Legislative Fiscal Bureau
One East Main, Suite 301 • Madison, WI 53703 • (608) 266-3847 • Fax: (608) 267-6873

June 1, 2005 Joint Committee on Finance Paper #107

Division Of Enterprise Technology Expenditure Reestimates (DOA -- General Agency Provisions)

[LFB 2005-07 Budget Summary: Page 22, #7]

CURRENT LAW

Base funding under the Department of Administration's Division of Enterprise Technology (DET) appropriation for printing, mail processing, communications and information technology for state agencies is $84,329,600 PR and 164.3 PR positions annually. Base funding under DET's communications and information technology for non-state agencies appropriation is $14,373,000 PR annually.

The Department of Administration (DOA) is authorized to implement a state government-wide reporting, data warehousing and data analysis system applicable to all executive branch agencies, except certain authorities.

GOVERNOR

Provide $12,833,300 PR annually of increased expenditure authority for DET. Convert the printing, mail processing, communications and information technology for state agencies appropriation from an annual to a continuing appropriation.

DISCUSSION POINTS

1. Under the bill, increased funding for DET would be allocated as follows: (a) $8,542,000 PR annually to the printing, mail processing, communications and information technology for state agencies appropriation (IT services for state agencies); and (b) $4,291,300 PR annually to the communications and information technology for non-state agencies appropriation

(IT services for non-state agencies).

2. The annual increased expenditure authority for IT services for state agencies appropriation would be provided for the following purposes: (a) $3,500,000 PR for new building costs for an off-site data center; (b) $2,500,000 PR for master lease payments on information technology hardware; (c) $5,000,000 PR for increased utilization of DET services by state agencies; and (d) -$2,458,000 PR related to the alignment of revenues and expenditures with the proper appropriations. This IT services for state agencies appropriation would also be converted from an annual to a continuing basis.

3. The annual increased expenditure authority for IT services for non-state agencies appropriation would be provided for the following purposes: (a) $2,458,000 PR related to the alignment of revenues and expenditures with the proper appropriations; and (b) $1,833,300 PR for increased utilization of the state's data and video network by local units of government and school districts.

4. The following discussion addresses selected issues relating to these expenditures: (a) funding for leasing a new state data center; (b) funding for increased utilization in connection with a new state business management IT system; (c) realignment of IT expenditures with the proper appropriations; and (d) the appropriation type authorized for the IT services for state agencies appropriation. The Committee's choices on many of these issues will depend on the degree of legislative oversight it deems appropriate of the IT initiatives described below.

Off-Site Data Center Operations

5. The current data center that houses the state's IT infrastructure is located in the DOA building in Madison. According to DOA, this data center: (a) is unable to support the demands of a more centralized IT operation; (b) does not provide optimal environmental conditions for the hardware; (c) has the potential for catastrophic failure due to the design of the facility; and (d) is difficult to secure. DET and the Division of State Facilities subsequently determined that the establishment of a new data center and supporting office space would provide the optimal solution to these issues. Further, the current DOA IT data facility would serve as a redundant site to increase overall data security.

6. The new data center would provide for a planned data recovery system that will: (a) be managed by the state instead of contracted providers; (b) use primary and backup facilities in close proximity to one another; (c) be based on simultaneous, redundant data operations; (d) be limited to two physically separated facilities; (e) allow DET to terminate its existing contract for mainframe data recovery services; and (f) when necessary, allow data to be recovered over a period of time based on the data's priority and cost of the recovery effort.

7. On November 17, 2004, DOA issued a request for proposals (RFP) for the lease of a new or remodeled facility within 22 miles of its current data center. The RFP indicated that DOA would consider occupancy as late as September, 2005, but would prefer to move to the new facility

by July, 2005.

8. Under the bill, increased annual costs associated with the new data center would be budgeted as follows: (a) $2,500,000 PR for rent; (b) $900,000 PR for rent and maintenance of a new secondary data center within DOA-managed space; (c) $1,000,000 PR for janitorial, security, utilities and other services at the new center; and (d) $500,000 PR for new fiberoptics, alternate power sources, and telephone and other equipment. These budgeted costs, totaling $4,900,000 PR annually, would be offset by an annual reduction of $1,400,000 PR related to decreased rental space costs at the state's current data center, resulting in the $3,500,000 PR annually provided under the bill.

9. Further, in order to establish the new facility and provide a connection to the current data center, the bill would provide an additional $2,500,000 PR annually for master lease payments for new IT hardware (mainframe computer processors, data storage systems, data switching equipment to route information, and additional servers). The additional equipment is intended to allow for simultaneous data storage operations at two locations and for the operation of important state data applications at either location in case of an emergency. According to DOA, the equipment would be purchased under a four-year master lease.

10. As of May 4, 2005, DOA has advised that the previous RFP for the data center would be withdrawn and leasing options for a smaller facility would instead be pursued. Consequently, a new RFP was issued on May 18, 2005. The Department's current intention is to review the resulting proposals on an expedited basis. The Department indicates that the new facility is estimated to be available in the summer of 2006.

11. Because of this delay, the Department has yet to enter into a lease for the new data center. Consequently, total costs of rent for the new facility are not yet known. Further, any lease would need to be approved by the State Building Commission. Given all of these considerations, it could be argued that providing increased expenditure authority of $6,000,000 PR for a new data center and associated master lease is premature at this time.

12. If the Committee chooses not to provide the additional data center leasing and related master lease funding at this time, DOA could still return to the Committee at a later date under the s. 16.505/16.515 passive review process. Once the Building Commission has reviewed the proposed lease for the new data center and those lease and associated equipment costs are known, the Committee would be better able to respond to a detailed request submitted by DOA for increased PR expenditure or position authority for the data center.

Business Management IT System (Increased Utilization)

13. The bill would provide increased expenditure authority of $5,000,000 PR annually under DET's IT services for state agencies appropriation in connection with the implementation of an integrated state government-wide IT system for financial management, human resources, payroll administration, and other general administrative business activities. These types of initiatives are

consistent with a recommendation that was adopted by the Legislature during its deliberations on the 2003-05 biennial budget.

14. In the 2003-05 biennial budget bill, the Legislature adopted a provision relating to the implementation of IT management systems for executive branch state agencies. The principal features of that legislative initiative were as follows:

- The Secretary of DOA was directed to issue RFPs for all of the following types of management systems: (a) a performance-based budgeting system; (b) a single web-based accounting system; (c) a single web-based electronic procurement system; (d) a single human resource system capable of processing all personnel information and payroll transactions and providing information to all employee's regarding their benefits and services; and (e) an internet portal.

- The Secretary of DOA was directed to determine the savings and efficiencies that would be result from implementing these system and incorporate those projected savings in the 2005-07 biennial budget. Where the systems could be implemented without statutory changes, the Secretary was directed to implement them; otherwise the Secretary was directed to submit any necessary statutory modifications as part of the 2005-07 biennial budget bill.

- DOA was authorized to implement a data warehouse system for executive branch agencies.

- The Secretary of DOA was directed to implement an integrated procurement system with such features as: (a) centralized order processing; (b) invoice aggregation by state agency; (c) a budget management interface to identify and prevent budget overruns; and (d) order entry accessibility by electronic data input, internet, fax or telephone. The Legislature's proposal would have required executive branch state agencies to convert to this new procurement system by July 1, 2005. Further, six months after implementing the system, the Secretary of DOA was directed to delete 88.0 FTE procurement-related executive branch state agency positions and lapse the associated non-FED funded salary and fringe benefits amounts to the general fund.

15. All of these provisions were vetoed by the Governor, except for the provision authorizing DOA to implement a state government-wide data warehousing system for executive branch agencies.

16. The genesis of the current proposal in the bill date to November, 2004, when DOA initiated a consultant's study, conducted by Salvaggio, Teal and Associates (STA), regarding the feasibility of implementing an integrated state government-wide IT system for financial management, human resources, payroll administration, and other general administrative business activities. This initiative has been included in the Governor's 2005-07 biennial budget recommendations and includes many of the concepts that were agreed to by the Legislature during its 2003-05 biennial budget deliberations. The issues of funding and staffing consolidations for the procurement, and human resources and payroll functions are addressed in separate budget papers.

17. The STA report indicated that:

- State government currently has at least 122 different IT systems that support human resources, payroll administration, and financial management, of which 97 could be consolidated;

- There is no state government-wide procurement, asset management or human resources system;

- The state does not have the ability to track spending on goods and services at the commodity level;

- Some of the state's consolidation and efficiency measures are dependent on the ability to evaluate state government-wide data;

- Some of the technology underlying the existing administrative systems is up to thirty years old and is difficult to modify;

- Current statewide systems may not meet all agencies business needs, resulting in individual agencies modifying the existing systems for specific needs;

- Statewide systems for financial management, position control, payroll administration and budget development are not integrated;

- The state does not maintain a state government-wide position, payroll or employee history; and

- Commercially available software is available that could address 85% to 95% of the state's requirements.

18. The consultant's report suggested that the new system be implemented over a 42-month period, first with the implementation of a procurement system, followed by the financial management system, and concluding with the human resources and payroll system.

19. The report estimated total project costs (implementation, hardware and software, on-going support and operations, and upgrading the system in the sixth year) at $135.3 million over an 11-year period, with some of the total project costs being funded with base resources. The consultant's cost estimate was offset during the period by the following: (a) an estimated $46.2 million in savings from the elimination of existing and planned IT systems; and (b) an estimated $603.0 million in "process improvement" savings (staff reductions and modifications in agency procedures).

20. The following table summarizes the estimated costs and savings identified by the consultant due to the implementation of the reporting system.

Estimated Eleven Year Costs and Benefits for State Governmentwide Administrative Reporting System

	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15
Costs											
Implementation Costs	$723,400	$4,809,900	$14,994,400	$26,702,700	$13,697,400	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
Application Software license	5,000,000	4,301,000	4,781,000	5,261,000	2,679,300	2,524,300	2,524,300	2,524,300	2,524,300	2,524,300	2,524,300
Ongoing Support and Operations	0	0	1,110,600	2,221,200	3,537,400	3,537,400	3,537,400	3,537,400	3,537,400	3,537,400	3,537,400
Upgrade	0	0	0	0	0	0	9,101,200	0	0	0	0
Fiscal Year Total	$5,723,400	$9,110,900	$20,886,000	$34,184,900	$19,914,100	$6,061,700	$15,162,900	$6,061,700	$6,061,700	$6,061,700	$6,061,700
Cumulative Cost	$5,723,400	$14,834,300	$35,720,300	$69,905,200	$89,819,300	$95,881,000	$111,043,900	$117,105,600	$123,167,300	$129,229,000	$135,290,700
Savings											
Procurement/Financial Management	$0	$0	$0	-$52,597,100	-$60,676,600	-$79,547,100	-$83,414,100	-$88,547,100	-$88,414,100	-$88,547,100	-$88,414,100
Human Resources	0	0	0	0	0	-2,359,700	-3,321,500	-3,321,500	-3,321,500	-3,321,500	-3,321,500
Fiscal Year Total	$0	$0	$0	-$52,597,100	-$60,676,600	-$81,906,800	-$86,735,600	-$91,868,600	-$91,735,600	-$91,868,600	-$91,735,600
Cumulative Savings	$0	$0	$0	-$52,597,100	-$113,273,700	-$195,180,500	-$281,916,100	-$373,784,700	-$465,520,300	-$557,388,900	-$649,124,500
Net Costs or Savings											
Fiscal Year	$5,723,400	$9,110,900	$20,886,000	-$18,412,200	-$40,762,500	-$75,845,100	-$71,572,700	-$85,806,900	-$85,673,900	-$85,806,900	-$85,673,900
Cumulative	$5,723,400	$14,834,300	$35,720,300	$17,308,100	-$23,454,400	-$99,299,500	-$170,872,200	-$256,679,100	-$342,353,000	-$428,159,900	-$513,833,800

Source: STA Consultants

21. Other specific recommendations from the report will have a bearing on the type of system developed by the state. These recommendations included:

- The state should consider implementation of a statewide business management system in order to increase state agency productivity, reduce costs and state personnel, enhancement the operation of certain common state agency business functions, and improve technology.

- The new IT system should focus on the areas of procurement, financial management and human resources.

- The University of Wisconsin System should be excluded from the initiatives, except for procurement.

- Additional analysis is necessary to determine whether the Department of Transportation should be included because of its project and cost accounting procedures and federal reporting requirements are not typically found in commercially available software.

- Additional analysis is necessary to determine whether a commercially available system can meet the state's IT asset inventory management requirements.

- The state should implement "an aggressive strategic sourcing" effort as part of the IT system project in order to reduce the costs of goods and services. The report describes strategic sourcing as "a process that creates quantifiable, hard-dollar savings by reducing the cost of purchased goods and services."

22. The bill would provide additional expenditure authority of $5,000,000 PR annually in connection with the new system. The additional expenditure authority, based generally on the consultant's study, would support additional hardware and software to increase the state's IT processing capacity for the new system. According to DOA, these precise funding needs are difficult to determine until the necessary software and IT hardware have been selected.

23. The increased costs would be recovered through charges to agencies for usage of the new system. These rates, however, have not yet been established. In addition, DOA indicates that the new IT system is intended to replace systems that agencies are currently using and would result in savings at the agency level.

24. Development of new IT projects is a complex task. A Legislative Audit Bureau review in 2001 of state agency usage of computer consultants observed that: "State agencies must periodically create, develop, and implement large IT systems that can cost millions of dollars and take years to develop. It is not uncommon for large IT development projects to exceed their original cost or time budgets." Based on evaluations from other states, the LAB stated that:

> "[T]he larger the project, the higher the probability it will fail to meet one or more of the three critical criteria of originally planned cost, time, and functionality. These evaluations found shortcomings in one of six general areas:

- planning by the agency and the vendor;

- organizational issues relating to the manner in which tasks were assigned and carried out;

- whether and how the scope of projects was controlled;

- executive-level commitment, competence, and communications;

- coordination and turnover among staff; and

- monitoring and measuring project status."

25. The LAB review identified a number of best practices related to IT contracting. These best practices included "seeking fixed prices for specific deliverables, clearly communicating system requirements to the contractor, using modular contracting to minimize problems caused by program changes, negotiating contracts the specify performance and results, and managing contractor performance. While such practices cannot guarantee project success, they may at least reduce the extent of cost overruns and time delays."

26. The May, 2005, issue of *Governing* magazine discusses state governmentwide reporting system similar to that proposed by the consultant. The article stated that while most reporting systems eventually work, there are several "stumbling blocks" involved in the development and implementation of these projects. These problems areas include: (a) specifications may be written incorrectly if the government is not very clear about the needs of the project; (b) vendors may oversell the capability of the operating systems; (c) once the project begins, officials may begin suggesting additional tasks that the system should include which will delay the final project and increase costs; (d) implementation is often longer and more complicated than predicted; (e) once the project is completed, there is a learning curve for the users of the systems, which may cause an initial slowdown in the productivity of the users; and (f) the costs initially contributed to implementing the program are often not reflective of long range costs, which may include significant increases for ongoing maintenance costs compared to current systems.

27. As the STA report indicated, state agencies currently run multiple human resources, payroll and financial management systems simultaneously. A number of these systems are old and may not contain all of the functionalities that are necessary for efficient management of an agency. Further, most of the management systems are not integrated across state government. Integration and modernization of these systems could provide better management data, and allow for more efficient use of resources. However, the development and deployment of a state government-wide business management system represents a complex undertaking. While commercially-available software may address 85% to 95% of the state's needs, 5% to 15% of its needs would need to be addressed on a customized basis.

28. Management information systems are important not only for the efficient operation of executive branch agencies, but also for oversight and review by the Legislature of agency

programs and expenditures.

29. Given the scale of the project, uncertainties with respect to its projected cost and the rate structure that will be applied to state agencies, and the importance of the project to the Legislature's ability to exercise effective agency oversight, it can be argued that approval of increased funding of $5,000,000 PR annually for the project is premature.

30. As with the earlier issue of funding the costs of a new data center, DOA could request that the Committee increase its PR expenditure or position authority under the s. 16.505/16.515 passive review process. Once the scope of the project, costs, potential rates, project timeline, and the extent of legislative involvement in the project are known, the Committee would be better able to respond to a detailed request submitted by DOA.

Appropriation Expenditure Authority Realignment

31. The bill would decrease expenditure authority by $2,458,000 PR annually under the IT services for state agencies appropriation and would increase expenditure authority under the IT services for non-state agencies appropriation by a corresponding amount to align revenues and expenditures as a result of a new state data and video contract. Further, the bill would provide $1,833,300 PR annually is associated with increased use of the state's data and video network by school districts.

32. As a result of the manner in which data and video were transmitted under the previous state data and video network contracts, revenues and expenditures from school districts and local governments were divided between two appropriations. Data network charges were allocated to the IT services for state agencies appropriation while video charges were allocated to the IT services to non-state agencies appropriation. Under a new video and data network contract, both data and video communications are generally transmitted in a similar manner, and these services may now be accounted for based on whether they provided to state or non-state entities. Consequently, $2,458,000 PR annually previously associated with data transmissions expenditures for school districts, but charged to the IT services for state agencies appropriation, should now be placed in the appropriation for non-state agency IT expenditures.

33. Also associated with the new data and video network contract, approximately 50 school districts that previously did not use the state's network are now expected to use these services. These school districts have previously been funded through the TEACH program for these data and video services. Based on these affected school districts' current payments, DET expenditures are anticipated to increase by $1,833,300 PR annually.

34. The realignment of expenditure authority and the increased expenditure authority associated with additional use of the state's data and video network would appear to be reasonable based on current expenditures. The Committee may wish to approve these recommended changes.

Appropriation Type

35. Under the bill, the IT services for state agencies appropriation would be converted from an annual appropriation to a continuing appropriation. Continuing appropriations are appropriations that are expendable until fully depleted or repealed by subsequent action of the Legislature. The amounts available for expenditure under a PR continuing appropriation consist of the balance in the appropriation account at the end of the previous fiscal year, if any, together with any revenues received during the fiscal year that are directed by law to be credited to the appropriation account. The dollar amounts shown in the appropriation schedule represent the most reliable estimates of the amounts that will be expended during any fiscal year. However, expenditures made from a continuing program revenue appropriation are generally limited only by the availability of the revenues supporting the appropriation.

36. By contrast, annual appropriations are expendable only up to the amount shown in the appropriation schedule and only for the fiscal year for which the appropriation is made. At the end of the fiscal year, the unencumbered balances in a PR appropriation typically remain in the appropriation account.

37. Under a continuing appropriation, legislative oversight of expenditures is decreased because the dollar amounts in the appropriations schedule are merely estimates of the amount of funds that the agency expects to spend for the purposes of the appropriation. Agencies may expend as much from a continuing appropriation as revenues credited to that appropriation will allow.

38. Further, depending on the purpose of the appropriation, an agency may collect the full cost of its operation through chargebacks to users of its services at whatever level of expenditure is actually made. Consequently, under a continuing appropriation, the funding level that the Legislature includes in the appropriations schedule does not serve as any limit on the amount that an agency can actually expend for the purposes of the appropriation.

39. Under the bill, as the result of all budget change recommendations, the estimated expenditure authority for the IT services for state agencies continuing appropriation would be $114,384,200 PR in 2005-06 and $112,754,500 PR in 2006-07.

40. DOA argues that continuing appropriations would allow the agency to respond quickly to the IT needs of state agencies, local governments and other customers. This ability would be viewed as particularly relevant where the agency is developing larger computer systems or operating newer systems whose costs cannot be fully determined in advance. A continuing appropriation, DOA argues, would permit the agency to act quickly to take advantage of changing information technology markets. Since no legislative approval would be necessary for increased expenditures above budgeted levels, the agency could make those expenditures from the appropriation that it considers necessary to carry out its responsibilities.

41. However, it could be argued that creation of continuing appropriations lessens the Legislature's ability to review, monitor, and evaluate the financial status of the appropriation. In

light of the previous discussion that the Committee consider not approving additional funding at this time for data center and IT system implementation activities ($6,000,000 PR annually and $5,000,000 PR annually, respectively), the Committee's ability to subject these types of expenditures to further review is contingent upon the appropriation remaining an annual appropriation subject to adjustment through s. 16.515 procedures.

42. The 14-day review process under s. 16.515 is available for increased expenditure authority for annual appropriations. Given that any large IT purchase should be planned in advance and contain detailed budget information, the timely submission of a s. 16.515 request would allow the Department to respond to IT needs appropriately. Therefore, the Committee could modify the bill to retain the annual appropriation.

Other Opportunities for Legislative Oversight

43. Under current law, the Legislature's Joint Committee on Information Policy and Technology is required to review: (a) IT systems and policies of state and local governments, including the ability of such systems to deliver high-quality services efficiently and cost-effectively; (b) the effects of proposals by the state to expand existing IT systems or implement new systems; and (c) the impact of proposed legislation on existing technology utilization by state and local governments.

44. Further, the Joint Committee on Information Policy and Technology may: (a) direct DOA to study or report on matters related to the Joint Committee's duties; (b) make recommendations to the Governor, the Legislature, state agencies or local government regarding matters under its authority; and (c) with the concurrence of the Joint Committee on Finance, direct DOA to report semiannually concerning any specific IT system project being developed with a total state cost exceeding $1,000,000 in the current or any succeeding fiscal biennium.

45. Under current law, any such report prepared by DOA must include information on: (a) the major stages of the project; (b) the likely project implementation and completion milestones for each stage of the project; (c) the budgeted and expended amounts for each stage of the project; and (d) an evaluation of the project, including a description of any problems encountered or risks associated with proceeding to the next stage of the project, if any.

46. The Joint Committee on Information Policy and Technology has yet to be organized for the 2005 legislative session. However, if the Joint Finance wishes, DOA could be directed to provide the same information to the Finance Committee as is required to be reported semiannually to the Joint Committee on Information Policy and Technology on IT system projects being developed. The report could include information on the development of the data center and the state business management system.

47. Under s. 16.971(3) of the statutes, DOA is required to notify the Joint Committee on Finance, in writing, of the proposed acquisition of any information technology resource that the Department considers major or that is likely to result in a substantive change in service, and that was

not considered in the regular budgeting process. If the proposed acquisition involves GPR or SEG funding, the Committee has oversight by means of a 14-day passive review and approval process. Since the data center and management information system projects have been recommended as part of the 2005-07 biennial budget bill, this provision would not apply to these projects.

48. In order to assure legislative review of the data center and management information system projects, the Committee could adopt a non-statutory provision which would specify that, notwithstanding current law, any proposed acquisition of any information technology resource related to the data center or the management information system project that the Department considers major or that is likely to result in a substantive change in service would be subject to Committee review under a 14-day passive review process.

ALTERNATIVES

1. Approve the Governor's recommendation to provide $12,833,300 PR annually of increased expenditure authority for DOA's Division of Enterprise Technology, and convert the printing, mail processing, communications and information technology for state agencies appropriation from an annual to a continuing appropriation.

2. Modify the Governor's recommendation by adopting any of the following:

a. Delete $6,000,000 PR annually associated with lease and hardware, software and equipment for a new data center.

Alternative 2a	PR
2005-07 FUNDING (Change to Bill)	- $12,000,000

b. Delete $5,000,000 PR annually associated a proposed state government-wide business system.

Alternative 2b	PR
2005-07 FUNDING (Change to Bill)	- $10,000,000

c. Delete the transfer of $2,458,000 PR annually in expenditure authority from the IT services for state agencies appropriation to the IT services for non-state agencies related to the realignment of revenues and expenditures and the increase of $1,833,300 PR annually associated with increased utilization of the state's data and video network by local units of government and school districts.

Alternative 2c	PR
2005-07 FUNDING (Change to Bill)	- $3,666,600

3. Delete the conversion of the IT services for state agencies appropriation from an annual to a continuing appropriation.

4. Create a non-statutory provision directing DOA to report semiannually to the Committee during the 2005-07 biennium relating to the lease of a new data center and the costs associated with additional hardware and software to increase the state's IT processing capacity in connection with the proposed state government-wide business system: (a) the major stages and substages of the projects, including an assessment of need, design, implementation and testing stages and their major substages; (b) the scheduled, estimated and actual completion dates for each major stage and substage of the projects; (c) the budgeted amounts and amounts actually expended on each major stage and substage of the projects; and (d) an evaluation of the projects, including any problems encountered or risks associated with proceeding to the next stage of the project, if any.

5. Create a non-statutory provision directing that notwithstanding the s. 16.971(3) reporting requirement, any proposed acquisition of any information technology resource related to the data center or the management information system project that DOA considers major or that is likely to result in a substantive change in service would nonetheless be subject to Committee review under a 14-day passive review process.

6. Delete the provision.

Alternative 6	**PR**
2005-07 FUNDING (Change to Bill)	**-** $25,666,600

Prepared by: Jere Bauer