changes	39,981	48,982	88,963	
Chargebacks	-	-	-	
FY21 One-time Expenses	-	-	-	
Subtotal Increase - Base Budget Request	\$ 39,981	\$ 48,982	\$ 88,963	6.1%
Change to Base Between Counties from Labor Cost Allocation Change				
PROPOSED CHANGES				
No new initiatives proposed				
Total Increase FY22 Proposed Budget Request	\$ 693,073	\$ 865,002	\$ 1,558,075	6.1%

III. MERIT SYSTEM BOARD BUDGET

The Merit System Board oversees the Commission's Merit System, upholds employee rights guaranteed under the Merit System, recommends employment and compensation policies to the Commission, and serves as the final administrative appellate body for employment matters pertaining to non-represented career employees. Three members serve on the impartial Board and are supported by one part-time position.

FY22 Priorities

Case Reviews: Continue to provide timely and objective review of cases and matters.

Proposed Budget Overview

The FY22 proposed budget is \$164,610 and reflects a 5.6% decrease of \$9,790. This decrease is driven by the following factors:

Personnel Services: Salary and benefit costs for the Board are set by the Commission. Adjustments have been made per the projections made by the Corporate Budget Office. Prior fiscal year budgets included increases, which have been adjusted in FY22 resulting in a decrease of 7% compared to FY21 levels.

Other Operating Charges: Discretionary costs for supplies and other services and charges are projected to remain flat compared to FY21.

Proposed New Initiatives

There are no new requests for FY22.

Funding Allocation

Both counties fund the Merit System Board's budget equally. The total budget is allocated as follows:

- Montgomery: \$82,305, a decrease of 5.6% from FY21.
- Prince George's: \$82,305, a decrease of 5.6% from FY21.

MERIT SYSTEM BOARD				
PRELIMINARY FY22 OPERATING BUDGET REQUEST				
	MC Admin Fund	PGC Admin Fund	DEPARTMENT TOTAL	% Change
FY21 Adopted Budget	\$ 87,200	\$ 87,200	\$ 174,400	
FY22 BASE BUDGET INCREASES				
Salaries	(4,073)	(4,073)	(8,146)	
Benefits	(827)	(827)	(1,654)	
Other Operating Changes	-	-	-	
Chargebacks	5	5	10	
FY21 One-time Expenses	-	-	-	
Subtotal Increase - Base Budget Request	\$ (4,895)	\$ (4,895)	\$ (9,790)	-5.6%
Change to Base Between Counties from Labor Cost Allocation Change				
PROPOSED CHANGES				
No new requests				
Total Increase FY22 Proposed Budget Request	\$ 82,305	\$ 82,305	\$ 164,610	-5.6%

MEMORANDUM

DATE: October 8, 2020

TO: Montgomery County Planning Board
Prince George's County Planning Board



FROM: Joseph C. Zimmerman, Secretary-Treasurer

SUBJECT: Finance Department FY22 budget submission

In developing this preliminary estimate of the FY 22 budget request, the Finance Department has carefully considered the service needs of the operating departments.

I am pleased to report that the base budget request, including major known commitments will only increase a modest 1.2%. Much of that is attributable to funding the Supplier Diversity position for a full year. There is, however, a shift in funding away from the Prince George's Admin Fund to the Montgomery Admin Fund. This is reflective of the cost allocations the Commission has adopted for FY 22.

After careful consideration and input from the operating departments, there are two proposed funding requests for fiscal 2022:

- Funding is requested for Employee Recognition Awards as a separate item, as opposed to using lapsed salary.
- Funding for Finance's share of Commission Wide IT initiatives (primarily next version of ERP) which are presented as part of the Office of the CIO's budget request and I support them.

Should the request be funded in its current form, an additional \$93,680 or 1.9% of additional funds will be required in FY 22 vs FY 21, per the attached schedule.

Thank you for your consideration and review of this preliminary request. I look forward to discussing it with you.

FINANCE DEPARTMENT

PRELIMINARY FY22 OPERATING BUDGET REQUEST

	MC Admin Fund	PGC Admin Fund	DEPARTMENT TOTAL	% Change
FY21 Adopted Budget	\$ 2,226,035	\$ 2,807,999	\$ 5,034,034	

FY22 BASE BUDGET INCREASES

Salaries	52,567	19,423	71,990	
Benefits	50,980	51,314	102,294	
Other Operating Changes	5,103	(7)	5,096	
Chargebacks	(48,300)	(71,800)	(120,100)	
FY21 One-time Expenses	-	-	-	
Subtotal Increase - Base Budget Request	\$ 60,350	\$ (1,070)	\$ 59,280	1.2%

PROPOSED CHANGES

Employee Recognition Awards (1st time budgeting this)	4,280	5,720	10,000	
Dept Share of CIO/CWIT Initiatives (ERP Upgrade)	12,200	12,200	24,400	
Subtotal Proposed Changes	\$ 16,480	\$ 17,920	\$ 34,400	0.7%
Total Increase FY22 Proposed Budget Request	\$ 76,830	\$ 16,850	\$ 93,680	1.9%



Office of the General Counsel
Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission

Reply To

Adrian R. Gardner
General Counsel
6611 Kenilworth Avenue, Suite 200
Riverdale, Maryland 20737
(301) 454-1670 • (301) 454-1674 fax

MEMORANDUM

TO: Montgomery County Planning Board
Prince George's County Planning Board

FROM: Debra S Borden
Deputy General Counsel

Adrian R. Gardner
General Counsel

DATE: October 9, 2020

SUBJECT: **Legal Department Preliminary Budget Estimate – FY2022**

This memorandum presents a preliminary estimate to guide development of a FY22 budget proposal for the Office of General Counsel (“OGC” or “Legal Department”). We submit the following budget framework for discussion:

LEGAL DEPARTMENT							
PRELIMINARY FY22 OPERATING BUDGET REQUEST							
			MC Admin Fund	PGC Admin Fund	DEPARTMENT TOTAL	% Change	Positions
		FY21 Adopted Budget	\$ 1,578,654	\$ 1,355,744	\$ 2,934,398		
FY22 BASE BUDGET INCREASES							
		Salaries	25,040	10,899	35,939		
		Benefits	3,678	14,634	18,312		
		Other Operating Changes	3,930	3,851	7,781		
		Chargebacks	(18,840)	(24,078)	(42,918)		
		FY21 One-time Expenses					
		Subtotal Increase - Base Budget Request	\$ 13,808	\$ 5,306	\$ 19,114	0.7%	
		Change to Base Between Counties from Labor Cost Allocation Change	\$ 1,592,462	\$ 1,361,050	\$ 2,953,512		
PROPOSED CHANGES							
		Department Share of CWIT ERP Upgrade	5,100	5,100	10,200		
		Subtotal Proposed Changes	\$ 5,100	\$ 5,100	\$ 10,200	0.3%	
		Total Increase FY22 Proposed Budget Request	\$ 1,597,562	\$ 1,366,150	\$ 2,963,712	1.0%	

Base Budget Overview

We are proposing a maintenance-level budget, one that accounts for the reduced service level at MRO that was required to meet the FY 19, FY 20 and FY 21 funding cuts in the Montgomery County Administrative Fund. After providing for the combined fiscal impact of personnel turnover, including expected increases in fringe benefit costs, the fiscal impact of our personnel budget results in a net increase of \$19,114 resulting in a budget for personnel services allocated to the respective administrative funds as follows:

- Montgomery County Administration Fund: \$1,592,462 (0.9% increase)
- Prince George's County Administration Fund: \$1,361,050 (0.4% decrease)

These figures reflect the updated labor allocation formula or split between Montgomery and Prince George's Counties respectively, 50.5% to 49.5%, as well as any changes in non-departmental charges passed through for capital equipment, the CIO allocation, CWIT charges, etc. Please refer to those non-departmental CAS budget estimates for specific details and amounts.

Additionally, our proposed estimate is based on a modest pass through of interdepartmental chargebacks that remain under discussion with our client departments. The proposed estimates will be subject to change to reflect final pension and/or OPEB numbers.

Conclusion

We hope the approach discussed above reflects an appropriate level of prudence and we look forward to further discussion.

* * *

cc: Melva Brown, Legal Department Program Manager



THE MARYLAND-NATIONAL CAPITAL PARK AND PLANNING COMMISSION

Office of the Inspector General • 7833 Walker Drive, Suite 425 • Greenbelt, Maryland 20770

October 15, 2020

To: Montgomery County Planning Board

Prince George's County Planning Board

From: Renee Kenney, CIG, CPA, CIA, CISA
Inspector General

Renee M. Kenney

Re: FY22 Budget Request/Justification

The Office of Inspector General (OIG) submits the following FY22 budget proposal for your consideration and approval:

Office of the Inspector General							
PRELIMINARY FY22 OPERATING BUDGET REQUEST							
			MC Admin Fund	PGC Admin Fund	DEPARTMENT TOTAL	% Change	Positions
		FY21 Adopted Budget	\$ 327,545	\$ 392,896	\$ 720,441		
FY22 BASE BUDGET INCREASES							
		Salaries	27,812	(20,907)	6,905		
		Benefits	(1,475)	(19,793)	(21,268)		
		Other Operating Changes	1,988	(233)	1,755		
		Chargebacks		1,195	1,195		
		Subtotal Increase - Base Budget Request	\$ 28,325	\$ (39,738)	\$ (11,413)	-1.6%	
PROPOSED CHANGES							
		CWIT Initiative - ERP Upgrade	1,300	1,300	2,600		
		Analytical Software	1,053	1,467	2,520		
		Subtotal Proposed Changes	\$ 2,353	\$ 2,767	\$ 5,120	0.7%	
		Total Increase FY22 Proposed Budget Request	\$ 358,223	\$ 355,925	\$ 714,148	-0.9%	

The OIG's overall FY22 budget of \$714,148 is slightly under (-0.9%) the prior year's approved budget. The OIG is requesting one modest increase (\$2,520) to cover software acquisition costs.

The fluctuation between counties is primarily due to a 4.0%¹ adjustment to the labor cost allocations. Labor cost allocations are based on a three-year running average of OIG personnel's actual labor charges as reported in the Commission's time keeping application (Kronos).

The OIG is not requesting any new positions in FY22. The increase (\$6,905) in salary costs can be attributed to contracted increases. The decrease (\$21,268) in benefits costs can be attributed to overall decreases in Commission benefit rates. The proposed budget does not reflect final pension and/or OPED numbers.

Proposed Changes

The FY22 budget includes an additional \$2,520 to cover the costs of analytical software. This software is necessary to complete performance audits and fraud investigations that require detailed analysis and reporting of large datasets. In FY20 we were able to secure a free trial of the software, and in FY21 we were able to utilize salary savings to cover the cost. The OIG does not anticipate any salary savings in FY22.

The table also reflects an additional \$2,600 in funding for an ERP upgrade proposed by the Office of the Chief Information Officer.

Thank you for your consideration.

¹ FY21 (62.2%/37.8%); FY22 (58.2%/41.8%)



THE MARYLAND-NATIONAL CAPITAL PARK AND PLANNING COMMISSION

6611 Kenilworth Avenue • Riverdale, Maryland 20737

October 14, 2020

TO: Montgomery County Planning Board
Prince George's County Planning Board

FROM: Mazen Chilet, Chief Information Officer *Chilet*

SUBJECT: FY22 Proposed Budget for the Office of the Chief Information Officer (CIO)

Staff Recommendation

Approval to prepare the FY22 Office of the Chief Information Officer (CIO) operating and project budgets at the Base Budget plus New Initiatives level.

Background

The CIO's budget consists of three parts:

1. **Corporate IT (CIT)** - funded by the two Administration Funds and chargebacks. Increased costs of software maintenance contracts, and a CIT share of CWIT, and offset by the decreased departmental chargebacks, resulting from moving the cost of software licenses to CWIT. The proposed budget for Corporate IT is \$2,829,070, a decrease of 2.6%.
2. **Office of the CIO (OCIO)** - an internal service fund (ISF), funded by direct charges to using departments. No new initiatives are proposed for FY22, other than the share of new initiatives proposed in CWIT. The base budget would decrease by 0.24% for the CIO ISF. The total budget would decrease by .09% with the shared portion of the CWIT initiatives.
3. **Commission-Wide IT Initiatives (CWIT)** - also an ISF, funded by direct charges to using departments. Growth in software license cost, new acquired license subscriptions, the license movement from CIT, and funding request for an ERP upgrade would increase the CWIT budget by \$1.2 million.

The IT Council, consisting of representatives of each major department, reviews the budgets for the Office of the CIO and for CWIT.

Operational Update

Several major projects were started in FY20 and FY21:

- **ERP Enhancements: Digital Personnel Actions (DPA):** DPAs are updates to Employee data in the ERP system. These updates are done as part of typical employee life-cycle events such as New Hire, New assignment, Leave of Absence, Seasonal Employee Profile Update ...etc. Historically, Personnel Actions have been processed manually using paper forms – lost forms, delayed approvals, data entry errors, illegible handwriting are a thing of the past. Over 8500 DPAs have been submitted since its launch in it launch.
-
-
- **Seasonal Payroll Automation (SPA),** This project will configure the data structure in the time keeping and Management system (Kronos) to be compatible with the ERP database. The automation of the seasonal employee payroll time and attendance data will provide the commission with tremendous efficiencies that will result in cost savings. Some of the key benefits are the automation of time and attendance data collection through timeclock where seasonal staff will use time clocks at the beginning and end of their scheduled work shifts, the elimination of errors and the automation of time collection and approval process.
- **The Security Assessment Project:** Year two of IT security assessment is underway. The project is expected to be completed by December 2020. We anticipate that the report will provide us with significant findings that will lay the groundwork for strengthening the Commission's IT security posture.
- **IT Security Policies and Standard Operating Procedures.** Initiatives managed by the Information Security Officer to provide compliance with the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST):
 1. M-NCPPC Vulnerability Management (VM) Policy and Standard Operating Procedures (SOP). We have developed an industry standard based vulnerability management policy-This policy defines how to secure M-NCPPC information assets through proper scanning, what constraints on behaviors of users as well as roles and responsibilities to meet effective vulnerability management
 2. M-NCPPC Cybersecurity Incident Response Plan. We have developed a cybersecurity incident response plan that would ensure we quickly recognize and respond to a cybersecurity related incident and assess, classify and efficiently contain the situation.

Corporate IT FY22 Budget

Corporate IT Base Budget

The Base Budget includes reduced salaries and reduced health insurance due to decision to freeze positions to meet Montgomery County budget reductions. After chargebacks, the base budget for Corporate IT is proposed to decrease by 4.1%.

Chargebacks have decreased due to the shifting Licenses that were allocated in Corporate IT to the Commission Wide IT (CWIT) and CIO ISF budget. The reason of the shift is due to the Commission Wide nature of the licenses. Those licenses are:

Infor ERP SaaS	\$ 458,016
ServiceNow Agency-Wide Functional Help Desk	\$ 125,000
NeoGov – FY21 cost was split between HR and EIT	\$ 42,000
Total Software Subscriptions/Licenses	\$ 625,016

Corporate IT New Initiatives

The CIO is not proposing new initiative in the requested FY22 Corporate IT Budget.

The net proposed budget for Corporate IT is \$2,829,070, a decrease of 2.6%.

PRELIMINARY FY22 OPERATING BUDGET REQUEST

	MC Admin Fund	PGC Admin Fund	DEPARTMENT TOTAL	% Change	Positions
FY21 Adopted Budget	\$ 1,684,700	\$ 1,220,730	\$ 2,905,430		
FY22 BASE BUDGET INCREASES					
Salaries	(51,925)	(72,969)	(124,894)		
Benefits	(8,859)	(16,095)	(24,954)		
Other Operating Changes	(264,271)	(286,911)	(551,182)		
Chargebacks	220,156	361,614	581,770		
FY21 One-time Expenses	-	-	-		
Subtotal Increase - Base Budget Request	\$ (104,899)	\$ (14,361)	\$ (119,260)	-4.1%	
Change to Base Between Counties from Labor Cost Allocation Change					
PROPOSED CHANGES					
CWIT Initiative - ERP Upgrade	4,200	4,200	8,400		
CWIT Initiative - IP Camera Upgrade	17,250	17,250	34,500		
Subtotal Proposed Changes	\$ 21,450	\$ 21,450	\$ 42,900	1.5%	
	\$ (83,449)	\$ 7,089	\$ (76,360)		
Total Increase FY22 Proposed Budget Request	\$ 1,601,251	\$ 1,227,819	\$ 2,829,070	-2.6%	

OFFICE OF THE CIO ISF FY22 Budget

The Office of the CIO ISF is an internal service fund (ISF) funded by direct charges to using departments.

CIO ISF Base Budget

The CIO base budget reflects a decrease of \$3,055 or -0.09% due to a decrease in benefits cost:

CIO ISF New Initiatives

The CIO is not proposing new initiative in the requested FY22 Corporate IT Budget.

Office of the CIO ISF Preliminary FY22 Operating Budget Request				
	FY21 Adopted	FY22 Proposed	Variance	% Change
FY22 BASE BUDGET INCREASES				
Salaries	890,741	905,278	14,537	2%
Benefits	380,600	363,008	(17,592)	-5%
Chargebacks	0	0		
Subtotal Increase - Base Budget Request	1,271,341	1,268,286	(3,055)	-0.24%
PROPOSED CHANGES				
CWIT Initiative - ERP Upgrade		600		
CWIT Initiative - IP Camera Upgrade		1,300		
Subtotal Proposed Changes		1,900		
Total Increase FY22 Proposed Budget Request	1,271,341	1,270,186	(1,155)	-0.09%

COMMISSION-WIDE IT (CWIT) ISF FY22 Budget

The proposed budget for the CWIT ISF is presented in four sections:

- 1) Base budget, consisting of on-going software licenses
- 2) Software licenses moved from Corporate IT budget and new software licenses
- 3) Continuing projects at level funding; and
- 4) New project initiatives.

The CIO prepared and presented the annual Enterprise Project Plan (EPP) and present full details of all ongoing and new Commission-Wide software licenses and IT Projects and initiatives. The CIO also provided detailed information to assist each IT Council member to form an opinion and be able to develop

a position on every current and newly developed initiative. IT Council members agreed to support the initiatives based on the merit of the proposed projects while being thoughtful of the current budget uncertainties.

Breakout of the CWIT ISF Budget Request by Department

The CWIT ISF is funded by charges to the supported departments; if the proposed requests are approved, the budgetary impact on each department is as follows:

Base budget, consisting of ongoing software licenses

CWIT Funding Allocation						
Ongoing License/Subscription						
	Microsoft Licenses	Kronos	Adobe Cloud	Website	ADA Monitoring	Security Mentor
Prince George's						
Planning	90,480	9,340	71,610	29,770	5,470	1,250
Parks	178,530	28,480	74,870	31,190	9,770	2,500
Recreation	565,180	28,480	71,610	31,190	9,770	8,750
Enterprise	-	-	-	-	-	-
DHRM	-	1,660	-	2,980	500	-
Finance	-	1,460	-	2,980	500	-
Corporate IT	98,690	610	-	2,980	250	630
Legal	-	160	-	2,840	20	-
Inspector General	-	500	-	2,980	-	-
CIO	-	40	-	2,980	250	-
	932,880	70,730	218,090	109,890	26,530	13,130
Montgomery:						
Planning	279,390	7,140	52,080	7,090	5,470	2,500
Parks	419,000	37,720	55,340	7,090	16,500	8,750
Enterprise	-	-	-	-	-	-
DHRM	-	1,660	-	2,980	500	-
Finance	-	1,460	-	2,980	500	-
Corporate IT	98,690	610	-	2,980	250	630
Legal	-	160	-	2,840	20	-
Inspector General	-	500	-	2,980	-	-
CIO	-	40	-	2,980	250	-
	797,080	49,290	107,420	31,920	23,490	11,880
	1,729,960	120,020	325,510	141,810	50,020	25,010
	1,729,960	120,000	325,500	141,750	50,000	25,000

Software licenses moved from Corporate IT budget and New Software license Subscriptions

CWIT Funding Allocation							
CIT- Moved and New License/Subscription							
	Infor SaaS	NeoGov	ServiceNow	Data Loss Preventio	Microsoft Azure	O365 Backup	ERP Managed
Prince George's							
Planning	35,630	2,500	3,690	5,230	2,090	5,230	8,170
Parks	108,690	7,870	17,630	10,320	4,130	10,320	24,920
Recreation	108,690	12,070	17,630	32,670	13,070	32,670	24,920
Enterprise	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
DHRM	6,320	680	9,380	-	-	-	1,560
Finance	5,590	420	9,380	-	-	-	2,310
Corporate IT	2,790	210	1,250	5,710	-	5,710	-
Legal	140	10	1,250	-	-	-	-
Internal Audit	1,920	210	6,250	-	-	-	-
CIO	140	10	-	-	-	-	-
	269,910	23,980	66,460	53,930	19,290	53,930	61,880
Montgomery							
Planning	27,250	2,500	3,690	16,150	6,460	16,150	6,250
Parks	143,950	13,970	27,380	24,220	9,690	24,220	33,000
Enterprise	-	-	-	-	490	-	1,560
DHRM	6,320	680	9,380	-	580	-	2,310
Finance	5,590	420	9,380	-	200	-	-
Corporate IT	2,790	210	1,250	5,710	200	5,710	-
Legal	140	10	1,250	-	320	-	-
Internal Audit	1,920	210	6,250	-	200	-	-
CIO	140	10	-	-	200	-	-
	188,100	18,010	58,580	46,080	18,340	46,080	43,120
	188,101	18,011	58,581	46,081	18,340	46,081	105,000
	458,016	42,000	125,000	100,000	40,000	100,000	105,000

Continuing projects at level funding

Project list:

- ERP Enhancements
- Time and Attendance Management (Kronos)
- Active Directory Phase V
- Budget Software Replacement
- Enterprise Content Management (ECM)
- Commission Intranet upgrade

New Project Initiatives

The CIO prepares and present to IT Council an annual Enterprise Project Plan (EPP) and present full details of all ongoing and new Commission Wide IT Projects and initiatives. The EPP includes all available information pertaining to the business case, resource needs, each project's name, project manager, project team, total budget, date of initiation, project milestones and estimated completion date.

CWIT Funding Allocation New Projects	
	ERP Upgrade
Prince George's	
Planning	77,800
Parks	237,300
Recreation	237,300
Enterprise	-
DHRM	13,800
Finance	12,200
Corporate IT	4,200
Legal	5,100
Internal Audit	1,300
CIO	300
	589,300
Montgomery	
Planning	59,500
Parks	314,300
Enterprise	-
DHRM	13,800
Finance	12,200
Corporate IT	4,200
Legal	5,100
Internal Audit	1,300
CIO	300
	410,700
	1,000,000
	1,000,000

New FY22 ERP Upgrade

2023 is end of life for the current ERP (V10). By the end FY21 the requirements study to assess our current V10 deployment and its ability to meet our business needs will be completed. What we will learn is: has the current version been able to meet our needs, if not, the study will identify where the deficiencies exist. We will also learn if other ERP providers can meet our functional needs better than our Current ERP

and at what cost. A complete analysis will be conducted with Finance, HR and representatives from the operating departments.

Return on Investment (ROI)

The Returns on Investment from implementing a new ERP solution will address four business needs based on the study findings. Areas of consideration are: Evolving business needs, desired service levels, and cost associated to business processes. Building on the first ERP implementation and the upgrade project we need to realize the Return on Investment from ERP implementation in a direct manner:

1. Addressing the current needs and plan to address unmet needs as enhancements
2. Improving service levels
3. Reducing business cost
4. Efficiencies from digitizing
5. Workflows and interactive reports

Lack of automation efficiencies

- New business needs will not be met, and makeshift work arounds will become normal business practice
- New business initiatives will be harder to achieve due to a lack of ERP system and organization agility
- Lack of system enhancements contributes to stagnate user skills and creative thinking