

2017-19 Biennium Budget Decision Package

Agency: **101 Caseload Forecast Council**
Decision Package Code/Title: **A1 Hosting Sentencing Database at SDC**
Budget Period: **2017-19**
Budget Level: **M2 - Inflation and Other Rate Changes**

Agency Recommendation Summary Text: The Caseload Forecast Council (CFC) is requesting \$58,000 for the 2017-19 Biennium for maintaining and operating its Sentencing Database System (SDS) server in the State Data Center (SDC) managed by Consolidated Technology Services (WaTech). This request will bring the agency into compliance with RCW 43.105.375 and maximize the use of the SDC.

Fiscal Summary:

Operating Expenditures	FY 2018	FY 2019	FY 2020	FY 2021
Fund 001-1	29,000	29,000	29,000	29,000
Total Cost	29,000	29,000	29,000	29,000
Object of Expenditure	FY 2018	FY 2019	FY 2020	FY 2021
E	29,000	29,000	29,000	29,000

Package Description

The Legislature directed state agencies, through RCW 43.105.375, to locate all existing and new servers within the State Data Center (SDC) located in Olympia. The Office of the Chief Information Officer (OCIO), in consultation with the Office of Financial Management, is responsible for implementing the business plan and migration schedule for moving all state agencies into the SDC. The CFC plans to move the SDS server during FY 2017, and will incur an ongoing annual cost of \$28,784 for maintenance and operation of the SDS server in the SDC. This will provide \$19,284 to pay for hosting the server within the SDC and \$9,500 for vendor costs to maintain the functionality of the SDS in response to changes in legislative and agency policies.

The SDS houses sentence-based data on all adult felony sentences and juvenile dispositions in the state. The SDS is critical to the CFC's mission of providing accurate statewide adult and juvenile sentencing data for adult corrections and supervision bed impacts that feed into criminal justice fiscal notes and statutorily required annual adult and juvenile sentencing manuals.

Agency Contact Information: Elaine Deschamps, Executive Director (360) 664-9371

Base Budget: If the proposal is an expansion or alteration of a current program or service, provide information on the resources now devoted to the program or service.

- Not Applicable

Decision Package expenditure, FTE and revenue assumptions, calculations and details:

- See IT Addendum itemized costs.

Decision Package Justification and Impacts

What specific performance outcomes does the agency expect?

- This change will optimize the use of the SDC and help agencies avoid the cost and complexity of maintaining their own server rooms and data centers. The SDC provides the necessary space, power, cooling, connectivity, and physical and network security for the server, storage, and networking equipment of agencies that use it. The SDC operates more efficiently and provides better physical and virtual security and resiliency than any other state agency space.
- The CFC assumes that moving its servers to the SDC will result in overall decreased costs to the state although costs incurred by the CFC are increased. The SDC uses power much more efficiently than individual, smaller and older facilities. Also, the debt service on the SDC, currently burdening the State General Fund, can be reduced as agencies with multiple fund sources locate their IT equipment there.

Performance Measure detail:

Fully describe and quantify expected impacts on state residents and specific populations served.

What are other important connections or impacts related to this proposal? Please complete the following table and provide detailed explanations or information below:

Impact(s) To:		Identify / Explanation
Regional/County impacts?	No	Identify:
Other local gov't impacts?	No	Identify:
Tribal gov't impacts?	No	Identify:
Other state agency impacts?	No	Identify:
Responds to specific task force, report, mandate or exec order?	Yes	Identify: RCW 43.105.375
Does request contain a compensation change?	No	Identify:
Does request require a change to a collective bargaining agreement?	No	Identify:
Facility/workplace needs or impacts?	No	Identify:
Capital Budget Impacts?	No	Identify:

Is change required to existing statutes, rules or contracts?	No	Identify:
Is the request related to or a result of litigation?	No	Identify lawsuit (please consult with Attorney General's Office):
Is the request related to Puget Sound recovery?	No	If yes, see budget instructions Section 14.4 for additional instructions
Identify other important connections		

Please provide a detailed discussion of connections/impacts identified above.

The Legislature directed state agencies, through RCW 43.105.375, to locate all existing and new servers within the State Data Center (SDC) located in Olympia. The Office of the Chief Information Officer (OCIO), in consultation with the Office of Financial Management, is responsible for implementing the business plan and migration schedule for moving all state agencies into the SDC.

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

No alternatives to current law were considered.

What are the consequences of not funding this request?

Agencies will not be in compliance with state law.

How has or can the agency address the issue or need in its current appropriation level?

Other supporting materials: Expenditure Level Detail is provided in the 2017-19 IT Addendum on page 4. For Item 1, O&M for SDS Server at SDC, please see Attachment *Cost Estimate CFC Sentencing Database O&M.pdf*, and for Item 2, O&M for SDS see text under Expenditure Level Detail on page 4.

Information technology: Does this Decision Package include funding for any IT-related costs, including hardware, software, services (including cloud-based services), contracts or IT staff?

- No 
- Yes Continue to IT Addendum below and follow the directions on the bottom of the addendum to meet requirements for OCIO review.)

2017-19 IT Addendum

Part 1: Itemized IT Costs

Information Technology Items in this DP (insert rows as required)	FY 2018	FY 2019	FY 2020	FY 2021
Item 1: Server O&M for SDS at SDC	19,284	19,284	19,284	19,284
Item 2: Vendor O&M for SDS	9,500	9,500	9,500	9,500
Total Cost	28,784	28,784	28,784	28,784

Expenditure Level Detail:

Item 1: Server O&M for SDS at SDC: WaTech estimates the annual cost for operation and maintenance (O&M) for the SDS server at the SDC to be \$19,284 per year. This includes the cost of hosting the server at the SDC, associated software upgrades, monitoring, storage, database back-ups and restoration. Please see Attachment *Cost Estimate for CFC Sentencing Database System O&M by WaTech.pdf* for item level detail.

Item 2: Vendor O&M for SDS: The CFC estimates the annual cost for vendor O&M of the SDS to be \$9,500 per year. SDS O&M costs will vary by year depending on a number of factors, such as the number and magnitude of legislative changes to sentencing law or changes made by other agencies that impact the SDS database (below is a recent example of this).

The expenditure estimate is based on a recent critical repair that was made to the SDS in June 2016, in response to changes made to the input data by the Administrative Office of the Courts in September 2015. The repair was critical to ensure that the SDS is compliant with other criminal justice databases and to reduce staff manual workarounds. The repair involved two components: 1) adding a data field to both the Adult and Juvenile applications and databases, and 2) modifying a current data field from numerical to character in the Juvenile application and database. WaTech staff performed this fix in 60 hours. This estimate assumes O&M would be needed twice per year at 50 rather than 60 hours, for a total of 100 hours per year at a DES Master Contract Vendor rate of \$95 per hour, for an annual cost of \$9,500.

Part 2: Identifying IT Projects

If the investment proposed in the decision package is the development or acquisition of an IT project/system, or is an enhancement to or modification of an existing IT project/system, it will also be reviewed and ranked by the OCIO as required by RCW 43.88.092. The answers to the three questions below will help OFM and the OCIO determine whether this decision package is, or enhances/modifies, an IT project:

1. Does this decision package fund the development or acquisition of a new or enhanced software or hardware system or service? Yes No
2. Does this decision package fund the acquisition or enhancements of any agency data centers? (See [OCIO Policy 184](#) for definition.) Yes No
3. Does this decision package fund the continuation of a project that is, or will be, under OCIO oversight? (See [OCIO Policy 121](#).) Yes No

If you answered “yes” to *any* of these questions, you must complete a concept review with the OCIO before submitting your budget request. Refer to chapter 12.2 of the operating budget instructions for more information.

2017-19 Biennium Budget Decision Package

Agency: **101 Caseload Forecast Council**
Decision Package Code/Title: **A2 Desktop Support Services**
Budget Period: **2017-19**
Budget Level: **M2 - Inflation and Other Rate Changes**

Agency Recommendation Summary Text: The Caseload Forecast Council requests funding to pay Consolidated Technology Services (WaTech) for Desktop Support Services in the 2017-19 Biennium. This service includes end user device connectivity to the Washington State Secure Government Network and the Internet. CTS ensures all the services, equipment and platforms used remain in compliance with IT policies and standards set by the Office of the Chief Information Officer.

Fiscal Summary:

Operating Expenditures	FY 2018	FY 2019	FY 2020	FY 2021
Fund 001-1	60,000	60,000	60,000	60,000
Object of Expenditure	FY 2018	FY 2019	FY 2020	FY 2021
E	60,000	60,000	60,000	60,000

Package Description

Consolidated Technology Services (CTS) provides Desktop Support Services to eligible customers for a fee. Eligible customers include entities entitled to use this service, by law. The service includes end user device connectivity to the Washington State Secure Government Network and its resources, other state resources, and the Internet. CTS is responsible for ensuring all the services, equipment and platforms used remain in compliance with IT policies and standards set by the Office of the Chief Information Officer.

Specific services include: Workstations (desktops/laptops), asset management, cabling, operating system, Microsoft Office Productivity Tools, Email, Local Area Network (LAN) support, IT Security & Compliance Services and all the staff that support these products and services.

The cost of supporting small agencies has not been charged separately in the past, it was absorbed through increased rates to the larger paying agencies. The cost for this service is approximately \$5,000 per year for each device supported. The Caseload Forecast Council has 12 devices.

Base Budget: If the proposal is an expansion or alteration of a current program or service, provide information on the resources now devoted to the program or service.

The CFC is a small agency that has not previously been supported by this service and has had no previous IT support from outside the agency. Many of these services are currently being provided by agency staff who are not IT professionals and who have a full workload in their non-IT positions.

Decision Package expenditure, FTE and revenue assumptions, calculations and details:

The calculations are based on the annual charge from WaTech of \$5,000 per device per year multiplied by 12 devices that the Caseload Forecast Council uses.

Decision Package Justification and Impacts

What specific performance outcomes does the agency expect?

Desktop computing is a basic office and communication tool that agencies must have to function.

Performance Measure detail:

Fully describe and quantify expected impacts on state residents and specific populations served.

- Not Applicable

What are other important connections or impacts related to this proposal? Please complete the following table and provide detailed explanations or information below:

Impact(s) To:		Identify / Explanation
Regional/County impacts?	No	Identify:
Other local gov't impacts?	No	Identify:
Tribal gov't impacts?	No	Identify:
Other state agency impacts?	No	Identify:
Responds to specific task force, report, mandate, or exec order?	No	Identify:
Does request contain a compensation change?	No	Identify:
Does request require a change to a collective bargaining agreement?	No	Identify:
Facility/workplace needs or impacts?	No	Identify:
Capital Budget Impacts?	No	Identify:
Is change required to existing statutes, rules or contracts?	No	Identify:
Is the request related to or a result of litigation?	No	Identify lawsuit (please consult with Attorney General's Office):

Is the request related to Puget Sound recovery?	No	If yes, see budget instructions Section 14.4 for additional instructions
Identify other important connections		

Please provide a detailed discussion of connections/impacts identified above.

- Not Applicable

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

The alternative is to have these costs absorbed by the desktop support service; in effect, OFM/GOV, DES and WaTech would support the small agency desktop support through higher costs for their desktop support service.

What are the consequences of not funding this request?

OFM/GOV, DES, and WaTech’s cost of desktop service would increase in order to support the small agency desktop service.

How has or can the agency address the issue or need in its current appropriation level?

The Caseload Forecast Council is an agency with FTEs. The additional cost of \$5,000 per year for each of its 12 devices is beyond the current budget capacity of the agency.

Other supporting materials: Please attach or reference any other supporting materials or information that will help analysts and policymakers understand and prioritize your request.

- Not Applicable

Information technology: Does this Decision Package include funding for any IT-related costs, including hardware, software, services (including cloud-based services), contracts or IT staff?

No 

Yes Continue to IT Addendum below and follow the directions on the bottom of the addendum to meet requirements for OCIO review.)

2017-19 IT Addendum

Part 1: Itemized IT Costs

Information Technology Items in this DP <i>(insert rows as required)</i>	FY 2018	FY 2019	FY 2020	FY 2021
Desktop Support Services	60,000	60,000	60,000	60,000
Total Cost	60,000	60,000	60,000	60,000

Part 2: Identifying IT Projects

If the investment proposed in the decision package is the development or acquisition of an IT project/system, or is an enhancement to or modification of an existing IT project/system, it will also be reviewed and ranked by the OCIO as required by RCW 43.88.092. The answers to the three questions below will help OFM and the OCIO determine whether this decision package is, or enhances/modifies, an IT project:

1. Does this decision package fund the development or acquisition of a new or enhanced software or hardware system or service? Yes No
2. Does this decision package fund the acquisition or enhancements of any agency data centers? (See [OCIO Policy 184](#) for definition.) Yes No
3. Does this decision package fund the continuation of a project that is, or will be, under OCIO oversight? (See [OCIO Policy 121](#).) Yes No

If you answered “yes” to any of these questions, you must complete a concept review with the OCIO before submitting your budget request. Refer to chapter 12.2 of the operating budget instructions for more information.

2017-19 Biennium Budget Decision Package

Agency: **101 Caseload Forecast Council**

Decision Package Code/Title: **01 Workload - Caseload Forecasting**

Budget Period: **2017-19**

Budget Level: **PL - Performance Level**

Agency Recommendation Summary Text:

Funding is requested, equivalent to one-half FTE, to enable the Caseload Forecast Council (CFC) to hire a full-time forecaster position to address multiple additional unfunded statutory duties assigned to the CFC over the past several years.

Fiscal Summary:

Operating Expenditures				
Fund 001-1	73,000	73,000	73,000	73,000
Total Cost	73,000	73,000	73,000	73,000
Object of Expenditure	FY 2018	FY 2019	FY 2020	FY 2021
Obj. A	49,000	49,000	49,000	49,000
Obj. B	12,000	12,000	12,000	12,000
Obj. E	12,000	12,000	12,000	12,000

Package Description

A core mission of the CFC is to provide state government with accurate, unbiased, consensus-driven and transparent caseload forecasts that provide the foundation for over 75 percent of the maintenance level budget. The CFC currently only has 2 full-time forecasters, and the Director and the Deputy Director also share forecasting duties. The forecasters produce 23 official forecasts that are formally adopted by the Council in November (Governor's budget), February (Legislative budget), and June (incorporation of legislative policy changes and in even years an outlook for the next biennium). The vast majority of these official forecasts contain component forecasts that bring the total number of forecasts produced to over 200. For reference, prior to 2015, the CFC carried a lower forecasting workload with an additional forecaster.

The CFC is requesting funding of \$73,000 per year, which is the equivalent of 0.5 FTE, for a Senior Forecaster position. The agency currently has funding for a half-time position, so this request would allow the agency to hire a full-time employee and address additional statutory duties assigned to the CFC over the past several years that were not funded, including:

- Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) and Working Connections Childcare (WCCC) per EHB 2262 (Workfirst and Child Care Programs),
- Extended Foster Care per E2SSB 5405 (Foster Care – Extended Services),

- Early Support for Infants and Toddlers (ESIT),
- Medicaid expansion of children’s eligibility to 300 percent of the Federal Poverty Level (FPL) per 2SSB 5093 (Child Health Care), and
- Medicaid expansion of adult’s eligibility up to 138 percent of the FPL under the Affordable Care Act (ACA). The ACA also significantly increased the complexity of the Medicaid forecast portfolio.

Additionally, during the 2016 legislative session, the CFC acquired two more forecasting duties without associated funding:

- Individual provider authorized personal care hours per E2SHB 1725 (In-Home Personal Care and Respite Services – Individual Providers – Compensation), and
- A separate forecast for Charter Schools.

To fulfill the requirement of the TANF / WCCC forecast without additional funding, OFM staff is currently producing these forecasts as a courtesy to the CFC. This arrangement is likely not sustainable in the long-run, nor does it satisfy the legislative intent of the CFC producing an independent forecast per EHB 2262.

Compounding the impact of these new duties on resources, the CFC sustained an unintentional budget reduction as a result of the standard carry-forward level (CFL) calculation for the 2013-15 Biennium. In addition to the across-the-board 6 percent cut taken during the budget reductions of the 2011-13 Biennium, the CFC received an additional 3 percent cut (\$77,000) to its base budget as a result of the CFL calculation. The CFC could not take the 6 percent reduction equally across both fiscal years due to significant costs incurred during FY2012 related to the merger of the Sentencing Guidelines Commission data-driven functions (per ESSB 5891 – Criminal Justice Cost Savings). The CFC took 80 percent of its reduction in FY2013, the second year of the biennium. The standard CFL calculation biennialized the larger second year reduction, turning what was intended to be a 6 percent reduction into a 9 percent reduction. If the CFC had taken the reduction equally across both fiscal years, there would have been no additional reduction to the CFC’s base budget.

Base Budget: If the proposal is an expansion or alteration of a current program or service, provide information on the resources now devoted to the program or service.

This proposal is not an expansion or alteration of a current program or service.

Decision Package expenditure, FTE and revenue assumptions, calculations and details:

The annual cost for one half-time position is calculated as follows:

- Object A – Salary, 0.5 FTE at the average Senior Forecaster salary (\$49,000)
- Object B – Benefits, at 25% of salary costs (\$12,000), and
- Object E – Goods and Services, based on a combination of FY 2016 actual and FY 2017 projected expenditures associated with 0.5 FTE (\$12,000).

Decision Package Justification and Impacts

What specific performance outcomes does the agency expect?

The main performance measure for agency activity level A001 “Caseload Forecasting” is forecast accuracy. The requested funding supports improved forecast accuracy by providing sufficient staffing to conduct the necessary review of and improvements to forecast methodologies, assessment of program and policy-related changes and their impacts on the forecasts, and the research required to explain forecast variances.

Performance Measure detail: No performance measures are submitted for this package.

Fully describe and quantify expected impacts on state residents and specific populations served.

While the work of the CFC has a significant impact on the state budget process by providing unbiased, accurate and transparent forecasts for over 75% of the maintenance level budget, and these forecasts enable accurate funding of programs that serve many Washington state residents, the impact on specific populations is indirect through the budget process.

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

Impact(s) To:		Identify / Explanation
Regional/County impacts?	No	Identify:
Other local gov't impacts?	No	Identify:
Tribal gov't impacts?	No	Identify:
Other state agency impacts?	No	Identify:
Responds to specific task force, report, mandate or exec order?	No	Identify:
Does request contain a compensation change?	No	Identify:
Does request require a change to a collective bargaining agreement?	No	Identify:
Facility/workplace needs or impacts?	No	Identify:
Capital Budget Impacts?	No	Identify:
Is change required to existing statutes, rules or contracts?	No	Identify:
Is the request related to or a result of litigation?	No	Identify lawsuit (please consult with Attorney General's Office):
Is the request related to Puget Sound recovery?	No	If yes, see budget instructions Section 14.4 for additional instructions
Identify other important connections		

Please provide a detailed discussion of connections/impacts identified above.

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

The CFC has not explored funding a part-time forecaster position because it is not functionally feasible given the nature of the day-to-day work, nor is it sufficient for the heightened seasonal workload during the forecast cycle periods (September through February and April through June).

What are the consequences of not funding this request?

Without the additional funding to support a full-time forecaster position, the CFC will need to consider what functions it can eliminate. This will entail an assessment of 1) current forecasting and sentencing functions that are not statutorily required of the CFC, 2) forecasts that can be simplified, and 3) sub-forecasts that can be eliminated.

How has or can the agency address the issue or need in its current appropriation level?

The agency could explore hiring a part-time forecaster but this does not meet the agency's needs. The CFC will need to consider what functions can be eliminated and/or simplified.

Other supporting materials:

Information technology: Does this Decision Package include funding for any IT-related costs, including hardware, software, services (including cloud-based services), contracts or IT staff?

No 

2017-19 Biennium Budget Decision Package

Agency: **101 Caseload Forecast Council**
Decision Package Code/Title: **BB SQL Server Storage and SQL Training**
Budget Period: **2017-19**
Budget Level: **PL - Performance Level**

Agency Recommendation Summary Text:

The Caseload Forecast Council (CFC) is requesting \$10,000 for the 2017-19 Biennium to fund storage of the CFC's caseload data on a Microsoft Structured Query Language (SQL) server hosted at WaTech's State Data Center (SDC) and SQL training for CFC staff. Of this amount, \$6,600 is for the ongoing cost of data storage and \$3,600 is for one-time staff training in SQL. Storing the data on a SQL server at the SDC ensures CFC compliance with RCW 43.105.375 to locate all existing and new servers within the SDC.

Fiscal Summary:

Operating Expenditures	FY 2018	FY 2019	FY 2020	FY 2021
Fund 001-1	5,100	5,100	3,300	3,300
Total Cost	5,100	5,100	3,300	3,300
Object of Expenditure	FY 2018	FY 2019	FY 2020	FY 2021
Obj. E	5,100	5,100	3,300	3,300

Package Description

This request would fund storage on a SQL server hosted by WaTech and staff training in SQL. Structured Query Language (SQL) is the programming language for managing data in relational databases, and a SQL server is a database management system. Storing the data on a SQL server at the SDC ensures CFC compliance with RCW 43.105.375 to locate all existing and new servers within the SDC.

The CFC's methods for storing forecast data are fragmented. Each forecaster has his or her own method for storing the data necessary for the caseload forecast process, which results in challenges when reviewing, reporting, and tracking data at the agency level.

With a SQL server, the CFC can centralize all forecast-related data in databases. This will make it more reliable and flexible for forecasters to access the data. Additionally, storing the data in a SQL server will allow CFC staff to build data integrity rules and constraints, thereby improving data quality. Staff will have a consistent tool to access historical forecast-related data, and centralized data storage will allow for a more seamless transition among staff during workload changes or staff turnover. The SQL server environment will also facilitate staff reporting and research efforts. Finally, a SQL server will enable storage of individual-level data that can improve both the forecasting techniques and the ability to explain forecast variances.

Base Budget: If the proposal is an expansion or alteration of a current program or service, provide information on the resources now devoted to the program or service.

This is not an expansion of a current program or service. There is no current funding in the CFC's base budget for a Microsoft SQL server or SQL server training.

Decision Package expenditure, FTE and revenue assumptions, calculations and details:

Item 1: SQL Storage at WaTech SDC: WaTech estimates the ongoing cost of the SQL server storage (including CPU, RAM, and 335 GB of storage) at the SDC to be \$3,300 per year. Please see Attachment *Cost Estimate SQL Server Storage for Caseload Forecasting-WaTech.pdf* for item level detail.

Item 2: SQL Server Training: The CFC estimates a one-time cost for SQL training from the Department of Enterprise Services (DES) at \$1,800 per year for the 2017-19 Biennium only (3 classes per year at \$600 each).

Decision Package Justification and Impacts

What specific performance outcomes does the agency expect?

This funding will allow the CFC to:

1. Store individual-level data to improve forecast techniques such as via "Big Data Analytics" (the process of examining large data sets to uncover hidden patterns, unknown correlations, economic and demographic trends, and other useful information),
2. Improve data quality,
3. Preserve historical caseload data in a more accessible environment,
4. Expand reporting and research capabilities, and
5. Increase reliability and flexibility for forecasters to manage and access data.

Performance Measure detail:

No performance measures submitted for this package.

Fully describe and quantify expected impacts on state residents and specific populations served.

This package does not have a direct impact on state residents or specific populations served.

What are other important connections or impacts related to this proposal? Please complete the following table and provide detailed explanations or information below:

Impact(s) To:		Identify / Explanation
Regional/County impacts?	No	Identify:
Other local gov't impacts?	No	Identify:
Tribal gov't impacts?	No	Identify:
Other state agency impacts?	No	Identify:
Responds to specific task force, report, mandate or exec order?	No	Identify:
Does request contain a compensation change?	No	Identify:
Does request require a change to a collective bargaining agreement?	No	Identify:
Facility/workplace needs or impacts?	No	Identify:
Capital Budget Impacts?	No	Identify:
Is change required to existing statutes, rules or contracts?	No	Identify:
Is the request related to or a result of litigation?	No	Identify lawsuit (please consult with Attorney General's Office):
Is the request related to Puget Sound recovery?	No	If yes, see budget instructions Section 14.4 for additional instructions
Identify other important connections		

Please provide a detailed discussion of connections/impacts identified above.

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

The CFC does not have sufficient resources to purchase SQL server storage and SQL training without additional appropriations.

What are the consequences of not funding this request?

The CFC data storage will continue to be fragmented. Improvements in data quality, usage of individual-level data, and introduction of new forecasting techniques may be impeded. Lack of centralized data storage will continue to complicate the transition of new forecasters in cases of staff turnover or forecast assignment changes. Data storage in SQL servers is a best practice already utilized by many agencies. Without additional funding, the CFC may need to develop workarounds to use data provided by other agencies for forecasting.

How has or can the agency address the issue or need in its current appropriation level?

The CFC does not have funding in its current budget to support SQL server storage and SQL training.

Other supporting materials: See Attachment *Cost Estimate SQL Server Storage for Caseload Forecasting-WaTech.xlsx* for item level detail for SQL storage.

Information technology: Does this Decision Package include funding for any IT-related costs, including hardware, software, services (including cloud-based services), contracts or IT staff?

- No 
- Yes Continue to IT Addendum below and follow the directions on the bottom of the addendum to meet requirements for OCIO review.)

2017-19 IT Addendum

Part 1: Itemized IT Costs

Please itemize any IT-related costs, including hardware, software, services (including cloud-based services), contracts (including professional services, quality assurance, and independent verification and validation), or IT staff. Be as specific as you can. (See chapter 12.1 of the operating budget instructions for guidance on what counts as “IT-related costs”)

Information Technology Items in this DP <i>(insert rows as required)</i>	FY 2018	FY 2019	FY 2020	FY 2021
Item 1: SQL Storage at WaTech SDC	3,300	3,300	3,300	3,300
Item 2: SQL Server Training from DES	1,800	1,800		
Total Cost	5,100	5,100	3,300	3,300

Part 2: Identifying IT Projects

If the investment proposed in the decision package is the development or acquisition of an IT project/system, or is an enhancement to or modification of an existing IT project/system, it will also be reviewed and ranked by the OCIO as required by RCW 43.88.092. The answers to the three questions below will help OFM and the OCIO determine whether this decision package is, or enhances/modifies, an IT project:

1. Does this decision package fund the development or acquisition of a new or enhanced software or hardware system or service? Yes No
2. Does this decision package fund the acquisition or enhancements of any agency data centers? (See [OCIO Policy 184](#) for definition.) Yes No
3. Does this decision package fund the continuation of a project that is, or will be, under OCIO oversight? (See [OCIO Policy 121.](#)) Yes No

If you answered “yes” to any of these questions, you must complete a concept review with the OCIO before submitting your budget request. Refer to chapter 12.2 of the operating budget instructions for more information.