

<u>Workforce Services</u>	<u>FY 2015</u>	<u>FY 2015 Appr.</u>	<u>Diff.</u>	<u>% Diff.</u>	<u>Agency Answers</u>
Administration	\$10,540,400	\$11,645,700	(\$1,105,300)	-9%	
Executive Director's Office	\$1,411,400	\$2,066,700	(\$655,300)	-32%	Personnel services expenses were less than appropriated due to organizational changes in the department.
Community Development Capital Budget	\$68,170,800	\$116,410,000	(\$48,239,200)	-41%	See explanation below.
Community Impact Board	\$68,170,800	\$116,410,000	(\$48,239,200)	-41%	See explanation below.
Other Charges/Pass Thru	\$68,170,800	\$116,410,000	(\$48,239,200)	-41%	The appropriation for the Community Impact Board reflects all available funding. However, only a portion of the funds paid out (those used for grants) are "expensed" while most of the funds paid out (those used for loans) are booked as receivables in the enterprise funds.
Housing and Community Development	\$44,163,900	\$70,738,500	(\$26,574,600)	-38%	See individual explanations below.
Community Development	\$6,447,000	\$7,371,500	(\$924,500)	-13%	
Personnel Services	\$1,142,800	\$1,779,900	(\$637,100)	-36%	Positions were budgeted for the entire year for the Rural Development group but not all hires were in place at July 1. Likewise, several positions were filled by interns that were hired at less than FTE hours, at a lower rate of pay, and without benefits.
HEAT	\$16,821,100	\$22,338,900	(\$5,517,800)	-25%	See explanation below.
Other Charges/Pass Thru	\$16,247,900	\$21,784,300	(\$5,536,400)	-25%	The warmer than anticipated winter resulted in fewer HEAT applications than expected when budgets were prepared.
Housing Development	\$687,500	\$21,105,400	(\$20,417,900)	-97%	See explanation below.
Other Charges/Pass Thru	\$0	\$20,487,400	(\$20,487,400)	-100%	We anticipated that a new federal program, the National Housing Trust Fund, would be operational in FY 15. It was not.
Navajo Revitalization Fund	\$2,608,300	\$1,044,900	\$1,563,400	150%	See explanation below.
Navajo Revitalization Fund	\$2,608,300	\$1,044,900	\$1,563,400	150%	See explanation below.
Other Charges/Pass Thru	\$2,608,300	\$1,000,000	\$1,608,300	161%	The Navajo Revitalization Fund (NRF) commits their funds in a timely manner, but has been slow to actually complete the projects (i.e., spend the funds and request payment) resulting in a backlog of available funds. In FY 15, staff began diligent efforts to encourage the NRF to do all of these things. Thus, expenditures were greater than anticipated when budgets were prepared.
Olene Walker Housing Loan Fund	\$13,774,200	\$5,420,200	\$8,354,000	154%	See explanation below.
Olene Walker Housing Loan Fund	\$13,774,200	\$5,420,200	\$8,354,000	154%	See explanation below.
Transfers	\$12,533,700	\$4,500,000	\$8,033,700	179%	This is a housekeeping change in how the DAS Division of Finance makes transfers.
Operations and Policy	\$401,728,500	\$716,226,400	(\$314,497,900)	-44%	See individual explanations below.
Information Technology	\$32,265,600	\$27,404,500	\$4,861,100	18%	See explanations below.
Current Expense	\$1,066,000	\$293,500	\$772,500	263%	Expenses were greater than anticipated at the time budgets were prepared due to the ININ (phone system) projects for ESD and UI.
DP Capital Outlay	\$7,145,700	\$5,846,000	\$1,299,700	22%	Capitalized expenses for systems development for the eREP ACA and UI modernization projects were greater than anticipated when budgets were prepared.
Child Care Assistance	\$42,063,300	\$53,543,900	(\$11,480,600)	-21%	See explanation below.
Other Charges/Pass Thru	\$42,063,300	\$53,543,900	(\$11,480,600)	-21%	The child care budget request for 2015 was split incorrectly, with too much requested for client services and not enough requested for non-client services (appropriation unit NJD). Additionally, client services expenses were lower than anticipated due to a drop in the number of child care providers, and delays in implementing an increase in subsidy rates.
Eligibility Services	\$56,493,700	\$53,323,400	\$3,170,300	6%	
DP Current Expense	\$409,000	\$1,720,000	(\$1,311,000)	-76%	Budget requests for certain IT costs were inadvertently made in both the Eligibility Services appropriation unit as well as the Information Technology appropriation unit.
Facilities and Pass-Through	(\$171,045,300)	\$9,687,600	(\$180,732,900)	-1866%	See explanations below.

FY 2015: Appropriated vs. Actual Expenditures - Department of Workforce Services

<u>Workforce Services</u>	<u>FY 2015</u>	<u>FY 2015 Appr.</u>	<u>Diff.</u>	<u>% Diff.</u>	<u>Agency Answers</u>
Current Expense	\$6,735,800	\$8,079,100	(\$1,343,300)	-17%	Budgeted request was calculated based on historical data and did not adequately account for savings achieved over the past several years by closing certain offices and renegotiating the terms of certain leases. FY2015 expenses were commensurate with FY2014 expenses.
Other Charges/Pass Thru	(\$179,800,700)	\$0	(\$179,800,700)	#DIV/0!	There is an error in FY2015. The "other charges" amount was zero.
Nutrition Assistance	\$314,313,700	\$410,000,000	(\$95,686,300)	-23%	See explanation below.
Other Charges/Pass Thru	\$314,313,700	\$410,000,000	(\$95,686,300)	-23%	Budget request was calculated using historical data, which projected significantly higher Food Stamp (SNAP) expenses at the time of the request due to much higher Food Stamp (SNAP) caseloads in the recent past.
Refugee Assistance	\$7,356,000	\$13,858,600	(\$6,502,600)	-47%	See explanation below.
Other Charges/Pass Thru	\$7,356,000	\$13,858,600	(\$6,502,600)	-47%	Appropriation amount was for the total refugee grant funds available, not for anticipated actual expenses.
Temporary Assistance for Needy Families	\$41,081,200	\$55,005,000	(\$13,923,800)	-25%	See explanation below.
Other Charges/Pass Thru	\$31,964,200	\$55,005,000	(\$23,040,800)	-42%	Budget request was for the total anticipated expenditures. Certain contracts took longer to execute than anticipated and benefits expenses were projected to be higher at the time of the request due to higher expenses in past years.
Trade Adjustment Act Assistance	\$586,600	\$2,000,000	(\$1,413,400)	-71%	See explanation below.
Other Charges/Pass Thru	\$586,600	\$2,000,000	(\$1,413,400)	-71%	Federal Funds in excess of \$2 million were available to expend on eligible Trade customers. Due to the number of actual eligible customers, expenses were less than anticipated when the budget request was completed.
Workforce Development	\$63,949,100	\$81,346,200	(\$17,397,100)	-21%	See explanations below.
Current Expense	\$19,756,300	\$26,151,500	(\$6,395,200)	-24%	Budget request was increased for FY15 based on projected Child Care and Development Fund (CCDF) spending, including \$2.6 million for development of the new child care payment to provider functionality. Expenses were less than anticipated when the budget request was completed and expenses for payment to provider development were charged to the Information Technology appropriation unit.
DP Current Expense	\$73,100	\$4,034,000	(\$3,960,900)	-98%	Budget requests for certain IT costs were inadvertently made in both the Eligibility Services appropriation unit as well as the Information Technology appropriation unit.
Permanent Community Impact Fund	\$70,084,700	\$121,171,800	(\$51,087,100)	-42%	See explanations below.
Permanent Community Impact Fund	\$70,084,700	\$121,171,800	(\$51,087,100)	-42%	See explanations below.
Other Charges/Pass Thru	\$548,400	\$35,799,900	(\$35,251,500)	-98%	The appropriation for the Community Impact Board reflects all available funding. However, only a portion of the funds paid out (those used for grants) are "expensed" while most of the funds paid out (those used for loans) are booked as receivables in the enterprise funds.
Transfers	\$69,493,500	\$85,330,700	(\$15,837,200)	-19%	The appropriation for the Community Impact Board reflects all available funding. However, only a portion of the funds paid out (those used for grants) are "expensed" while most of the funds paid out (those used for loans) are booked as receivables in the enterprise funds.
State Small Business Credit Initiative Program Fund	\$468,100	\$3,364,200	(\$2,896,100)	-86%	See explanation below.
State Small Business Credit Initiative	\$468,100	\$3,364,200	(\$2,896,100)	-86%	See explanation below.

<u>Workforce Services</u>	<u>FY 2015</u>	<u>FY 2015 Appr.</u>	<u>Diff.</u>	<u>% Diff.</u>	<u>Agency Answers</u>
Other Charges/Pass Thru	\$455,000	\$3,094,200	(\$2,639,200)	-85%	Federal State Small Business Credit Initiative funds are available to run a variety of programs designed to encourage small business growth and the appropriation reflects this. Which program or product is utilized will not be known until a project application is received. While funds are available for direct lending, the program has seen an increase in the loan-guarantee program. Thus, while we are still participating in small business financing, we do not always pay out funds for loans or grants. Any direct lending gets booked as a receivable and any funds used for loan guarantees are tracked internally in our loan-loss reserve.
Unemployment Compensation Fund	\$177,105,300	\$452,975,000	(\$275,869,700)	-61%	See explanation below.
Unemployment Compensation Fu	\$177,105,300	\$452,975,000	(\$275,869,700)	-61%	FY 2015 total expense was less than the FY 2015 appropriation because of continued favorable unemployment rates in Utah.
Current Expense	\$0	\$0	\$0	#DIV/0!	
Other Charges/Pass Thru	\$176,630,600	\$452,975,000	(\$276,344,400)	-61%	Other Charges/Pass Thru expense amount represents dollars paid to unemployment claimants. Due to a continued low unemployment rate in Utah, claimant expenses were less than the appropriated amount.
Unemployment Insurance	\$19,902,800	\$25,507,900	(\$5,605,100)	-22%	Budget request was calculated based on historical data. Overall reduced spending during SFY 2015 caused the actual to appropriated negative variance.
Unemployment Insurance Admini	\$16,878,200	\$22,141,000	(\$5,262,800)	-24%	Budget request was calculated based on historical data. Overall reduced spending during SFY 2015 caused the actual to appropriated negative variance.
Current Expense	\$1,662,500	\$5,370,300	(\$3,707,800)	-69%	Budget request was calculated based on historical data. Overall reduced spending during SFY 2015 caused the actual to appropriated negative variance.
Grand Total	\$829,791,300	\$1,545,783,700	(\$715,992,400)	-46%	