

DI.01
State Board of Elections

Operating Budget Data

(\$ in Thousands)

	FY 00	FY 01	FY 02		% Change
	<u>Actual</u>	<u>Working</u>	<u>Allowance</u>	<u>Change</u>	<u>Prior Year</u>
General Fund	\$3,136	\$3,882	\$4,529	\$647	16.7%
Total Funds	\$3,136	\$3,882	\$4,529	\$647	16.7%

- \$115,000 deficiency appropriation request for fiscal 2001 to cover publication of general election ballot questions
- \$1,565,886 for maintenance support of central voter registration database, election management, and campaign finance reporting systems

Personnel Data

	FY 00	FY 01	FY 02	
	<u>Actual</u>	<u>Working</u>	<u>Allowance</u>	<u>Change</u>
Regular Positions	30.00	27.50	27.50	0.00
Contractual FTEs	<u>2.50</u>	<u>2.00</u>	<u>2.00</u>	<u>0.00</u>
Total Personnel	32.50	29.50	29.50	0.00

Vacancy Data: Regular

Budgeted Turnover: FY 02	2.00	7.27%
Positions Vacant as of 12/31/00	2.00	6.67%

- The number of positions in the fiscal 2000 actual (30.00) is incorrect. The personnel detail included the 2.50 contractual full-time equivalents in error.

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

For further information contact: James L. Stoops

Phone: (410) 946-5530

Analysis in Brief

Issues

Information Technology Applications Are Now Operational: The central voter registration database, election management and campaign finance systems are operational.

No "Chads" in Maryland's Election Future: The Governor, by executive order (Executive Order 01.01.2000.25), has appointed a Special Committee on Voting Systems and Election Procedures.

Recommended Actions

1. Concur with Governor's allowance.

Updates

Posting of Election Results: The election night reporting of the presidential election results on the State Election Board (SBE) Internet web site was successful.

Campaign Finance Reporting: All campaign finance reports required to be submitted to SBE are now available to the public from the SBE Internet web site in a searchable database: www.elections.state.md.us.

DI.01
State Board of Elections

Operating Budget Analysis

Program Description

The State Board of Elections (SBE) supervises elections in the State through the 24 local boards of supervisors of elections. The board strives to ensure compliance with Maryland and federal law, access to candidacy for all those seeking elective office, and the fullest possible exercise of the franchise.

Proposed Deficiency

A 2001 deficiency appropriation of \$115,000 is requested to cover the publication of questions on the 2000 general election ballot. Under the former election code, SBE was required to publish statewide ballot questions for two weeks prior to the election. Under the new election code, SBE is required to publish statewide ballot issues for three weeks and local referendum issues adopted by the General Assembly for four weeks. Senate Bill 509, requiring a referendum on the neighborhood renewal authority in Baltimore County, was one example of legislation requiring a local referendum. The fiscal 2001 appropriation anticipated publishing the advertisement for two weeks under the prior law.

Governor's Proposed Budget

The SBE allowance increases \$646,631, or 16.7%, in fiscal 2002 as depicted in **Exhibit 1**. Information technology (IT) is now a significant part of the SBE's budget. In fiscal 2001, the agency received \$958,102 for the final year for the Computer Science Corporation (CSC) contract for the development and implementation of the central voter registration database (CVRDB), local election management system (LEMS), and campaign finance system. In fiscal 2002, all three systems will be fully operational and accepted by SBE. The fiscal 2002 allowance includes \$1,565,886 for systems maintenance to maintain the three systems applications (see Issue **1. Information Technology Applications Are Now Operational**). In addition, the allowance includes \$531,632 for State Treasurer financing of hardware and software purchased for SBE and the local election boards. This is the same amount appropriated for State Treasurer financing in fiscal 2001. The only other significant item is the reduction in the fixed charge insurance assessment (\$36,260) from fiscal 2001. In fiscal 2001, SBE was assessed \$44,667 for insurance; the allowance is \$8,407 in fiscal 2002.

DI.01 - State Board of Elections

Exhibit 1

**Governor's Proposed Budget
State Board of Elections
(\$ in Thousands)**

How Much It Grows:	General <u>Fund</u>	<u>Total</u>
2001 Working Appropriation	\$3,882	\$3,882
2002 Governor's Allowance	<u>4,529</u>	<u>4,529</u>
Amount Change	\$647	\$647
Percent Change	16.7%	16.7%

Where It Goes:

Personnel Expenses

Fiscal 2002 general salary increase	\$23
Increments, fiscal 2001 increase phase-in and other	69
Employee and retiree health insurance rate change	10
Retirement contribution rate change	(10)
Workers compensation premium assessment	8
Turnover adjustments	(27)
Other fringe benefit adjustments	7
Total	\$80

Operating Expenses

Reduction in other contractual payroll expenses	(12)
Reduction in in-state and out-of-state travel	(11)
IT application development for voter registration database, election management, and campaign finance systems completed in fiscal 2001	(958)
IT systems maintenance for new systems in production	1,566
Increase in data processing supplies and other office supplies	31
Reduction in fixed charges for insurance	(36)
Other operating expenses	(13)
Total	\$647

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

DI.01 - State Board of Elections

Performance Analysis: Managing for Results

The goals/objectives of SBE are to use IT to maintain the central voter registration database, maintain campaign finance records, and report election results on election day. The performance data in **Exhibit 2** reports the progress of SBE and the local election boards in meeting the goals and objectives in fiscal 2001. SBE expects to complete implementation of all IT systems in fiscal 2002. By June 2001, following full implementation the new Motor Vehicle Administration (MVA) licensing system, SBE expects to electronically transfer all new voter registrations received from MVA to local boards. Another goal is to provide training for election officials and campaign treasurers. The training of campaign treasurers should significantly reduce errors in the electronic reporting of campaign finances. After fiscal 2002, SBE will need to develop new performance measures as most of the performance objectives in Exhibit 2 will be achieved.

DI.01 - State Board of Elections

Exhibit 2

**Program Measurement Data
State Board of Elections
Fiscal Years**

	<u>Actual 1998</u>	<u>Actual 1999</u>	<u>Est. 2000</u>	<u>Actual 2000</u>	<u>Est. 2001</u>	<u>Est. 2002</u>	<u>Ann. Chg. 98-00</u>	<u>Ann. Chg. 00-02</u>
Local election boards receiving duplicate voter registration records	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	12	24	n/a	n/a
Local election boards receiving electronic MVA registration data via SBE	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	6	12	n/a	n/a
Local election boards receiving Department of Health and Mental Hygiene death notices via SBE	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	24	24	n/a	n/a
Local boards receiving convicted felon reports via SBE	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	6	24	n/a	n/a
Local boards posting timely election results on SBE web site	n/a	n/a	n/a	22	23	24	n/a	4.4%
Election officials trained	n/a	150	n/a	285	275	275	n/a	n/a
Training for campaign treasurers	n/a	n/a	n/a	250	100	150	n/a	-22.5%
Corrections to campaign finance reports required	n/a	n/a	n/a	300	250	250	n/a	-8.7%

Source: State Board of Elections, Managing for Results submission

Issues

1. Information Technology Applications Are Now Operational

SBE began development of a statewide integrated voter registration system in fiscal 1999. The new voter registration system and LEMS were scheduled to be fully implemented in all subdivisions by December 1999. It was expected that the new CVRDB and LEMS would be in place for the March 2000 primary and November 2000 general elections. The CVRDB was loaded and functional at SBE for the March 2000 primary. However, Allegany and Washington counties, the pilot jurisdictions, were the only local boards to use the CVRDB and LEMS for the primary election.

Current Status

Four jurisdictions, with the addition of Garrett and Worcester counties, fully implemented the new systems for the general election in November. An additional six jurisdictions -- Caroline, Dorchester, Kent, Queen Anne's, Somerset, and Talbot counties -- currently parallel the new system with existing local systems. The remaining jurisdictions will fully implement the new voter registration and election management systems after the November 2000 general election. Most development work is expected to be complete by the end of fiscal 2001, except for the final integration of the MVA electronic interface to update voter records from the driver license MVA files now scheduled for fiscal 2002.

The current task order for systems programming and maintenance of the CVRDB, campaign finance application, and ballot preparation is \$1,960,104. SBE has identified \$1,627,842 in resources available in fiscal 2001: \$958,102 from the fiscal 2001 budget and \$669,740 from funds encumbered from fiscal 2000 for the CSC contract. This leaves a potential deficiency of \$348,418 maintenance programming support if all items identified in the task order are required. The fiscal 2002 budget provides \$1,565,586 for the systems maintenance contract. There should be fewer systems programming changes and enhancements required in fiscal 2002 unless there are changes enacted in the current legislative session.

Central Voter Registration Database

The CVRDB became operational in February 2000 and since then has been used to check for and remove duplicate registrations and voters ineligible due to criminal convictions. CVRDB maintains a mirror image of the local board files and will utilize local LAN and wide area networks (WAN) as the computer platform for the system. Previously, six local election jurisdictions had PC (Personal Computer) LAN-based registration systems, eight local offices were on county-based mainframe systems, and eight jurisdictions were on the ADC mainframe-based system. Funds were provided in the SBE 1998 through 2001 budgets for an SBE LAN and a WAN for local election boards. An SBE WAN is currently linked to the 24 local election offices. The LAN equipment is operational in 16 local election offices. Funds for the LANs in the remaining eight jurisdictions are included in the fiscal 2001 budget and the fiscal 2002 budget request as indicated in **Exhibit 3**. The allowance includes \$531,632 in fiscal 2002 for lease payments to the State Treasurer, the same as the fiscal 2001 appropriation. SBE has included in the

DI.01 - State Board of Elections

Exhibit 3

**State Board of Elections
Estimated State Treasurer Lease Payments**

Estimated Lease Payments to State Treasurer

<u>Submission</u>	<u>Equip. Leased</u>	<u>FY 2000</u>	<u>FY 2001</u>	<u>FY 2002</u>	<u>FY 2003</u>
July 1998	\$198,887	\$20,081	\$38,760	\$38,742	0
January 1999	--	38,768	38,751	38,732	0
July 1999		--	86,426	73,308	73,308
January 2000	--	--	73,308	73,308	73,308
July 2000		--	4,942	22,160	22,150
	--	--			
#4 July 2001	516,426	--	0	86,071	86,071
January	--	--			
Total original servers/PCs		\$58,849	\$350,422	\$440,548	\$363,053
Replacement equipment			143,000	143,000	143,000
Subtotal			\$493,422	\$583,548	\$506,053
Stage 2 replacement PCs			--		
Total Requirements			\$493,422		
Base Budget			\$531,632	\$531,632	\$531,632
Shortfall FY 2002			\$38,210	(\$77,416)	

Source: State Board of Elections

projection the replacement of existing equipment on a three-year cycle. SBE will need to adjust this schedule somewhat to stay within the allowance for fiscal 2002 and avoid the projected shortfall noted in Exhibit 3. This should not be a problem.

DI.01 - State Board of Elections

Except for Baltimore City, each local board is provided with a LAN server and 2 PCs. In fiscal 2001, a \$79,000 general fund deficiency covered expenses incurred by SBE to computerize the Baltimore City Board of Elections. SBE installed a LAN network with 12 PCs, a LAN server, and communication lines to connect the Baltimore City Board of Elections with SBE. The Baltimore City server and LAN were not financed through the State Treasurer's Office, so they are not included in Exhibit 3. Except for providing the 10 extra PCs, the policy followed in Baltimore City is consistent with the policy followed with respect to the other 23 jurisdictions where SBE is installing a LAN and furnishing 2 PCs in each jurisdiction.

Local Election Boards to Maintain and Validate Voter Registration

The major design change that has occurred is where and how the CVRDB will be maintained. The original concept of one statewide CVRDB, on one central SBE file server that local boards would access through the WAN network, is not cost effective because of high communication charges. Now, each of the 24 local election boards will maintain the local voter registration database on a local file server.

The local election boards will review and validate all additions, deletions, or changes to the local voter registration database. State and local election authorities will exchange files using the SBE WAN. The SBE WAN will accommodate files transmitted to and from SBE, local election boards using the SBE WAN, the MVA (driver licensing transactions) the Administrative Office of the Courts (felony convictions). However, as the working file for each subdivision will be decentralized, the volume of data flowing between SBE and local LANs will be considerably reduced. The transfer of data between SBE and local LANs will occur in batch mode overnight. The local election boards may generate election day supplies, precinct registers, and voter authority cards from LEMS.

The MVA will be the source of most voter registration transactions. The new \$31 million MVA driver licensing system, approved by the Board of Public Works on October 27, 1999, will interface with the CVRDB. The MVA interface will allow SBE to receive the data and digitized signature from the MVA driver license files on voter registrations that will be sent to local election boards for processing.

The electronic transfer of voter registration data requires SBE and local election boards to have verification procedures in place to ensure that MVA driver licensing transactions do not result in duplicate voter registrations. MVA change-of-address transaction will require SBE and local election boards to add the voter registration for the new address and to delete the voter registration for the old address.

Currently, until the electronic system is fully implemented, voters fill out a change-of address form at MVA. MVA sends the change-of-address notifications to the local election board for the previous place of residence. The local election board cancels the old registration and sends the voter a new voter application when the new residence is in another jurisdiction. During the last election period when the new application arrived in the mail, many voters threw them out thinking they had already registered with MVA. When these voters went to the new precinct in the general election, they discovered they were not on the voter list for the new precinct and were deleted from old precinct voter list. The motor voter problem first surfaced in the March 7 presidential primary in Maryland when about 30 people encountered

DI.01 - State Board of Elections

trouble. However, SBE did not change the motor voter procedures because local election officials objected to changing the process between the primary and general elections.

Initially, MVA change-of-transactions will not be included in the MVA electronic transfer to SBE. The integrity of the CVRDB is dependent on the ability to process change-of-address transactions. **DLS recommends that SBE discuss with MVA the methodology of including MVA change-of-address transactions in the MVA electronic notification to SBE.**

Another problem with CVRDB is removing voters who have moved out of State and are no longer Maryland residents. This is not just an election issue. The Jury Commissioner in many jurisdictions use a driver licensing file merged with the CVRDB to broaden the database for the selection of juries. **DLS recommends SBE discuss the procedures used by local boards and SBE to ensure that voters are not disenfranchised by motor voter procedures, and those who are not State residents are removed from the CVRDB. In addition, SBE should discuss the procedures used to ensure that voters in the CVRDB are not under the age of 18, particularly when the registration transaction does not originate from MVA where the age of the voter is verified.**

Platform for Total Election Management

The SBE WAN is required for an electronically linked system of total election management, not just for the statewide voter registration system. The network will allow for the exchange of information and results between the local election offices and SBE. The WAN network will ensure uniformity of election practices and maintain voter registration records, campaign fund reports, and other election related data accurately.

2. No "Chads" in Maryland's Election Future

SBE reports that Montgomery County was the only jurisdiction to use a punch card ballot. However, the system used in Montgomery County was "DATAVOTE." The system in Florida causing all the problems is "VOTOMATIC." These two systems are both punch card systems but are dramatically different. The principle difference is in the ballot. DATAVOTE has the names of the candidates and ballot questions printed on the cards. The DATAVOTE system has an apparatus in the voting booth that cuts out the hole when a candidate is selected. The VOTOMATIC system does not display the names of the candidates on the ballot and requires the voter to use a metal punch to push out a perforated chad. When the chad is not completely separated from the card, the problem of "hanging chads" develops. The "hanging chad" is unpredictable. In one count it can leave the hole open, counting as a vote, and on the next count cover the hole. Additionally, every time the cards are handled, there is the possibility of releasing another chad that leads to over votes and possible disqualification of the ballot. The Montgomery County DATAVOTE did not have a perforated chad.

Most Maryland counties currently use a "mark sense" ballot where the voter indicates a vote preference by filling in the space between the lines beside the candidate or ballot question. The ballot is read by an optical scanner at the polling place. Incorrectly marked ballots or overvotes are rejected by

DI.01 - State Board of Elections

the machine so that the voter can follow procedures to request a replacement ballot. This system, or a variation, is in use in 19 counties. Baltimore City uses an ATM-like (automated teller machine) terminal to record votes. The mechanical lever voting machine was used in Prince George's, Allegany, and Dorchester counties. Montgomery County has the punch card DATAVOTE system noted in the previous paragraph.

Special Committee on Voting Systems and Election Procedures in Maryland

The Governor by Executive Order (Executive Order 01.01.2000.25) has appointed a Special Committee on Voting Systems and Election Procedures in Maryland chaired by the Secretary of State with former Senators Jullian L. Lapides and F. Vernon Boozer as Vice-Chairmen. The 14-member committee also includes two senators, two delegates, a circuit court judge, the Anne Arundel County Executive, and four public members. The chairperson of the State Elections Board, and the president of the Maryland Association of State Election Officials are ex officio members of the committee.

The committee has held two public meetings and is required to report to the Governor on or before February 9, 2001. The executive order charge to the committee is to:

- evaluate the election systems and procedures utilized in Maryland;
- revised existing standards for recounts and contested elections to ensure conformance with the highest professional standards and best practices;
- recommend appropriate funding sources to provide Marylanders with accurate, convenient and reliable voting systems; and
- recommend statutory and regulatory changes to ensure full and fair elections in Maryland.

Supreme Court Findings on the Election Procedures in Florida

On December 12, 2000, the United State Supreme Court in *George W. Bush, et al v. Albert Gore Jr., et al* (page 9) found that each of the [Florida] "counties used varying standards to determine what was a legal vote." In *Bush v. Gore*, the United States Supreme Court (page10) found the Florida recount procedures "inconsistent with the minimum procedures necessary to protect the fundamental right of each voter in the special instance of a statewide recount under the authority of a single state judicial officer." The United States Supreme Court stated (page 11) that in order for a recount to be in compliance with the equal protection and due process clause of the United States Constitution "It would require not only the adoption (after opportunity for argument) of adequate statewide standards for determining what is a legal vote, practical procedures to implement them, but also orderly Judicial review of any disputed matters that might arise."

DI.01 - State Board of Elections

On December 4, 2000, the United States Supreme Court had remanded the initial Palm Beach County (George W. Bush v. Palm Beach County Canvassing Board, et al) dispute back to the Florida Supreme Court. In that case, the United States Supreme Court noted (page 12) that "Congress has provided that when 'any controversy or contest concerning the appointment of all or any electors' from a State arises, the dispute must be resolved exclusively by reference to 'laws enacted *prior to*' election day." 3U.S.C. §5 (emphasis added by the Supreme Court). The Supreme Court found (page 20) that the Florida Supreme Court had "essentially given the green light to a standardless exercise in which vote-counters in a few carefully selected counties will divine the 'intent of the electorate' without any legislative guidance or uniform standards."

From the two United States Supreme Court cases it is abundantly clear that in an election of a President of the United States:

- The State legislature determines the procedures for the conduct of the election.
- The election procedures and resolution of any disputes thereof must be decided by laws enacted prior to the date of the election.
- The election standards must be uniform and recount procedures may not vary from county to county.
- The recount procedures must be specific and provide for little administrative discretion or the rules, as applied from one jurisdiction to another, will not be uniform.
- There must be provision for orderly judicial review of any dispute that might arise.
- When a court orders a statewide remedy, "there must be at least some assurance that the rudimentary requirements of equal treatment and fundamental fairness are satisfied." (page 11, Bush v. Gore)

New Voting Machines and Election Procedures

The OPTEC contract for optical scanning of marked ballots used in most counties is up for renewal. Now is the perfect time for the State to adopt one technology and one set of standards to conduct a recount in a contested election. However, Baltimore City, at considerable expense, replaced mechanical lever machines with direct recording electronic ATM technology and should, therefore, be exempt from any requirement to replace the new machines.

It is important that the recount procedures match the voting machine technology. It is also important that, in light of the Supreme Court decisions, that the State legislature by law provide standards for a recount not just by administrative review of regulations. While the State has more leeway in election standards for a non-presidential election, it makes no sense to have two standards -- one for presidential elections and one for other election contests. It is also important that there be plenty of opportunity for public comment, which would not be the case if the election procedures are adopted during the current legislative session. **The agency should be prepared to comment on recent developments at the national level and their implications for Maryland's system of voting.**

Recommended Actions

1. Concur with Governor's allowance.

Updates

1. Posting of Election Results

The 2000 *Joint Chairmen's Report* requested that the SBE submit a report detailing its plan to post election results promptly and accurately on SBE's web site. The required plan was submitted. The election-night reporting of the Presidential election results on the SBE Internet web site was successful. SBE reports that the web site recorded 237,043 hits on November 6 and 382,510 on November 7, surpassing the 133,485 hits on October 12.

After the presidential primary election, the SBE gained full control of the design, maintenance, and updating of its web site. This improved the reporting and posting of election results. SBE reports that:

- Data integrity was maintained throughout the web posting process.
- A special elections results top level page was designed to provide direct access to the most frequently accessed figures.
- The results were posted immediately after receipt and proofing.
- The results were available in three universally accessible formats: html, printable html, and CSV (comma separated value, universal data sharing).
- The data was available with or without the candidate's address, by office in a combined report of all offices.
- The files were designed to be usable and to minimize download time.
- SBE had a contingency plan with personnel standing by on election day in the Department of Budget and Management telecommunications link to SBE offices to assist with any emergency telecommunications failure.

2. Campaign Finance Reports

Beginning in November 1999, all campaign finance reports submitted to the SBE are required to be submitted in an electronic format (except those reports specifically exempted by SBE from the electronic filing requirements because of *de minimis* fund-raising activity). SBE provides the necessary computer software and computer disks to any person required to file campaign reports. In addition to the electronic reports created by the SBE-supplied software, SBE will continue to accept electronic report export formats generated by several off-the-shelf systems used by campaign treasurers.

DI.01 - State Board of Elections

Since November 2000, the campaign finance reports may be transmitted to SBE electronically via the Internet. Campaign treasurers still are required to mail or hand deliver a signed Campaign Fund Report Transmittal Sheet. In the future, provision will be made to electronically accept a digitized signature or password protected identification.

SBE will make the campaign finance reports available to the public from a public access terminal located in the SBE Annapolis office or in local election board offices. These reports are partially available on-line from the SBE Internet web site www.election.state.md.us, and SBE will soon make the reports fully available through a searchable database on the web site. Currently, the database allows searches on contributions received by campaign committees. In the future, the database will allow searches on campaign committee expenditures, outstanding obligations incurred, and create summary information.

Current and Prior Year Budgets

Current and Prior Year Budgets State Board of Elections (\$ in Thousands)

	<u>General Fund</u>	<u>Special Fund</u>	<u>Federal Fund</u>	<u>Reimb. Fund</u>	<u>Total</u>
Fiscal 2000					
Legislative Appropriation	\$3,033	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$3,033
Deficiency Appropriation	79	0	0	0	79
Budget Amendments	24	0	0	0	24
Reversions and Cancellations	0	0	0	0	0
Actual Expenditures	\$3,136	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$3,136
Fiscal 2001					
Legislative Appropriation	\$3,866	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$3,866
Budget Amendments	16	0	0	0	16
Working Appropriation	\$3,882	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$3,882

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

Fiscal 2000

A deficiency appropriation of \$79,000 was provided for a LAN in the Baltimore City election board. An additional transfer of funds was required to close-out SBE expenditures in fiscal 2000.

**Object/Fund Difference Report
State Board of Elections**

Object/Fund	FY00	FY01	FY02	FY01 - FY02	Percent Change
	Actual	Working Appropriation	Allowance	Amount Change	
Positions					
01 Regular	30.00	27.50	27.50	0	0%
02 Contractual	2.50	2.00	2.00	0	0%
Total Positions	32.50	29.50	29.50	0	0%
Objects					
01 Salaries and Wages	\$ 1,082,114	\$ 1,298,321	\$ 1,377,995	\$ 79,674	6.1%
02 Technical & Spec Fees	145,966	120,877	109,247	(11,630)	(9.6%)
03 Communication	131,260	298,666	304,364	5,698	1.9%
04 Travel	22,467	24,000	13,500	(10,500)	(43.8%)
07 Motor Vehicles	1,271	3,850	1,828	(2,022)	(52.5%)
08 Contractual Services	1,372,897	1,278,361	1,886,046	607,685	47.5%
09 Supplies & Materials	71,831	14,100	45,400	31,300	222.0%
10 Equip - Replacement	72,098	531,632	531,632	0	0%
11 Equip - Additional	1,783	0	0	0	0.0%
12 Grants, Subsidies, Contr	(45,478)	0	0	0	0.0%
13 Fixed Charges	275,674	312,562	258,988	(53,574)	(17.1%)
14 Land & Structures	4,065	0	0	0	0.0%
Total Objects	\$ 3,135,948	\$ 3,882,369	\$ 4,529,000	\$ 646,631	16.7%
Funds					
01 General Fund	\$ 3,135,948	\$ 3,882,369	\$ 4,529,000	\$ 646,631	16.7%
Total Funds	\$ 3,135,948	\$ 3,882,369	\$ 4,529,000	\$ 646,631	16.7%

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