

Ethics Commission (296)

Lead Administrator: Ashley Kemp, Executive Director

FY'17 Projected Division/Program Funding By Source						
	Appropriations	Federal	Revolving	Local	Other*	Total
Administration	\$739,754		\$169,645			\$909,399
ISD Data Processing			\$25,746			\$25,746
576 Fund Special App'n	\$298,620					\$298,620
Division Name						\$0
Division Name						\$0
Division Name						\$0
Total	\$1,038,374	\$0	\$195,391	\$0	\$0	\$1,233,765

*Source of "Other" and % of "Other" total for each.

According to OMES these funds lapsed Nov. 30. They will need re-appropriated to complete the project. Otherwise the revolving fund balance funding will increase

FY'16 Carryover and Refund by Funding Source						
	Appropriations	Federal	Revolving	Local	Other*	Total
FY'16 Carryover						\$0
FY'16 GR Refund**	\$20,016					\$20,016

*Source of "Other" and % of "Other" total for each.

**Indicate how the FY'16 General Revenue refund was budgeted
Supposed to be budgeted to salary

What Changes did the Agency Make between FY'16 and FY'17?

1.) Are there any services no longer provided because of budget cuts?

The Commission, in part, due to the time consuming nature of managing financial disclosure statements that encompassed elected officers, non-elected officers and certain state employees, revised the financial disclosure rules to apply to elected officers only.

2.) What services are provided at a higher cost to the user?

Continuing Education programs, registration and administration fees.

3.) What services are still provided but with a slower response rate?

n/a

4.) Did the agency provide any pay raises that were not legislatively/statutorily required? If so, please provide a detailed description in a separate document.

74 O.S. 840-2.17 is inapplicable to the Ethics Commission.

FY'18 Requested Division/Program Funding By Source						
	Appropriations	Federal	Revolving	Other	Total	% Change
Administration	\$754,754		\$141,645		\$896,399	-1.43%
ISD Data Processing			\$25,746		\$25,746	0.00%
FY '15 576 re-appropriation	\$194,380					
Political Subdivision Enforcement	\$100,000					
Division Name						
Division Name						
Total	\$1,049,134	\$0	\$167,391	\$0	\$922,145	-25.26%

*Source of "Other" and % of "Other" total for each.

**If FY 15's 576 funds are re-appropriated the Administration division will decrease by \$78,00

FY'18 Top Five Appropriation Funding Requests

	\$ Amount
Request 1: Maintain current services--with the lapse of the 576 funds (special appropriation) the costs of hosting and maintenance	\$832,754
Request 2: (re-appropriation) 576 funds to complete software implementation and maintenance	\$194,380
Request 3: (one time funds) Fund the Political Subdivision Enforcement Fund established by SB 1745 (2014)	\$100,000
Request 4: Description	
Request 5: Description	
Total Increase above FY-18 Request	1,127,134

How would the agency handle a 5% appropriation reduction in FY'18?

This would be extremely problematic with the lapse of the 576 funds unless the balance of the funds is re-appropriated.

The special appropriation in FY '15 was for the implementation, hosting and maintenance of the Commission's new software for up to 4 years.

Those funds were not re-appropriated in FY 17 and have lapsed as of Nov. 30. The project is not completed and maintenance is ongoing at approximately \$80,000 per

costs have been paid through the 576 fund but will now be paid through the revolving fund.

How would the agency handle a 7.5% appropriation reduction in FY'18?

The Commission does not have any non-mission critical agency expenditures. With the lapse of the 576 funds those funds must be born by the ISD/Data Processing f
An additional 7.5% cut would impede the ability of the agency to maintain its current services and reduce enforcement actions and auditing functions.

How would the agency handle a 10% appropriation reduction in FY'18?

The Commission does not have any non-mission critical agency expenditures. With the lapse of the 576 funds those funds must be born by the ISD Data Processing f
An additional 10 % cut would impede the ability of the agency to maintain its current services and reduce enforcement actions and auditing functions.

Is the agency seeking any fee increases for FY'18?

		\$ Amount
Increase 1	N/A	\$0
Increase 2	N/A	\$0
Increase 3	N/A	\$0

What are the agency's top 2-3 capital or technology (one-time) requests, if applicable?

- \$100,000 to fund the Political Subdivision Enforcement fun to allow the Commission to establish enforcement of the Ethics Rules at the county and municipal level
- Re-appropriation of the balance of the FY '15 576 funds. These funds were intended to be used for up to 5 years as part of the initial implementation and maintenance project. The project is not yet completed but the funds have lapsed. This not a "new" appropriation but enables the Commission to use the funds for purpose for which the appropriation was made.

Federal Government Impact

- 1.) How much federal money received by the agency is tied to a mandate by the Federal Government? n/a
- 2.) Are any of those funds inadequate to pay for the federal mandate? n/a
- 3.) What would the consequences be of ending all of the federal funded programs for your agency? n/a
- 4.) How will your agency be affected by federal budget cuts in the coming fiscal year? n/a
- 5.) Has the agency requested any additional federal earmarks or increases? n/a

Division and Program Descriptions

Administrative Services. This division carries out the administrative functions required of all agencies as well as the constitutional functions of the agency. It administers the rules governing lobbyists, campaign finance, conflicts of interest and financial disclosure. This includes promulgation, education, compliance review, and enforcement. The division functions as a repository for all registrations and reports filed by candidate committees, political action committees, party committees, special function committees, financial disclosure, and lobbyist and legislative liaisons.

Political Subdivision Enforcement Division created in 2014 for the enforcement of the Local Government Campaign Finance and Financial Disclosure act. The Commission is not required to enforce the Local Government Campaign Finance and Financial Disclosure Act unless the fund created for the Division has \$100,000 or more. This Division needs one time funding to begin the program after which time it should be self-funding.

FY'17 Budgeted FTE

	Supervisors	Classified	Unclassified	\$0 - \$35 K	\$35 K - \$70 K	\$70 K - \$\$\$
Administration	2	0	4		4	3
Total	2	0	4	0	4	3

FTE History

	2017 Budgeted	2016	2013	2010	2006
Administration	7	6	6		
Total	7	6	6	0	0

Performance Measure Review					
Measure I	FY'16	FY'15	FY'14	FY'13	FY'12

Revolving Funds (200 Series Funds)			
Revolving Fund I	FY'14-16 Avg. Revenues	FY'14-16 Avg. Expenditures	June '16 Balance
200 Oklahoma County Campaign, Ethics Rev Fund	\$80,222	\$10,174	\$412,347

***NOTE:** For FY 13-15 the agency did not need to utilize the Revolving Fund due to 100% agency turnover resulting in significant unexpected appropriated fund savings. This allowed expenditures normally paid from the revolving fund to be paid through appropriated funds. As of Nov. 30, 2016 the Revolving fund will be used to fund the hosting/maintenance fees of The Guardian System at approximately \$80,000/year. Additionally, due to the Commission's unique constitutional prohibition against carryover funding sufficient funds must be maintained in the revolving account for terminal leave, unexpected litigation and investigations.