



Thomas A. Schweich

Missouri State Auditor

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

Division of Workforce Development



April 2011

Report No. 2011-16

<http://auditor.mo.gov>



Thomas A. Schweich
Missouri State Auditor

CITIZENS SUMMARY

Findings in the audit of the Department of Economic Development, Division of Workforce Development

Contract Monitoring

The Division of Workforce Development (DWD) did not adequately monitor the status of a software development contract and paid \$3.8 million to a vendor for two computer systems it could not use. The DWD salvaged the project by paying another vendor \$570,000 to complete the project and implement the systems. If the DWD had paid the first vendor only as the agreed upon milestones were met, the DWD should have realized early on that the project was not being completed as stipulated in the contract.

Since this contract was procured, the state's process has changed and information technology contracts are monitored by the Office of Administration Information Technology Services Division and are paid only upon completion of defined milestones.

Payment of Operating Costs of the Governor's Office

The DWD paid over \$1,630 in travel costs for the Governor and a Department of Labor and Industrial Relations official for air travel to promote an information technology training program to be administered by the DWD. It does not seem appropriate for the DWD to pay for flights that include no DWD employees. Shifting costs among departments circumvents the appropriations process and distorts the actual costs of operating the DWD, the Department of Labor and Industrial Relations, and the Governor's office.

In the areas audited, the overall performance of this entity was **Good**.*

*The rating(s) cover only audited areas and do not reflect an opinion on the overall operation of the entity. Within that context, the rating scale indicates the following:

- Excellent:** The audit results indicate this entity is very well managed. The report contains no findings. In addition, if applicable, prior recommendations have been implemented.
- Good:** The audit results indicate this entity is well managed. The report contains few findings, and the entity has indicated most or all recommendations have already been, or will be, implemented. In addition, if applicable, many of the prior recommendations have been implemented.
- Fair:** The audit results indicate this entity needs to improve operations in several areas. The report contains several findings, or one or more findings that require management's immediate attention, and/or the entity has indicated several recommendations will not be implemented. In addition, if applicable, several prior recommendations have not been implemented.
- Poor:** The audit results indicate this entity needs to significantly improve operations. The report contains numerous findings that require management's immediate attention, and/or the entity has indicated most recommendations will not be implemented. In addition, if applicable, most prior recommendations have not been implemented.

All reports are available on our website: <http://auditor.mo.gov>

American Recovery and
Reinvestment Act of 2009
(Federal Stimulus)

The DWD was awarded approximately \$98.8 million in federal stimulus funds (\$32,706,284 in 2009 and \$66,265,250 in 2010) and spent approximately \$3.9 million in FY2009 and \$52.8 million in FY2010. Appropriations to the DWD from the Federal Stimulus-DED Fund were expended on: personal service (\$3,483,625 in 2010); expense and equipment (\$22,056 in 2009 and \$2,093,447 in 2010); job training (3,890,786 in 2009 and \$46,057,513 in 2010); dislocated workers assistance (\$818,425 in 2010); emerging industry grants (\$74,124 in 2010); and temporary assistance for needy families summer youth program (\$295,000 in 2010).

While most of the DWD federal stimulus funds went to fund existing programs and fill budget gaps, according to the DWD, federal stimulus funding helped create or retain an average of 813.5 full-time equivalent jobs in FY2010. These positions were related primarily to temporary jobs in the Workforce Investment Act Summer Youth program intended to provide work experience for youth to prepare them for the workforce.

Division of Workforce Development

Table of Contents

State Auditor's Report	2
------------------------	---

Management Advisory Report - State Auditor's Findings	1. Contract Monitoring4 2. Payment of Operating Costs of the Governor's Office5
---	--

Organization and Statistical Information	6
---	---

Appendixes

	Combined Statements of Receipts, Disbursements, and Changes in Cash and Investments, Year Ended -	
A-1	June 30, 2010	9
A-2	June 30, 2009	10
B	Comparative Statement of Appropriations and Expenditures, 2 Years Ended June 30, 2010.....	11
C	Comparative Statement of Expenditures (From Appropriations) 5 Years Ended June 30, 2010.....	12



THOMAS A. SCHWEICH

Missouri State Auditor

Honorable Jeremiah W. (Jay) Nixon, Governor
and
David Kerr, Director
Department of Economic Development
and
Julie Gibson, Director
Division of Workforce Development
Jefferson City, Missouri

We have audited certain operations of the Department of Economic Development, Division of Workforce Development, in fulfillment of our duties under Chapter 29, RSMo. The scope of our audit included, but was not necessarily limited to, the 2 years ended June 30, 2010. The objectives of our audit were to:

1. Evaluate the division's internal controls over significant management and financial functions.
2. Evaluate the division's compliance with certain legal provisions.
3. Evaluate the economy and efficiency of certain management practices and operations, including certain financial transactions.

Our methodology included reviewing written policies and procedures, financial records, and other pertinent documents; interviewing various personnel of the division, as well as certain external parties; and testing selected transactions. We obtained an understanding of internal controls that are significant within the context of the audit objectives and assessed whether such controls have been properly designed and placed in operation. We tested certain of those controls to obtain evidence regarding the effectiveness of their design and operation. We also obtained an understanding of legal provisions that are significant within the context of the audit objectives, and we assessed the risk that illegal acts, including fraud, and violations of contract, grant agreement, or other legal provisions could occur. Based on that risk assessment, we designed and performed procedures to provide reasonable assurance of detecting instances of noncompliance significant to those provisions.

We conducted our audit in accordance with the standards applicable to performance audits contained in *Government Auditing Standards*, issued by the Comptroller General of the United States. Those standards require that we plan and perform our audit to obtain sufficient, appropriate evidence to provide a reasonable basis for our findings and conclusions based on our audit objectives. We believe that the evidence obtained provides such a basis.

The accompanying Organization and Statistical Information is presented for informational purposes. This information was obtained from the division's management and was not subjected to the procedures applied in our audit of the division.

For the areas audited, we identified (1) no significant deficiencies in internal controls, (2) no significant noncompliance with legal provisions, and (3) the need for improvement in management practices and procedures. The accompanying Management Advisory Report presents our findings arising from our audit of the Department of Economic Development, Division of Workforce Development.

A handwritten signature in black ink, reading "Thomas A. Schweich". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name "Thomas" and last name "Schweich" clearly legible, and "A." as a middle initial.

Thomas A. Schweich
State Auditor

The following auditors participated in the preparation of this report:

Director of Audits:	John Luetkemeyer, CPA
Audit Manager:	Robert Showers, CPA
In-Charge Auditor:	Denise Huddleston, MBA
Audit Staff:	Robert Graham

Division of Workforce Development

Management Advisory Report

State Auditor's Findings

1. Contract Monitoring

The Division of Workforce Development (DWD) did not sufficiently monitor the status of a software development contract and did not determine the usability of project deliverables¹ before paying the vendor. The DWD paid a total of \$3.8 million to the vendor to develop the Toolbox and Great Hires systems to track program participants and match participants with appropriate employers. The contract was entered into in August 2005 with a scheduled completion date of June 2006. However, DWD officials attempted to withhold the final \$1.75 million payment when they determined neither system was usable. After negotiating with the vendor and consulting with the U.S. Department of Labor, the final payment was made in June 2010. The DWD paid an additional \$570,000 to another software company to complete the project and implement the systems. This contract was entered into in April 2007 and completed in 2008.

The Office of Administration (OA), Division of Purchasing and Materials Management, was responsible for the procurement of the systems. Although project deliverables were clearly defined in the contract, the DWD agreed to pay the vendor on a monthly basis rather than based on the completion and acceptance of project deliverables. In addition, the DWD did not monitor the status of the project before making monthly payments to ensure the division was receiving functional deliverables as defined in the contract.

Paying vendors based on the status of deliverables and achievement of milestones helps ensure the project is being completed as expected, and helps to avoid unnecessary costs and ineffective products. The state's process for information technology contracts, such as the one in question, have changed since this contract was procured. Current practices dictate projects be monitored by the OA Information Technology Services Division and paid only as milestones are achieved.

Recommendation

In any future contracts, the DWD should make payments to contractors based on the status of project deliverables to ensure the product received meets contract specifications.

Auditee's Response

The DWD paid the vendor in accordance with the terms of the contract; however, DWD accepts the recommendation and future contracts will be based on the status of contract deliverables.

¹ A product or service that is prepared for and delivered to the government under the terms of a contract; National Institute of Standards and Technology, Special Publication 800-64 p.63/71



Division of Workforce Development
Management Advisory Report - State Auditor's Finding

2. Payment of Operating Costs of the Governor's Office

In fiscal year 2010, the DWD paid more than \$1,630 related to travel costs of the Governor's office and another state agency, thus circumventing the appropriation process established by the General Assembly. The trip billed to the DWD was for the Governor and a Department of Labor and Industrial Relations (DLIR) official to promote an information technology training program to be administered by the DWD. Documentation of the flight shows no DWD personnel were on the flight.

It does not appear appropriate for the DWD to bear the cost of flights that include no DWD employees. This practice distorts the actual costs of operating the DWD, the DLIR, and the Governor's office.

Recommendation

The DWD work with the Governor's office to discontinue the practice of using DWD appropriations to pay operating costs of the Governor's office and the DLIR.

Auditee's Response

The Office of Administration, Division of Budget and Planning determines the allocation of expenses incurred by the Governor's office for providing services to state departments. The Division of Budget and Planning informed the Department of Economic Development of its share of those expenses. Travel expenses benefitting state departments and their constituents are allocated to the departments. The Department of Economic Development believes the costs are an appropriate expense.

Division of Workforce Development

Organization and Statistical Information

The Division of Workforce Development (DWD) is a division of the Department of Economic Development (DED). The DWD is responsible for providing services to businesses and individuals to increase workforce skills necessary for various industries. The DWD has seven sections; Business and Industry, Workforce Services, Planning and Performance Management, Workforce Development Board, Equal Employment Officer, Policy Communications, and Financial Management.

Julie Gibson has served as the Director of the DWD since March 2009. Mark Bauer served as interim Director from February 2009 to March 2009. Dawn Busick was Director during the remainder of the 2 years ended June 30, 2010. At June 30, 2010, the DWD had 432 employees.

DWD services are provided through 43 career centers, 14 local workforce investment boards (WIB), and 12 community college districts. The DWD has contracts with the WIB's to provide guidance to the career centers. The career centers administer several federal programs including the Workforce Investment Act and the Wagner-Peyser programs.

The DWD administers three state-funded programs aimed at job creation and retention. These three programs are; Missouri Customized Training Program, Community College New Jobs Training Program (NJTP), and Community College Job Retention Training Program (JRTP). The Missouri Customized Training Program is funded through the Missouri Job Development Fund (MJDF).

Missouri Customized Training Program

The MJDF is established and defined by sections 620.470 through 620.481, RSMo. The MJDF provides assistance to eligible businesses to train workers with a focus on job creation and retention. The DWD receives appropriations from the General Revenue Fund to fund this program. Businesses submit training program applications that are evaluated for potential program awards. Appropriations totaled \$13.9 million for fiscal year 2010. This funding assistance can help lower the cost of locating a new facility or keeping a facility in Missouri. Funding assistance is available for a variety of training costs, including instructional salaries, curriculum development, and training materials.

The MJDF is operated by Local Educational Agencies (LEAs). LEAs are primarily community colleges, area career schools, and some 4-year universities that provide training and locally administer funding assistance. Companies can choose from a variety of training options to best meet their needs. Many of Missouri's LEAs have developed specialized resources for providing instruction, curriculum development, or training materials to businesses. In other instances, the individual company or a private vendor may be the best match for meeting training goals.



Division of Workforce Development
Organization and Statistical Information

To be eligible for training funding, businesses must be located in Missouri and employ Missouri residents as full-time employees. Businesses should be either creating new jobs or retraining employees after making a significant capital investment. The DWD has established certain criteria to help with determining how MJDF resources should be distributed. Factors such as new job creation, substantial capital investment, high wages (at or above the county average), and a written commitment to support a program are considered. If any jobs for which training assistance has been received are moved out of Missouri or eliminated within 5 years of the date the project is approved, a company may be responsible for repayment of all training assistance received through the program.

Community College New Jobs Training Program

The NJTP is authorized by Sections 178.892 through 178.896, RSMo. The NJTP provides assistance in reducing the cost associated with training to expand a workforce. Under the NJTP, revenue from the diverted withholding taxes from employees in the newly created jobs is used to pay training expenses. The amount of withholding taxes diverted totaled \$3.2 million for fiscal year 2010. The NJTP is considered a tax credit program, and was separately audited in 2003.²

The NJTP is operated by community colleges and monitored by the DWD. Provided training can include skill assessments, instruction costs, curriculum development, pre-employment training and on-the-job training (not to exceed 50 percent of project training costs). Training may be provided by the company, an LEA, or a training vendor.

Recipients can involve a company that is locating a new facility or expanding existing workforce in Missouri. Companies must be in the industries of manufacturing, processing, or assembling of products, or research and development, or provide services of interstate commerce to be eligible. They must be located in Missouri and have a sound credit rating. Generally, companies selected to receive funding should be creating at least 100 jobs at or above the county average wage rate.

Community College Job Retention Training Program

The JRTP is authorized by Sections 178.760 through 178.764, RSMo. The JRTP provides assistance in reducing the cost associated with retraining an existing workforce for the purpose of retaining jobs in Missouri. Under the JRTP, revenue from the diverted withholding taxes from employees in retained jobs is used to pay training expenses. The amount of withholding taxes diverted totaled \$8.1 million for fiscal year 2010.

The JRTP is operated by community colleges and monitored by the DWD. Provided training can include skill assessments, instruction costs,

² *New Jobs Training Program Tax Credit*, April 2003 (Report No. 2003-32).



Division of Workforce Development
Organization and Statistical Information

curriculum development, and on-the-job training (not to exceed 50 percent of project training costs). Training may be provided by the company, an LEA or a training vendor.

To be eligible for the JRTP, companies must (1) be in the industries of manufacturing, processing, or assembling of products, research and development, or provide services of interstate commerce; (2) be located in Missouri and have a sound credit rating; (3) generally be creating at least 100 jobs at or above the county average wage rate, and (4) meet one of the following criteria: have made a capital investment of at least \$1 million, be located in a border county of the state and represent a potential risk of relocation from the state, or be determined by the DWD to represent a substantial risk of relocation from the state.

American Recovery and
Reinvestment Act of 2009
(Federal Stimulus)

The DWD was awarded approximately \$98.8 million in American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 monies, and has spent approximately \$3.9 million and \$52.8 million of those funds during the years ended June 30, 2009 and 2010, respectively. These monies were appropriated to the DWD from the Federal Stimulus - DED Fund (see Appendix B). The funds were used primarily for job training purposes as part of the Workforce Investment Act grant from the United States Department of Labor, although portions were used for general administration of the DWD. According to DWD documents, ARRA funding helped to create or retain an average of 813.5 full-time equivalent jobs during fiscal year 2010.³ The majority of the jobs reported were associated with the summer youth program, which is intended to provide employment-related services and high quality work experience for youth to prepare them for the workforce. Accordingly, these jobs were designed to be temporary.

³ Job data was not available for fiscal year 2009 activity.

Appendix A-1

Department of Economic Development
Division of Workforce Development
Combined Statements of Receipts, Disbursements, and Changes in Cash and Investments
Year Ended June 30, 2010

		Job Development and Training Fund	Missouri Community College New Job Training Fund	Missouri Job Development Fund	Missouri Community College Job Retention Training Fund	DED-Federal Stimulus Fund	Total (Memorandum Only)
RECEIPTS							
Federal grant	\$	116,644,548	0	0	0	0	116,644,548
Donated assets - state agency		19,087	0	0	0	0	19,087
American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA)		0	0	0	0	54,633,328	54,633,328
Vendor refunds		106,003	0	0	0	0	106,003
Individual income tax		0	3,228,611	0	8,145,996	0	11,374,607
Cost reimbursements		4,363,672	0	109,836	0	0	4,473,508
Rebates		48	0	3	0	0	51
Overpayments		11,891	0	9,259	0	0	21,150
Interagency receipts		3,142,502	0	2,853,304	0	0	5,995,806
Transfers in		0	0	9,643,027	0	0	9,643,027
Total receipts		124,287,751	3,228,611	12,615,429	8,145,996	54,633,328	202,911,115
DISBURSEMENTS							
Personal service		13,011,481	0	315,946	0	3,483,625	16,811,052
Expense and equipment		4,627,877	0	21,403	0	1,745,163	6,394,443
Debt service		88,530	0	0	0	0	88,530
Building lease payments		793,984	0	120	0	0	794,104
Miscellaneous expenses		38,428	0	826	0	4,191	43,445
Program distributions		95,925,549	3,228,601	12,976,173	8,145,996	47,589,156	167,865,475
Interagency disbursements		3,801,522	0	0	0	0	3,801,522
Appropriated transfers out		7,552,230	0	211,596	0	0	7,763,826
Total disbursements		125,839,601	3,228,601	13,526,064	8,145,996	52,822,135	203,562,397
RECEIPTS OVER (UNDER) DISBURSEMENTS		(1,551,850)	10	(910,635)	0	1,811,193	(651,282)
CASH AND INVESTMENTS, JULY 1		1,875,682	0	2,533,271	0	8,072	4,417,025
CASH AND INVESTMENTS, JUNE 30	\$	323,832	10	1,622,636	0	1,819,265	3,765,743

Appendix A-2

Department of Economic Development
Division of Workforce Development
Combined Statements of Receipts, Disbursements, and Changes in Cash and Investments
Year Ended June 30, 2009

	Job Development and Training Fund	Missouri Community College New Job Training Fund	Missouri Job Development Fund	Missouri Community College Job Retention Training Fund	DED-Federal Stimulus Fund	Total (Memorandum Only)
RECEIPTS						
Federal grant	\$ 119,401,138	0	0	0	0	119,401,138
American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA)	0	0	0	0	3,920,914	3,920,914
Vendor refunds	389,563	0	54,583	0	0	444,146
Other refunds	53	0	0	0	0	53
Individual income tax	0	4,175,591	0	9,992,850	0	14,168,441
Cost reimbursements	1,094,057	0	135,197	0	0	1,229,254
Canceled checks	40	0	0	0	0	40
Capital credit/dividends	107	0	0	0	0	107
Overpayments	7,921	0	0	0	0	7,921
Interagency receipts	840,251	0	0	0	0	840,251
Transfers in	1,806,768	0	10,215,914	0	0	12,022,682
Total receipts	123,539,898	4,175,591	10,405,694	9,992,850	3,920,914	152,034,947
DISBURSEMENTS						
Personal service	15,257,240	0	320,918	0	0	15,578,158
Expense and equipment	2,740,948	0	63,727	0	137,681	2,942,356
Debt service	89,089	0	0	0	0	89,089
Building lease payments	1,076,484	0	150	0	0	1,076,634
Miscellaneous expenses	27,194	0	87	0	0	27,281
Program distributions	92,500,810	4,175,591	9,594,174	9,992,850	3,775,161	120,038,586
Interagency disbursements	3,732,009	0	0	0	0	3,732,009
Appropriated transfers out	8,295,042	0	194,321	0	0	8,489,363
Total disbursements	123,718,816	4,175,591	10,173,377	9,992,850	3,912,842	151,973,476
RECEIPTS OVER (UNDER) DISBURSEMENTS	(178,918)	0	232,317	0	8,072	61,471
CASH AND INVESTMENTS, JULY 1	2,054,600	0	2,300,954	0	0	4,355,554
CASH AND INVESTMENTS, JUNE 30	\$ 1,875,682	0	2,533,271	0	8,072	4,417,025

Appendix B

Department of Economic Development
Division of Workforce Development
Comparative Statement of Appropriations and Expenditures (1)

Year Ended June 30,						
	2010			2009		
	Appropriation Authority	Expenditures	Lapsed Balances	Appropriation Authority	Expenditures	Lapsed Balances
General Revenue Fund						
Workforce autism	\$ 200,000	193,884	6,116	200,000	163,568	36,432
DED state owned	185,733	182,129	3,604	249,893	206,863	43,030
Upgrades device project	625,000	229,268	395,732 (3)	0	0	0
Job training	1,978,912	1,819,545	159,367	1,978,912	1,919,545	59,367
Total General Revenue Fund	2,989,645	2,424,826	564,819 (2)	2,428,805	2,289,976	138,829 (2)
Facilities Maintenance Reserve Fund						
Paving management	0	0	0	7,935	7,935	0
Total Facilities Maintenance Reserve Fund	0	0	0	7,935	7,935	0
Job Development and Training Fund						
Workforce development personal service	21,397,398	12,956,714	8,440,684	21,397,398	15,202,140	6,195,258
Job training	96,024,374	80,270,751	15,753,623	99,695,988	84,126,034	15,569,954
TAA and JTPA Programs	18,000,000	17,955,771	44,229	8,950,000	8,949,169	831
DED leasing	1,606,112	1,449,520	156,592	1,737,669	1,484,467	253,202
Workforce development expense and equipment	3,038,437	2,454,937	583,500	3,042,037	2,295,282	746,755
DED state owned	1,122,772	971,735	151,037	1,208,376	1,172,754	35,622
Women's council administration personal service	55,167	54,767	400	55,167	55,100	67
Women's council administration expense and equipment	16,502	13,434	3,068	16,502	16,502	0
Total Job Development & Training Fund	141,260,762	116,127,629	25,133,133	136,103,137	113,301,448	22,801,689
Child Support Enforcement Fund						
Job training	0	0	0	370,183	370,183	0
Workforce development personal service	0	0	0	197,290	197,290	0
Workforce development expense and equipment	0	0	0	18,955	18,955	0
Total Child Support Enforcement Fund	0	0	0	586,428	586,428	0
Missouri Community College New Job Training Fund						
Community college new jobs training	16,000,000	3,228,601	12,771,399	16,000,000	4,175,591	11,824,409
Total Mo Community College New Job Training Fund	16,000,000	3,228,601	12,771,399	16,000,000	4,175,591	11,824,409
Missouri Job Development Fund						
Missouri job development	13,494,139	12,976,173	517,966	10,640,835	9,594,174	1,046,661
Workforce development personal service	371,707	315,946	55,761	371,707	320,918	50,789
Workforce development expense and equipment	81,389	22,349	59,040	81,389	63,965	17,424
Total Missouri Job Development Fund	13,947,235	13,314,468	632,767 (2)	11,093,931	9,979,057	1,114,874
Missouri Community College Job Retention Training Program Fund						
Jobs retention training program	10,000,000	8,145,996	1,854,004	10,000,000	9,992,850	7,150
Total MO Community College Job Retention Training Program Fund	10,000,000	8,145,996	1,854,004	10,000,000	9,992,850	7,150
Special Employment Security Fund						
Buildings and land	0	0	0	216,000	15,434	200,566
DED leasing	216,000	216,000	0	200,566	200,566	0
Total Special Employment Security Fund	216,000	216,000	0	416,566	216,000	200,566 (2)
Hero At Home Fund						
Workforce development	315,000	450	314,550	350,000	11,296	338,704
Total Hero At Home Fund	315,000	450	314,550	350,000	11,296	338,704
Federal Stimulus-DED Fund						
Workforce development personal service	4,423,929	3,483,625	940,304	1,479,842	0	1,479,842
Workforce development expense and equipment	2,168,448	2,093,447	75,001	369,960	22,056	347,904
Job training	46,059,448	46,057,513	1,935	30,856,482	3,890,786	26,965,696
Dislocated workers assistance	818,425	818,425	0	0	0	0
Emerging industry grants	12,500,000	74,124	12,425,876	0	0	0
TANF summer youth program	295,000	295,000	0	0	0	0
Total Federal Stimulus-DED Fund	66,265,250	52,822,134	13,443,116	32,706,284	3,912,842	28,793,442
Total All Funds	\$ 250,993,892	196,280,104	54,713,788	209,693,086	144,473,423	65,219,663

(1) The amounts include Office of Administration appropriations which were expended on behalf of the Division of Workforce Development for real property rentals and leases.

(2) The lapsed balances include the following withholdings made at the Governor's request:

Year Ended June 30,		
	2010	2009
General Revenue Fund		
Workforce autism	\$ 6,000	36,432
Job training	159,367	59,367
DED state owned	3,604	0
Total General Revenue Fund	168,971	95,799
Missouri Job Development Fund		
Missouri job development	483,394	0
Total Missouri Job Development Fund	483,394	0
Special Employment Security Fund		
Buildings and land	0	200,566
Total Special Employment Security Fund	0	200,566
Total All Funds	\$ 652,365	296,365

(3) Biennial appropriations set up in the current fiscal year are re-appropriations to the next fiscal year. After the fiscal year-end processing has been completed, the unexpended appropriation balance for a biennial appropriation is established in the new fiscal year. Therefore, there is no lapsed balance for a biennial appropriation at the end of the first year.

Appendix C

Department of Economic Development
Division of Workforce Development
Comparative Statement of Expenditures (From Appropriations) (1)

		Year Ended June 30,				
		2010	2009	2008	2007	2006
Salaries and wages	\$	16,811,052	15,775,448	16,119,457	16,119,347	16,576,871
Travel, in-state		530,471	499,008	674,170	757,450	843,592
Travel, out-of-state		81,194	79,945	99,004	106,997	115,939
Fuel and utilities		190,707	156,665	180,623	188,409	295,902
Supplies		508,822	481,081	587,756	450,093	563,468
Professional development		155,361	224,711	283,134	446,556	292,827
Communication services and supplies		553,615	545,488	648,030	614,199	789,787
Services:						
Professional services		4,031,186	623,167	940,546	1,007,791	1,657,025
Janitorial		111,985	130,800	146,459	147,050	266,682
Maintenance and repair		346,180	346,117	226,268	271,444	459,224
Equipment:						
Computer		24,581	51,874	2,160	0	0
Motorized		23,125	14,208	970	15,170	39,376
Office		152,205	19,851	30,839	66,130	117,337
Other		179,561	25,657	74,646	36,684	94,837
Property and improvements		0	13,236	39,957	41,130	2,547
Debt service		88,530	89,089	56,849	57,014	19,611
Real property rentals and leases		2,548,442	2,832,288	3,345,119	3,188,695	1,656,329
Equipment rental and leases		20,289	14,107	20,261	17,897	35,768
Miscellaneous expenses		43,445	27,281	43,003	58,532	86,701
Rebillable expenses		0	20,223	53,910	0	0
Program distributions		169,879,353	122,503,179	108,468,646	100,552,549	95,463,181
Total Expenditures	\$	196,280,104	144,473,423	132,041,807	124,143,136	119,377,004

(1)The amounts include Office of Administration appropriations expended on behalf of the Division of Workforce Development (DWD) for real property rentals and leases.