

October 1, 2013

Les Boles, Director
Office of State Budget
1201 Main Street, Suite 870
Columbia, SC 29201

Dear Mr. Boles:

I am pleased to submit the budget request for fiscal year 2014-15 for the State Election Commission (SEC). During this fiscal year, the State Election Commissions' primary focus will be providing voter registration and election support to counties, maintaining the statewide voter registration system, supporting the statewide voting system, conducting the General Election, and continuing voter education and outreach efforts to ensure citizens of South Carolina have an opportunity to register and vote. The 2014 General Election will be the first statewide election under the new photo identification requirements.

The first priority is to provide funding for Security and Technology enhancements. A Risk and Vulnerability Assessment of the statewide voter registration system and agency networks was conducted by Deloitte and Touche. The request will enhance security of the registration system to protect the personal information (name, date of birth and social security numbers) of approximately 4 million citizens as well as increase security of the statewide voting system and agency networks. The request includes recurring and nonrecurring funds totaling \$480,000.

The second priority is to recoup statewide election funds used to develop a candidate filing system and to conduct the special primary, runoff and election for U.S. House of Representatives District 1. The Equal Access to the Ballot Act was passed late in the legislative session; however, funds to develop a candidate filing system were not appropriated. The request is for \$625,000.

The third priority is a request to restore funds from previous budget reductions. While I understand the severity of the economic situation is requiring limited government, the SEC has reached a critical point where we no longer have the funds necessary to provide mandated services, putting fair and accurate elections at risk. The SEC is requesting \$800k in previously taken budget reductions be restored.

The final request is part of our long range plan to replace the statewide voting system. The amount of the request is \$10M to establish a fund to replace the voting system in the future.

Thank you for your consideration of the funding requests for the State Election Commission. If you have questions, please call me or Janet Reynolds at (803) 734-9060.

Sincerely,



Marci Andino

Cc: Governor Nikki R. Haley
Senator Hugh K. Leatherman, Sr., Chairman, Senate Finance Committee
Representative Brian White, Chairman, House Ways and Means Committee

COMMISSIONERS

BILLY WAY, JR.
Chairperson

MARK A. BENSON

MARILYN BOWERS

E. ALLEN DAWSON

NICOLE SPAIN WHITE

MARCI ANDINO
Executive Director

2221 Devine Street
P.O. Box 5987
Columbia, SC 29250

803.734.9060
Fax: 803.734.9366
www.scvotes.org

AGENCY NAME:	State Election Commission		
AGENCY CODE:	E28	SECTION:	100



Fiscal Year 2014-15 Agency Budget Plan

FORM A – SUMMARY

**RECURRING FUNDS
(FORM B
DECISION PACKAGES)**

My agency is submitting the following recurring decision packages (Form B):	
739, 1742	
For FY 2014-15, my agency is (mark "X"):	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Requesting a net increase in recurring General Fund appropriations.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Not requesting a net increase in recurring General Fund Appropriations.

**CAPITAL &
NON-RECURRING
FUNDS
(FORM C
DECISION PACKAGES)**

My agency is submitting the following one-time decision packages (Form C):	
1729, 1745, 1798	
For FY 2014-15, my agency is (mark "X"):	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Requesting capital and/or non-recurring funds.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Not requesting capital and/or non-recurring funds.

PROVISOS

For FY 2014-15, my agency is (mark "X"):	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Requesting a new proviso and/or substantive changes to existing provisos.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Only requesting technical proviso changes (such as date references).
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Not requesting any proviso changes.

Please identify your agency's preferred contacts for this year's budget process.

	<u>Name</u>	<u>Phone</u>	<u>Email</u>
PRIMARY CONTACT:	Janet Reynolds	734-9069	jreynolds@elections.sc.gov
SECONDARY CONTACT:	Marci Andino	734-9060	marci@elections.sc.gov

I have reviewed and approved the enclosed FY 2014-15 Agency Budget Plan, which is complete and accurate to the extent of my knowledge.

**AGENCY DIRECTOR
(SIGN/DATE):**

	10/1/13
--	---------

**AGENCY DIRECTOR
(TYPE/PRINT NAME):**

Marci Andino	
--------------	--

This form must be signed by the department head – not a delegate.

AGENCY NAME:	State Election Commission		
AGENCY CODE:	E28	SECTION:	100

FORM B – PROGRAM REVISION REQUEST

DECISION PACKAGE	739
-------------------------	-----

Provide the decision package number issued by the PBF system (“Governor’s Request”).

TITLE	Security and Technology Enhancements
--------------	--------------------------------------

Provide a brief, descriptive title for this request.

AMOUNT	\$ 380,000
---------------	------------

What is the net change in requested appropriations for FY 2014-15? This amount should correspond to the decision package’s total in PBF across all funding sources.

ENABLING AUTHORITY	S. C. Code of Laws Sections 7-3-20, 7-5-186, 7-13-1655 and 7-15-460.
---------------------------	--

What state or federal statutory, regulatory, and/or administrative authority established this program? Is this decision package prompted by the establishment of or a revision to that authority?

FACTORS ASSOCIATED WITH THE REQUEST	Mark “X” for all that apply:
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Change in cost of providing current services to existing program audience.
	<input type="checkbox"/> Non-mandated change in eligibility / enrollment for existing program.
	<input type="checkbox"/> Change in case load / enrollment under existing program guidelines.
	<input type="checkbox"/> Non-mandated program change in service levels or areas.
	<input type="checkbox"/> Loss of federal or other external financial support for existing program.
	<input type="checkbox"/> Exhaustion of fund balances previously used to support program.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Proposed establishment of a new program or initiative.	

RECIPIENTS OF FUNDS	<p>The SEC requests funds to hire a security officer to manage the security needs of the agency. The SEC currently does not have staff with the essential security credentials. The SEC currently has a contract with a vendor, selected through a competitive process, to develop and make enhancements to the Voter Registration and Election Management System (VREMS). A software and hardware vendor would be selected off of state contract or through competitive process to implement solutions to resolve vulnerabilities identified in the security assessment.</p> <p>The Election Registration Information Center (ERIC) is a non-profit organization managed by participating states. ERIC would receive the funds for the initial enrollment and for the recurring costs for South Carolina’s membership. Also, the B&C Board’s Division of State Information Technology (DSIT) would receive payment for supplying confirmation cards which the SEC is federally mandated to send to voters who are</p>
----------------------------	--

AGENCY NAME:	State Election Commission		
AGENCY CODE:	E28	SECTION:	100

identified as no longer residing in the state. The U. S. Postal Service would receive funds to pay postage for the required mailings on an ongoing basis.

What individuals or entities would receive these funds (contractors, vendors, grantees, individual beneficiaries, etc.)? How would these funds be allocated – using an existing formula, through a competitive process, based upon predetermined eligibility criteria?

RELATED REQUEST(S)

Is this decision package associated with other decision packages requested by your agency or other agencies this year? Is it associated with a specific capital or non-recurring request?

MATCHING FUNDS

No matching funds or other resources are available.

Would these funds be matched by federal, institutional, philanthropic, or other resources? If so, identify the source and amount.

FUNDING ALTERNATIVES

The SEC does not have any other funding sources which can be used for this initiative.

What other possible funding sources were considered? Could this request be met in whole or in part with the use of other resources, including fund balances? If so, please comment on the sustainability of such an approach.

SUMMARY

Security
 In August 2013, Deloitte and Touche LLP (Deloitte) performed a security assessment on selected portions of the SEC’s Information Technology infrastructure and web applications to identify security vulnerabilities and to suggest mitigation controls to reduce risks associated with potential cyber threats. The largest portion of the assessment is the statewide voter registration system which contains the names, addresses, dates of birth, and social security numbers of approximately four million citizens. While the SEC has implemented boundary protection solutions such as firewalls and a Security Information and Event Management (SIEM) tool, Deloitte and Touche identified several critical security improvements necessary to ensure the security of sensitive data within the SEC’s information technology environment.

Deloitte identified software and hardware enhancements as well as recommended the agency hire a security officer to manage the security of the statewide voter registration system, the statewide voting system, and agency networks. The SEC is maintaining the confidentiality of the specific recommendations to protect the integrity of the systems.

AGENCY NAME:	State Election Commission		
AGENCY CODE:	E28	SECTION:	100

ERIC
ERIC was developed by the PEW Charitable Trust at no charge to the member states for the purpose of improving the accuracy of voter rolls and increasing access to voter registration for all eligible citizens. ERIC allows participating states to securely compare voter data to identify voters who have moved to, or registered in, another state. Participating states gain access to state-of-the-art technology to compare information on registered voters from official data sources resulting in highly confident matches indicating a voter moved, died or registered in another state.

The SEC will maintain control of the voter registration database and will also continue to update records based on the information provided. No action will be taken to modify or create a voter's records without conducting the federally mandated confirmation mailing to the voter.

In 2012 the General Assembly passed Act 265 allowing the SEC to participate in ERIC. However, funding was not provided.

Provide a summary of the rationale for the decision package. Why has it been requested? How specifically would the requested funds be used?

AGENCY NAME:	State Election Commission		
AGENCY CODE:	E28	SECTION:	100

METHOD OF CALCULATION	<p><u>Security</u></p> <p>The FTE was calculated based on the anticipated salary and maximum benefits required for an information technology security officer. Estimates for security software and hardware were obtained through a review of the existing state contract. Estimates for enhancements to the statewide voter registration system were provided by the current vendor. The SEC is maintaining the confidentiality of the specific recommendations to protect the integrity of the systems.</p> <p>Factors that could cause deviation are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • salary requirements/changes in employer share for benefits • a change in software/hardware prices • additional changes not identified in the risk assessment <p><u>ERIC</u></p> <p>The initial membership cost is set by ERIC member states at \$25,000. The ongoing costs to maintain ERIC was estimated based on the amount paid by states currently in the consortium. As additional states become members, the cost of maintaining ERIC will decrease. Other recurring costs were calculated based on the number of voter cards mailed for previous confirmation card mailings at the current postal rates for outgoing and incoming postage.</p> <p>Factors that could cause deviation are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the number of voters involved in the confirmation mailing • U. S. postal rate increases • costs of card production/printing at DSIT
------------------------------	---

How was the amount of the request calculated? What factors could cause deviations between the request and the amount that could ultimately be required in order to perform the underlying work?

FUTURE IMPACT	<p>Monitoring and enhancing security is an ongoing effort. There is an annual fee for participation in ERIC as well as increased confirmation mailings. The SEC has no discretionary funds available for these initiatives. No funds have been provided and the agency does not have other programs that can be cut to fund these initiatives.</p>
----------------------	--

Will the state incur any maintenance-of-effort or other obligations by adopting this decision package? What impact will there be on future capital and/or operating

AGENCY NAME:	State Election Commission		
AGENCY CODE:	E28	SECTION:	100

budgets if this request is or is not honored? Has a source of any such funds been identified and/or obtained by your agency?

PRIORITIZATION	<p>Protecting personally identifiable information and the statewide voting system is the SEC's number one priority. However, the agency does not have sufficient operating funds to implement the recommendations of the security assessment to eliminate the identified deficiencies.</p>
-----------------------	--

If no or insufficient new funds are available in order to meet this need, how would the agency prefer to proceed? By using fund balances, generating new revenue, cutting other programs, or deferring action on this request in FY 2014-15?

AGENCY NAME:	State Election Commission		
AGENCY CODE:	E28	SECTION:	100

INTENDED IMPACT	<p>Enhanced security and participation in ERIC will allow the agency to better protect PII, the statewide voting system and the overall integrity of elections.</p>
------------------------	---

What impact is this decision package intended to have on service delivery and program outcomes, and over what period of time?

PROGRAM EVALUATION	<p><u>Security Evaluation</u> The security of Personally Identifiable Information (PII) and the statewide voting system will be evaluated by monitoring for breaches and compliance with the agency security plan on an ongoing basis.</p> <p><u>Security Outcomes</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The requested funding would allow the agency to proactively protect critical systems against threats and malicious activity. • County election offices will see an added benefit through SEC provided voting system security guidance. • Access to the statewide voter registration system will be only through authorized devices. • Improved protection of voters' privacy. <p><u>ERIC Evaluation</u> The effectiveness of participation in ERIC will be measured by the number of voters identified as having moved, died or registered in another state.</p> <p><u>ERIC Outcomes</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Participation in the ERIC program is expected to improve the accuracy of South Carolina's voter rolls and increase access to voter registration for all eligible citizens. • The number of voters who require a confirmation mailing each year should decrease as records for registered voters who have moved, died or have a duplicate record are identified and the correction to the voter rolls is made. • Reduced opportunity for and perception of potential election fraud.
---------------------------	--

How would the use of these funds be evaluated? What specific outcome or performance measures would be used to assess the effectiveness of this program?

AGENCY NAME:	State Election Commission		
AGENCY CODE:	E28	SECTION:	100

FORM B – PROGRAM REVISION REQUEST

DECISION PACKAGE	1742
-------------------------	------

Provide the decision package number issued by the PBF system (“Governor’s Request”).

TITLE	General Fund Budget Reduction Recoupment
--------------	--

Provide a brief, descriptive title for this request.

AMOUNT	\$800,000
---------------	-----------

What is the net change in requested appropriations for FY 2014-15? This amount should correspond to the decision package’s total in PBF across all funding sources.

ENABLING AUTHORITY	S. C. Code of Laws Title 7 and the S. C. Appropriations Act
---------------------------	---

What state or federal statutory, regulatory, and/or administrative authority established this program? Is this decision package prompted by the establishment of or a revision to that authority?

FACTORS ASSOCIATED WITH THE REQUEST	Mark “X” for all that apply:
	<input type="checkbox"/> Change in cost of providing current services to existing program audience.
	<input type="checkbox"/> Non-mandated change in eligibility / enrollment for existing program.
	<input type="checkbox"/> Change in case load / enrollment under existing program guidelines.
	<input type="checkbox"/> Non-mandated program change in service levels or areas.
	<input type="checkbox"/> Loss of federal or other external financial support for existing program.
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Exhaustion of fund balances previously used to support program.
<input type="checkbox"/> Proposed establishment of a new program or initiative.	

MATCHING FUNDS	No matching funds or other resources are available.
-----------------------	---

Would these funds be matched by federal, institutional, philanthropic, or other resources? If so, identify the source and amount.

FUNDING ALTERNATIVES	The SEC does not currently have any other funding sources which can be used.
-----------------------------	--

What other possible funding sources were considered? Could this request be met in whole or in part with the use of other resources, including fund balances? If so, please

AGENCY NAME:	State Election Commission		
AGENCY CODE:	E28	SECTION:	100

comment on the sustainability of such an approach.

SUMMARY	<p>General fund personnel services and other operating funds are severely underfunded due to budget reductions taken in prior years. The SEC’s general fund budget has been reduced to a level in which the agency struggles to meet state mandates such as maintaining the statewide voter registration system, statewide voting system and conducting a training program for county and municipal election officials. The agency has reduced operating expenses but continues to rely on funds appropriated for the conduct of primaries and general elections to sustain the agency.</p>
----------------	---

Provide a summary of the rationale for the decision package. Why has it been requested? How specifically would the requested funds be used?

AGENCY NAME:	State Election Commission		
AGENCY CODE:	E28	SECTION:	100

METHOD OF CALCULATION	<p>Current analysis of agency operating expenses.</p>
------------------------------	---

How was the amount of the request calculated? What factors could cause deviations between the request and the amount that could ultimately be required in order to perform the underlying work?

FUTURE IMPACT	<p>In order to maintain compliance with state mandates, the agency will continue to use funds appropriated for statewide elections to sustain the agency.</p>
----------------------	---

Will the state incur any maintenance-of-effort or other obligations by adopting this decision package? What impact will there be on future capital and/or operating budgets if this request is or is not honored? Has a source of any such funds been identified and/or obtained by your agency?

PRIORITIZATION	<p>Adequate funding for the agency is imperative for providing voter registration and elections to the citizens of South Carolina. If new funds are not provided the agency will continue to use funds appropriated for statewide elections in order to meet state agency mandates.</p>
-----------------------	---

If no or insufficient new funds are available in order to meet this need, how would the agency prefer to proceed? By using fund balances, generating new revenue, cutting other programs, or deferring action on this request in FY 2014-15?

AGENCY NAME:	State Election Commission		
AGENCY CODE:	E28	SECTION:	100

INTENDED IMPACT	<p>The agency is currently underfunded in all program areas. Funds are necessary to adequately maintain the statewide voter registration system, statewide voting system and conduct the training and certification program for county and municipal election officials.</p>
------------------------	--

What impact is this decision package intended to have on service delivery and program outcomes, and over what period of time?

PROGRAM EVALUATION	<p>The measurement to assess the effectiveness of these programs is the ongoing accomplishment of the SEC's mission to ensure that every eligible citizen has the opportunity to register to vote, participate in fair and impartial elections, and have the assurance that their vote will count.</p>
---------------------------	--

How would the use of these funds be evaluated? What specific outcome or performance measures would be used to assess the effectiveness of this program?

AGENCY NAME:	State Election Commission		
AGENCY CODE:	E28	SECTION:	100

FORM C – CAPITAL OR NON-RECURRING APPROPRIATION REQUEST

DECISION PACKAGE	1729
-------------------------	------

Provide the decision package number issued by the PBF system ("Governor's Request").

TITLE	Statewide Election Funds
--------------	--------------------------

Provide a brief, descriptive title for this request.

AMOUNT	\$625,000
---------------	-----------

How much is requested for this project in FY 2014-15?

BUDGET PROGRAM	Statewide Election Funds
-----------------------	--------------------------

Identify the associated budget program(s) by name and budget section.

SUMMARY	<p>Due to the passage of the Equal Access to the Ballot Act requiring candidates to file with election commissions and the necessity to conduct the U. S. House of Representatives District 1 Special Election, the statewide election program is underfunded by \$625,000. The SEC was forced to use statewide primary funds to develop a candidate filing system and conduct the special election.</p> <p>The newly developed candidate filing system to be used by all county election commissions and the State Election Commission not only facilitates candidate filing but provides instant public access to candidate filing information and documents through the agency website. The system will provide increased transparency and accountability. The cost of the candidate filing system is estimated to be \$225,000.</p> <p>A primary, runoff and special election were held in five counties to fill the vacancy in U. S. House of Representatives District 1. The cost of these special elections was \$456,257.</p>
----------------	---

Provide a summary of the project and explain why it is necessary.

AGENCY NAME:	State Election Commission		
AGENCY CODE:	E28	SECTION:	100

RELATED REQUEST(S)	
---------------------------	--

Is this decision package associated with other decision packages requested by your agency or other agencies this year? Is it associated with a specific capital or non-recurring request?

MATCHING FUNDS	No matching funds or other resources are available.
-----------------------	---

Would these funds be matched by federal, institutional, philanthropic, or other resources? If so, identify the source and amount.

FUNDING ALTERNATIVES	The SEC does not have any other funding sources which can be used for this initiative.
-----------------------------	--

What other possible funding sources were considered?

LONG-TERM PLANNING AND SUSTAINABILITY	The SEC is currently appropriated \$3M for statewide elections. No other capital or operating funds for this project will be requested in the future for this purpose.
--	--

What other funds have already been invested in this project (source/type, amount, timeframe)? Will other capital and/or operating funds for this project be requested in the future? If so, how much, and in which fiscal years? Has a source for those funds been identified/secured?

OTHER APPROVALS	Act 61 was passed by the General Assembly in 2012.
------------------------	--

What approvals have already been obtained? Are there additional approvals that must be secured in order for the project to succeed? (Institutional board, JBRC, BCB, etc.)

AGENCY NAME:	State Election Commission		
AGENCY CODE:	E28	SECTION:	100

FORM C – CAPITAL OR NON-RECURRING APPROPRIATION REQUEST

DECISION PACKAGE	1745
-------------------------	------

Provide the decision package number issued by the PBF system ("Governor's Request").

TITLE	New Statewide Voting System
--------------	-----------------------------

Provide a brief, descriptive title for this request.

AMOUNT	10,000,000
---------------	------------

How much is requested for this project in FY 2014-15?

BUDGET PROGRAM	
-----------------------	--

Identify the associated budget program(s) by name and budget section.

SUMMARY	<p>The State currently uses an electronic voting system statewide. The current system is approximately 10 years old. The life expectancy is 12-15 years, provided replacement parts are available. The purpose of this request is to establish a fund in anticipation of a new statewide voting system. It is difficult to predict the type of voting technology that may exist in five years or the cost associated with such because of federal changes to voting system standards which are pending. Our request is based on the cost of the current voting system.</p>
----------------	--

Provide a summary of the project and explain why it is necessary.

AGENCY NAME:	State Election Commission		
AGENCY CODE:	E28	SECTION:	100

RELATED REQUEST(S)	None
---------------------------	------

Is this decision package associated with other decision packages requested by your agency or other agencies this year? Is it associated with a specific capital or non-recurring request?

MATCHING FUNDS	Federal or other resources are not anticipated.
-----------------------	---

Would these funds be matched by federal, institutional, philanthropic, or other resources? If so, identify the source and amount.

FUNDING ALTERNATIVES	The SEC does not have any other funding sources which can be used for this initiative.
-----------------------------	--

What other possible funding sources were considered?

LONG-TERM PLANNING AND SUSTAINABILITY	No other funds have been invested in the project. The purpose of this request is to establish a fund in anticipation of a new statewide voting system. This request is for the initial \$10M and additional funds will be necessary over the next several years. No other sources have been identified.
--	---

What other funds have already been invested in this project (source/type, amount, timeframe)? Will other capital and/or operating funds for this project be requested in the future? If so, how much, and in which fiscal years? Has a source for those funds been identified/secured?

OTHER APPROVALS	S. C. Code of Laws Sections 7-13-1610, 7-13-1620, 7-13-1640, and 7-13-1655.
------------------------	---

What approvals have already been obtained? Are there additional approvals that must be secured in order for the project to succeed? (Institutional board, JBRC, BCB, etc.)

AGENCY NAME:	State Election Commission		
AGENCY CODE:	E28	SECTION:	100

FORM C – CAPITAL OR NON-RECURRING APPROPRIATION REQUEST

DECISION PACKAGE	1798
-------------------------	------

Provide the decision package number issued by the PBF system ("Governor's Request").

TITLE	Security and Technology Enhancements
--------------	--------------------------------------

Provide a brief, descriptive title for this request.

AMOUNT	100,000
---------------	---------

How much is requested for this project in FY 2014-15?

BUDGET PROGRAM	Voter Services/20010000
-----------------------	-------------------------

Identify the associated budget program(s) by name and budget section.

SUMMARY	<p><u>Security</u> In August 2013, Deloitte and Touche LLP (Deloitte) performed a security assessment on selected portions of the SEC's Information Technology infrastructure and web applications to identify security vulnerabilities and to suggest mitigation controls to reduce risks associated with potential cyber threats. The largest portion of the assessment is the statewide voter registration system which contains the names, addresses, dates of birth, and social security numbers of approximately four million citizens. While the SEC has implemented boundary protection solutions such as firewalls and a Security Information and Event Management (SIEM) tool, Deloitte and Touche identified several critical security improvements necessary to ensure the security of sensitive data within the SEC's information technology environment.</p> <p>Deloitte identified software and hardware enhancements as well as recommended the agency hire a security officer to manage the security of the statewide voter registration system, the statewide voting system, and agency networks. The SEC is maintaining the confidentiality of the specific recommendations to protect the integrity of the systems.</p> <p><u>ERIC</u> ERIC was developed by the PEW Charitable Trust at no charge to the member states for the purpose of improving the accuracy of voter rolls and increasing access to voter registration for all eligible citizens. ERIC allows participating states to securely compare voter data to identify voters who have moved to, or registered in, another state. Participating states gain access to state-of-the-art technology to compare information on registered voters from official data sources resulting in highly confident matches indicating a voter moved, died or registered in another state.</p> <p>The SEC will maintain control of the voter registration database and will also continue to update records based on the information provided. No action will be taken to modify or create a voter's records without conducting the federally mandated confirmation mailing to the voter.</p> <p>In 2012 the General Assembly passed Act 265 allowing the SEC to participate in ERIC. However, funding was not provided.</p>
----------------	--

Provide a summary of the project and explain why it is necessary.

AGENCY NAME:	State Election Commission		
AGENCY CODE:	E28	SECTION:	100

RELATED REQUEST(S)	
---------------------------	--

Is this decision package associated with other decision packages requested by your agency or other agencies this year? Is it associated with a specific capital or non-recurring request?

MATCHING FUNDS	No matching funds or other resources are available.
-----------------------	---

Would these funds be matched by federal, institutional, philanthropic, or other resources? If so, identify the source and amount.

FUNDING ALTERNATIVES	The SEC does not have any other funding sources which can be used for this initiative.
-----------------------------	--

What other possible funding sources were considered?

LONG-TERM PLANNING AND SUSTAINABILITY	No other funds have been invested in the project. No other capital or operating funds for this project will be requested in the future.
--	---

What other funds have already been invested in this project (source/type, amount, timeframe)? Will other capital and/or operating funds for this project be requested in the future? If so, how much, and in which fiscal years? Has a source for those funds been identified/secured?

OTHER APPROVALS	Act 265 was passed by the General Assembly in 2012.
------------------------	---

What approvals have already been obtained? Are there additional approvals that must be secured in order for the project to succeed? (Institutional board, JBRC, BCB, etc.)