

**State Auditor**

Lead Administrator: Gary Jones, State Auditor and Inspector

Lead Financial Officer: Diane L. Thomas, CFO

FY'14 Budgeted FTE						
	Supervisors	Classified	Unclassified	\$0 - \$35 K	\$35 K - \$70 K	\$70 K - \$\$\$
Administration	3	0	9	2	4	3
Local Government Services	8	0	66	13	49	4
State Agency Services	3	0	41	2	35	6
Special Services	2		17	0	13	2
Performance Audits	1		24	0	22	2
<b>Total</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>157</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>123</b>	<b>17</b>

FTE History					
	2013 Budgeted	2012	2009	2008	2003
Administration	9.0	8.6	10.0	11.0	12.0
Local Government Services	58.0	53.5	52.0	56.0	80.0
State Agency Services	36.0	36.4	35.0	41.0	52.0
Special Services	16.0	13.6	18.0	19.0	20.0
Performance Audits	8.0	6.7	4.0	3.0	0.0
<b>Total</b>	<b>127</b>	<b>119</b>	<b>119</b>	<b>130</b>	<b>164</b>

FY'13 Projected Division/Program Funding By Source						
	Appropriations	Federal	Revolving	Local	Other*	Total
Administration	\$912,000		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$912,000
Local Government Services	\$1,599,000		\$2,999,000			\$4,598,000
State Agency Services	\$1,258,000		\$1,880,000			\$3,138,000
Special Services	\$513,000		\$790,000			\$1,303,000
Performance Audits	\$118,000		\$0			\$118,000
Ancillary Services	\$307,000		\$0			\$307,000
ISD Data Processing	\$0		\$0			\$0
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$4,707,000</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$5,669,000</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$10,376,000</b>

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

FY'12 Carryover by Funding Source						
	Appropriations	Federal	Revolving	Local	Other*	Total
FY'12 Carryover	\$53,000	\$0	\$621,000	\$0	\$0	\$674,000

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

**What Changes did the Agency Make between FY'12 and FY'13**

1.) Are there any services no longer provided because of budget cuts?  
 All of our services are required by Constitution or Statutes. Without proper funding for the resources we need, including hiring or retaining qualified employees, the required work is completed at a slower pace, resulting in less efficiency for our Agency and the taxpayers.

2.) What services are provided at a higher cost to the user?  
 Although SAI slightly increased auditing rates for specific personnel - most audits payments are capped by Statute.

3.) What services are still provided but with a slower response rate?  
 SAI's required audits were significantly back-logged when the State Auditor assumed office. In January 2011, 25 counties out of 77, were in compliance. As of June 30, 2012, SAI made significant strides in eliminating the backlog. By January 2013, 65 counties were in compliance and all counties will be in compliance by June 30, 2013.

FY'14 Requested Division/Program Funding By Source						
	Appropriations	Federal	Revolving	Other	Total	% Change
Administration	\$942,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$942,000	3.18%
Local Government Services	\$2,599,000	\$0	\$2,999,000	\$0	\$5,598,000	17.86%
State Agency Services	\$1,658,000	\$0	\$1,880,000	\$0	\$3,538,000	11.31%
Special Services	\$653,000	\$0	\$790,000	\$0	\$1,443,000	9.70%
Performance Audits	\$1,118,000	\$0	\$572,000	\$0	\$1,690,000	93.02%
Ancillary Services	\$400,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$400,000	23.25%
ISD Data Processing	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$7,370,000</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$6,241,000</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$13,611,000</b>	<b>23.77%</b>

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

FY'14 Top Five Appropriation Funding Requests	
	\$ Amount
Performance Audits	\$1,000,000
Local Government Services	\$1,000,000
State Agency Services	\$400,000
Special Services	\$140,000
Administration	\$30,000

**How would the agency handle a 3% appropriation reduction in FY'14?**

A 3% reduction to our current appropriation would be \$141,210. We would have to decrease current personnel which would result in a slowdown of audit completions.

**How would the agency handle a 5% appropriation reduction in FY'14?**

A 5% reduction to the appropriation would be \$235,349. Personnel would need to be reduced by 3 to 4 FTE.

Is the agency seeking any fee increases for FY'14?	
	\$ Amount
SAI periodically review the charges for employees invoiced to audit clients.	\$0

**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**  
Internal functions of the Office concerning budgeting, personnel, accounting, office policy, consistency in audits, and general administration of the Office.

**Local Government Services**  
Local Government Services consists of the following programs: County Audit Services to ensure the independent audit of the receipt and disbursement of county funds; Management Services to advise county officers on procedural and technical matters related to accounting and budget procedures; and Investigative Audits Services to assist the Attorney General, District Attorneys, and governing bodies of public entities with investigations into suspected fraudulent activities.

**State Agency Services**  
State Agency Services consists of the following programs: Financial Audit Services to audit the State of Oklahoma's CAFR (instrumental to support the state's bond ratings and the Single Audit), and to prepare the Single Audit to meet mandates for the receipt of federal funds; Performance Audit Services to improve state agency operations and aid those responsible for initiating corrective action; and Information Services to provide IT auditors and support for the statewide auditors.

**Special Services**  
Special Services consists of the following programs: Quality Assurance and Audit Review, Minerals Management Audit Services, Horse Racing and Gaming Audit Services, Board of Equalization Support, and Pension Commission Support.

**Ancillary Services**  
This program consists of pass-through funds to OSU-Commission on County Government Districts.

Performance Measure Review					
	FY12	FY'11	FY'10	FY'09	FY'08
<b>Local Government Services</b>					
Audit Reports Issued	375	370	228	364	
Investigative Reports Issued	15	11	11	11	
<b>State Agency Services</b>					
Audit Reports Issued	25	20	22	19	
Audit Recommendations Made	85	85	85	127	
<b>Special Services</b>					
Underpaid Royalties & Interest Collected	\$425,000	\$425,000	\$400,000	\$185,000	
State Deposits	\$1,700,000	\$1,345,276	\$2,737,907	\$16,205,456	
Total Wagers	\$160,000,000	\$153,925,962	\$91,393,312	\$169,066,770	