

**State of Alaska  
FY2004 Governor's Operating Budget**

**Department of Military and Veterans Affairs  
Alaska National Guard  
Budget Request Unit Budget Summary**

## Alaska National Guard Budget Request Unit

**Contact: John Cramer, Administrative Services Director**

**Tel:** (907) 465-4602 **Fax:** (907) 465-4605 **E-mail:** John\_Cramer@ak-prepared.com

### BRU Mission

To provide a force that fulfills state and federal military missions and that is capable of protecting life and property, preserving peace and order, and enhancing public safety.

### BRU Services Provided

The Alaska National Guard is made up of the Commissioner/Adjutant General's office; two military divisions, the Air and Army Guard (each commanded by a Director/Assistant Adjutant General located in the Military Headquarters Component); the Division of Administrative Services; the Alaska State Defense Force and the Naval Militia (volunteer organizations that support the Guard and the Division of Emergency Services during times of disaster); and the Army Guard and the Air Guard Facility management sections, which support the state and federal missions of the military units. The Commissioner/Adjutant General directs/commands the entire federal/state structure.

There are over 4,000 members of the Air and Army Guard who are under the command of the Adjutant General. There are 262 state employees who are directed by the Commissioner. This is a unique organization within state government. The federal government supports the structure in five ways: 1) 100% of the military branches of the Air and Army Guard by paying salaries and other operations costs (none of which is in the state budget); 2) 100% of military construction of the Air Guard (only a small portion is in the state budget) and 75% of all operation and maintenance of facilities; 3) 100% of security guards, environmental, aircraft rescue and firefighters; 4) up to 100% of the facilities maintenance and operations of the Army guard depending on the mission of the units using the facilities; and 5) up to 100% of the military construction of the Army Guard depending on the mission of the units using the new facility (for example, fed scout facilities are 100% federal funds while training support facilities are 75/25%). This federal support is conditioned on the State providing funds to meet the required state match.

This BRU also includes the Alaska Military Youth Academy that provides training to "at-risk" youth in self-discipline, community services, and educational goal identification to obtain a high school diploma or GED, and career planning.

### BRU Goals and Strategies

See specific detail at component level.

### Key BRU Issues for FY2003 – 2004

See specific detail at component level.

### Major BRU Accomplishments in 2002

See specific detail at component level.

### Key Performance Measures for FY2004

#### Measure:

**Military Headquarters - Whether the guard meets military efficiency and readiness ratings.**  
Sec 101(b)(1) Ch 124 SLA 2002(HB 515)

#### Alaska's Target & Progress:

The Army National Guard has reported meeting the required level of readiness for each of the reporting periods since the last report to the legislature.

**Benchmark Comparisons:**

The military efficiency and readiness ratings are specified by the Department of Defense.

**Background and Strategies:**

We report back to the Department of Defense. Although the reports are classified, the DMVA can generally report that there are no problems in this area.

**Measure:**

**Military Headquarters - The adequacy of response time for each emergency**

Sec 101(b)(2) Ch 124 SLA 2002(HB 515)

**Alaska's Target & Progress:**

The Alaska Air National Guard Rescue Coordination Center (RCC) serves as the coordinating agency for aviation-related search and rescue. Aircraft are available to respond from 3 locations in the state. The 210<sup>th</sup> Rescue Squadron maintains rescue-ready assets at Kulis ANG Base in Anchorage and at Eielson AFB near Fairbanks. The 68<sup>th</sup> Medical Detachment, US Army Alaska, also maintains a response asset. The rescue assets are tasked with the primary mission of support search and rescue of military aircraft in the state. Because of this federally funded mission, response time for RCC-controlled assets varies. Three response postures exist. Short response can launch within 30 minutes of notification. Medium response can launch within 1 hour and 45 minutes from notification. Long response will launch no later than 3 hours and 30 minutes from notification.

The Army National Guard responded to 65 search and rescue or medevac requests with 70 Alaskan lives saved and/or assisted during SFY02, totaling 136 flight hours, with a launch time ranging from under 15 minutes to 2 hours depending on varied circumstances.

**Benchmark Comparisons:**

This varies by incident.

**Background and Strategies:**

The RCC mission is federal. A side benefit to the state is the availability of the 24-hour capabilities of the RCC. National Guard and active air assets can be used in support of state search and rescue as outlined in federal and state guidelines. Response times are designed primarily for federal missions. However, assets in short, medium, or long response postures can also launch for state missions. As long as air rescue assets respond within the appropriate window, response times are not tracked.

**Measure:**

**Military Headquarters - The number of persons assisted during actual events**

Sec 101(b)(3) Ch 124 SLA 2002(HB 515)

**Alaska's Target & Progress:**

Nine search missions and thirty-three medevacs were requested. Seventy people were saved/assisted.

The 210<sup>th</sup> Rescue Squadron and the Rescue Coordination Center also participated in 448 rescue missions resulting in 192 lives saved.

**Benchmark Comparisons:**

This varies by incident.

**Background and Strategies:**

The National Guard stands by and is ready to respond to incidents when called upon. The Air Guard is prepared to perform Search & Rescue Missions in Alaska and stand by in support of our nation's defense. The Army Guard ensures that units are trained to meet the federal mission requirements to provide security, long range communication and aviation mission support.

All 613,000 Alaskans and indirectly all US citizens are covered under the umbrella of the National Guard.

**Measure:**

**Military Headquarters - Whether the guard meets recruitment and retention goals established by the National Guard**

Sec 101(b)(4) Ch 124 SLA 2002(HB 515)

**Alaska's Target & Progress:**

The National Guard Bureau recruiting goal for FY02 was 414; Alaska Army National Guard production was 389. We were unable to attain a 414 recruiting goal due to a redirection of federal funds for recruiting. Our overall number increased 2.5% overall through retention of soldiers.

The National Guard Bureau retention goal for FY02 was a loss rate equal to or less than 18% of assigned strength. Alaska Army National Guard's loss rate was 13%.

**Benchmark Comparisons:**

The National Guard Bureau provides the targets.

**Background and Strategies:**

It is important for the Alaska National Guard to meet its recruitment and retention goals in order to have a viable program. One of the initiatives which has helped the Alaska National Guard is the Educational Benefits program with the state funding for the tuition credits at University of Alaska. This allows guard members to meet educational requirements for promotion.

**Measure:**

**Military Headquarters - Whether the guard acquires new missions while minimizing the cost to the state**

Sec 101(b)(5) Ch 124 SLA 2002(HB 515)

**Alaska's Target & Progress:**

The Army National Guard fielded the 103<sup>rd</sup> Civil Support Team of 22 full-time Army and Air National Guard men and women with state of the art weapons of mass destruction detection equipment at no cost to the state.

Space and missile defense facilities in Alaska are not yet fielded, but we are on target.

**Benchmark Comparisons:**

No benchmark exists.

**Background and Strategies:**

The National Guard has worked hard to remain relevant since the end of the Cold War. Since that time, guard units have transitioned to security missions and space and missile defense. New missions are being pursued in space surveillance and security at Clear Air Station; a role in the Alaska North American Aerospace Defense Command (NORAD) operations center; strategic airlift; and domestic preparedness against weapons of mass destruction. These new missions will bring jobs and economic activity to the state but will not require a general fund outlay for facilities operation and maintenance.

**Measure:**

**Commissioner's Office - The percentage of divisions that meet assigned performance measures**

Sec 102(b)(1) Ch 124 SLA 2002(HB 515)

**Alaska's Target & Progress:**

The department will meet 100% of its 33 performance measures' reporting requirements.

**Benchmark Comparisons:**

There is no benchmark for this measure.

**Background and Strategies:**

The department has federal performance measures and some of these are classified, but we reported against the legislative measures in each BRU.

**Measure:**

**Commissioner's Office - The average time taken to respond to complaints and questions that have been elevated to the commissioner's office**

Sec 102 (b)(2) Ch 124 SLA 2002(HB 515)

**Alaska's Target & Progress:**

The department tracks its correspondence, and for the 2002 calendar year-to-date the average time to respond to formal inquiries was 14 days, which is within the two week timeframe established for our target.

We respond to telephone inquiries immediately.

**Benchmark Comparisons:**

There is no benchmark for this measure.

**Background and Strategies:**

The department uses the Correspondence Tracking System (CTS) to log when correspondence is received and when formal responses are completed.

**Measure:**

**Commissioner's Office - The percentage of costs applicable to administrative services as compared to the total personnel costs for the department**

Sec 103(b)(1) Ch 124 SLA 2002(HB 515)

**Alaska's Target & Progress:**

In FY 2002 the total actual expenditures were \$27.6 million in the operating budget excluding the Disaster Relief Funding, of which \$1,002.9 thousand was spent in the Administrative Services Division. Of the total \$27.6 million operating cost \$13.1 million was for personal services cost, which means the percentage of administrative services cost as compared to the total personnel costs was 8%.

**Benchmark Comparisons:**

There is no benchmark for this measure.

**Background and Strategies:**

A standard way to measure the level of administrative services is its cost in relation to the department's personal services cost. In a department like DMVA this will fluctuate because of the emergency response responsibilities and its related cost. Large emergency response projects such as Miller Reach and the Western Alaska Fisheries Disaster require a significant amount of extra work and staff, which will impact the results from year to year.

Our overall strategy is to keep our administrative services cost as low as possible and provide the best quality of service with the funding and staffing provided. The division's statistics are FY 1996, 9%; FY 1997, 8%; FY 1998, 9%; FY 1999, 7%; FY 2000, 9%, FY2001 8%, and FY2002 8%.

**Measure:**

**Commissioner's Office - The percentage of late penalties compared to total payroll payments**

Sec 103(b)(2) Ch 124 SLA 2002(HB 515)

**Alaska's Target & Progress:**

There were no late penalties in FY02.

**Benchmark Comparisons:**

The ideal is NO late penalties for payroll, which result in high morale for the workforce.

**Background and Strategies:**

The single most important function the administrative services section performs is to pay the employees their paychecks timely and accurately. The union contracts require us to pay a penalty for any late paychecks. A good measure of the quality of the payroll services is the lack of late penalties for payroll.

**Measure:**

**Commissioner's Office - The average vendor payment time**

Sec 103(b)(3) Ch 124 SLA 2002(HB 515)

**Alaska's Target & Progress:**

The average vendor payment time for FY2002 was 27 days.

**Benchmark Comparisons:**

The standard for average vendor payment time is 30 days before late charges and penalties are assessed.

**Background and Strategies:**

The department standard is to pay vendors within 30 days after invoice date.

**Measure:**

**Commissioner's Office - The number of audit exceptions**

Sec 103(b)(4) Ch 124 SLA 2002(HB 515)

**Alaska's Target & Progress:**

The department did not have any audit exceptions in FY02.

**Benchmark Comparisons:**

The ideal is NO audit exceptions.

**Background and Strategies:**

An independent measure of the Administrative Services functions success is a "clean" audit by Legislative Audit. The department standard is to have all accounting, payroll, and procurement actions comply with state and federal rules and regulations and generally accepted accounting and business practices.

**Measure:**

**Air Guard & Army Guard - The percentage reduction in accrued deferred maintenance projects**

Sec 104(b)(1) Ch 124 SLA 2002(HB 515)

**Alaska's Target & Progress:**

FY 2002 total Air Guard deferred maintenance is \$12.6 million, an increase of over 16% from FY 2001. The deferred maintenance backlog for Army Guard is \$21.2 million as of September 2002, a decrease of \$600,000 or 3% from FY 2001. With available resources, it is unlikely DMVA will achieve our goal of 5% reduction in the total DMVA deferred maintenance backlog of \$33.8 million.

**Benchmark Comparisons:**

Warranty and manufacturers' guides to replace, repair, maintain and renew building components.

**Background and Strategies:**

**Air Guard:**

The Air Guard Facility Maintenance Division's deferred maintenance program amounts to \$12.6 million. The combined effects of aging buildings and insufficient repair resources have caused this amount to increase yearly. There are three projects on our current deferred maintenance list that total \$4.3 million. None of these projects can be completed, because sufficient state match does not exist. A one-time appropriation for large (in excess of \$600,000) projects would result in an immediate and dramatic reduction in the size of the deferred maintenance amount.

At Eielson Air Force Base in Fairbanks, 16 of the 18 structures have been built since 1990. The average age of these facilities is 6.8 years. The remaining two structures are 1950's vintage; one of which was remodeled in 1998 and the other has had very little modification. The average facility age at Kulis Air Guard Base in Anchorage, in contrast, is 19 years. This 12-year difference is reflected in the share of deferred maintenance at each base. 94% of ANG deferred maintenance is at Kulis.

**Army Guard:**

With the completion of various on-going construction projects, upgrades and new Federal Scout Armories, the deferred maintenance backlog of Army Guard Facilities is currently \$21.2 million for FY02.

The average age of the Alaska Army Guard buildings is 31.5 years. Scheduled replacement deals with the life expectancy of a part or building. For example, roofs - life expectancy 20 years, boiler - life expectancy 25 years, carpets - life expectancy 7 years. These items require preventative maintenance to reach a specific life expectancy.

With regard to buildings, NGB regulations will not allow funding of a project which exceeds 50% of the building's replacement value.

**The Air and Army Guard's strategies for meeting our goal:**

Performing preventative maintenance in accordance with manufacturers' recommendations. By doing this, DMVA is able to extend the life expectancy of various buildings, components and machinery. Preventative maintenance reduces the possibility of costly emergency repairs or replacements.

Scheduled renewal items are those that assist the building in meeting current requirements, whether for increased personnel, updating to current standards or complying with new codes. Examples include providing more electrical outlets for current computer needs, energy upgrades, and modifications for code compliance, i.e., ADA and fuel tank upgrades, GFI circuit breakers, and upgrading building insulation.

Review the Project Inventory and Evaluation Report (PIER) and address the most damaging projects on the maintenance, renewal or replacement list. With the Alaska terrain and weather, the most costly of the maintenance projects are usually foundations, roofs and insulation. With the age of the buildings, more of these items need attention each year.

At the time it becomes more expensive to replace or renew facility components, the facility is removed from the PIER and placed on the major construction list for replacement of the total facility.

**Measure:**

**Air Guard & Army Guard - The change in the number of days lost due to facility-related accidents**

Sec 104(b)(2) Ch 124 SLA 2002(HB 515)

**Alaska's Target & Progress:**

The Alaska Air National Guard experienced no lost work due to facilities-related injuries in FY02. This is largely a result in aggressive safety programs at both ANG Wings.

**Benchmark Comparisons:**

There is no benchmark for this measure.

**Background and Strategies:**

The ideal is no lost days due to facility related accidents, which we achieve yearly. This may warrant further definition.

**Measure:**

**Air Guard & Army Guard - Expenditures and estimated cost savings related to energy efficiency measures applied to state and federal facilities**

Sec 104(b)(3) Ch 124 SLA 2002(HB 515)

**Alaska's Target & Progress:**

Army Guard:

The Army Guard target is a reduction in energy consumption of 30 % in MWH consumed per square foot by 2005. In the past five years, we have replaced light fixtures, electric motors, and installed mechanical system and lighting controls at our facilities, statewide. Data from some of the remote locations indicates reductions in electrical consumption of 24%.

Air Guard:

The Air Guard's goal is to have all structures meet the federally mandated guidelines by 2005.

Kulis Air National Guard Facility implemented several energy saving programs over the last three years with documented results. The information utilized for this conclusion comes from the Defense Utility Energy Reporting System (Duers), which takes several factors into consideration including megawatt hours used (MWH), cost, gross sq. ft., and facility population.

The amount of energy needed to heat a facility has drastically decreased with substantial energy savings realized. Although the price per barrel increased during this time period (FY00/01) energy savings still occurred. If the price per barrel remained at the FY 98/99 price, Kulis would have experienced 30-40 percent higher savings.

The cost per sq.ft. dropped from \$3.21 in FY98/99 to \$2.31 for FY00/01

The cost per person dropped from \$5.87 in FY98/99 to \$3.83 for FY00/01

Total MWH usage increased from FY98/99 to FY00/01 from 3,348 to 4,465, but because total sq.ft. increased from 355,082 to 404,555; the cost per sq.ft. for MWH changed from \$106.05 in FY98/99 to \$90.60 in FY00/01.

#### **Benchmark Comparisons:**

Actual consumption of utilities from prior years per facility compared to a baseline consumption from 1992.

#### **Background and Strategies:**

Army Guard:

As defined by the Cooperative Agreement, the Facilities and Maintenance Division is required to expend 2.5% of federal funding towards energy related projects. This amount plus special funding FMD acquired from the National Guard provided \$1,062.5 funding for projects in FFY01 and approximately \$602.7 was funded in FFY02. The Army Guard is currently implementing a Utility Management program that will provide more accurate data for future fiscal years.

Air Guard:

The Energy Policy Act of 1992 first established energy savings mandates for U.S. Federal agencies. Executive Order 12902 established the more aggressive mandate that by 2005, all U.S. Federal agencies must use 30 percent less energy per square foot in their buildings than they consumed in 1985. The Air Guard operates facilities at both ends of the energy-efficiency spectrum.

At Kulis ANGB, the average structure age is 19 years. All newer structures meet the same energy-efficiency design requirements as those at Eielson. Kulis has implemented several energy-savings programs, including the Green Light program (replacement of high-energy lamps with 34-watt bulbs and reduced-energy ballast), and Direct Digital Control (DDC) of heating, ventilating, and HVAC systems. New technology lighting has reaped savings of up to 42% in buildings similar to those at Kulis.

Winter extremes in Alaska hinder our ability to accurately interpret the effectiveness of cost-saving measures. In addition, Eielson does not purchase utilities from commercial providers. Because of this, the cost-per-unit of energy does not necessarily correlate with that experienced by Kulis.

#### **Measure:**

**Air Guard & Army Guard - The cost per square foot to operate and maintain Alaska National Guard facilities during a federal fiscal year**

Sec 104(b)(4) Ch 124 SLA 2002(HB 515)

#### **Alaska's Target & Progress:**

---

FY2004 Governor

3/20/03 10:48 AM

Department of Military and Veterans Affairs

Page 8

**Army Guard:** It depends on the type of facility and location, but on average \$6.64 is a statewide cost per square foot. This is based upon 250 buildings at 109 separate locations.

**Air Guard:**

Actual Cost:

Installation	Utility	Maintenance	Total
Kulis	\$1.45	\$3.39	\$4.84
Eielson	\$1.37(app)	\$3.80	\$5.17

**Benchmark Comparisons:**

Army Guard:

Comparison of square foot cost by facility type, (i.e. State Armories, Logistical Facilities, Training Sites, Federal Scout Armories).

**Background and Strategies:**

Army Guard:

The cost per square foot is based upon the amount of funding expended on projects, utilities, maintenance, etc for each given facility.

**Measure:**

**Alaska Military Youth Academy - Percentage of cadets who receive their high school diplomas or equivalencies by completion of Phase III.**

Sec 105(b)(1) Ch 124 SLA 2002(HB 515)

**Alaska's Target & Progress:**

Out of the 100 graduates from Class 01-1, 83.0% received their GED. Class 00-2 had 78% of its graduates receive a GED.

**Benchmark Comparisons:**

Nationwide average is 64.0% as reported in the National Guard Youth ChalleNGe Program Annual report, 2001.

**Background and Strategies:**

The primary focus of the educational portion of the Academy is to achieve educational excellence by utilizing a focused curriculum in writing skills, social studies, science, literature and arts, and mathematics. This is accomplished by using our certified military instructors, our partnership with the state certified teachers of the Alyeska Central School, and the use of our computer based learning programs.

**Measure:**

**Alaska Military Youth Academy - Percentage of cadets increasing English comprehension a minimum of one grade level at the completion of Phase II**

Sec 105(b)(2) Ch 124 SLA 2002(HB 515)

**Alaska's Target & Progress:**

Out of the 94 graduates from Class 02-1, 70% of the students increased their English comprehension by at least 1 year. On average, English comprehension increased by 1.5 grade levels over the period of 20 weeks. Out of the 96 graduates from Class 01-2, 80% of the students increased their English comprehension by at least 1 year. On average, English comprehension increased by 1.2 grade levels over the period of 22 weeks.

**Benchmark Comparisons:**

Nationwide average is 1.5 grade levels for English as reported in the National Guard Youth ChalleNGe Program Annual report, 2001.

**Background and Strategies:**

Students are measured for both English and math comprehension levels upon enrollment to the Academy at the beginning of week 3, using the Test of Adult Basic Education (TABE) examination. Students are measured again at week 22 utilizing the same test. Besides a curriculum in social studies and science, the Academy specifically focuses on writing skills, literature & arts, and mathematics. Through the dedication of our certified teachers and military instructors, as well as our partnership with the state certified teachers of the Alyeska Central School, and the use of our computer based learning programs, the Academy is making significant inroads towards increasing both the English and math skills of its' graduates.

**Measure:**

**Alaska Military Youth Academy - Percentage of cadets increasing math comprehension a minimum of one grade level at the completion of Phase II.**

Sec 105(b)(3) Ch 124 SLA 2002(HB 515)

**Alaska's Target & Progress:**

Out of the 94 graduates from Class 02-1, 70% of the students increased their math comprehension by at least 1 year. On average the math comprehension increased 2.0 grade levels over the period of 22 weeks. Out of the 96 graduates from Class 01-2, 80% of the students increased their math comprehension by at least 1 year. On average the math comprehension increased 2.0 grade levels over the period of 22 weeks.

**Benchmark Comparisons:**

Nationwide average is 1.8 grade levels for math as reported in the National Guard Youth ChalleNGe Program Annual report, 2001.

**Background and Strategies:**

Students are measured for both English and math comprehension levels upon enrollment to the Academy at the beginning of week 3, using the Test of Adult Basic Education (TABE) examination. Students are measured again at week 22 utilizing the same test. Besides a curriculum in social studies and science, the Academy specifically focuses on writing skills, literature & arts, and mathematics. Through the dedication of our certified teachers and military instructors, as well as our partnership with the state certified teachers of the Alyeska Central School, and the use of our computer based learning programs, the Academy is making significant inroads towards increasing both the English and math skills of its' graduates.

**Measure:**

**Alaska Military Youth Academy - Percentage of Cadets who graduate from Phase II.**

Sec 105(b)(4) Ch 124 SLA 2002(HB 515)

**Alaska's Target & Progress:**

The September 2002 graduation of Class 02-1 graduated 94 cadets. Class 02-1 had 85% of its enrolled cadets graduate (the same percentage as the previous classes).

**Benchmark Comparisons:**

The graduation target for the Alaska ChalleNGe Program, as established by the Cooperative Funding Agreement between the National Guard Bureau and the State of Alaska, dated October 1998, establishes a target graduation of 100 students per class.

**Background and Strategies:**

In order to graduate 100 students we register around 150 applicants in the 2 week Pre-ChalleNGe program, and of those an estimated 120 will remain in the program and are enrolled in the 20-week residential ChalleNGe Program. However, in order to maintain our goal of 100 graduates per class we need to increase our retention rate over the 20 week residential phase of the program.

**Measure:**

**Alaska Military Youth Academy - The percentage of cadets who are working or in school, including continuing education, one year after completion of Phase II.**

Sec 105(b)(5) Ch 124 SLA 2002(HB 515)

**Alaska's Target & Progress:**

Classes 00-2 and 01-1 have completed their 12-month post residential after care program phase and have a 90.0% and 95.0% success rate respectively. Class 01-2 graduated the residential phase February 15, 2002 and Class 02-01 graduated the residential phase September 6, 2002. Both classes are in their post residential after care program phase and success rate statistics are not yet available.

**Benchmark Comparisons:**

Nationwide average is 77% as reported in the National Guard Youth Challenge Program Annual report, 2001.

**Background and Strategies:**

Stressing the eight core program components during the 22 week residential phase, our interactive computer learning tools, the continued partnership with Alyeska Central School, and the introduction of the Workforce Investment Act program along with the Alaska Works Partnership program have provided excellent tools and means to enhance the graduates' ability to maintain the initial success level well beyond their post residential program phase. These programs are critical to the placement of cadets into meaningful careers or employment.

Our nationally recognized mentoring program has been the recipient of several awards. Mentors are an integral part of the overall success of our graduates. They serve as role models, friends, and tutors to the cadets during Phase I and Phase II of the program.

**Measure:**

**Alaska Military Youth Academy - Cost of the program per registered cadet.**

Sec 105(b)(6) Ch 124 SLA 2002(HB 515)

**Alaska's Target & Progress:**

A total of 268 cadets registered during FY02 at a total cost per cadet of \$17,796.

**Benchmark Comparisons:**

Mt. Edgecumbe Boarding School is the only other state operated residential high school in Alaska. Mt. Edgecumbe runs on a traditional semester system and has students in-residence for about nine months out of the year. They graduate about 50 students per year and enroll approximately 200 students at the beginning of the school year. Mt. Edgecumbe's operating budget is \$4,400,800. This is an approximate cost of \$22,000 per registered student (as reported by the Mt. Edgecumbe Registrar's office).

**Background and Strategies:**

As a result of SB345, the Department of Education shall allocate funding for the AMYA program in an amount equal to the base student allocation (\$4,010) multiplied by seven (\$28,070) for each student and the basic student allocation (\$4,010) multiplied by 6/10 (\$2,406) for each nonresidential student, minus the amount received by the program in federal matching funds. The determination of the number of residential and nonresidential students shall be made by the department on October 1 of the prior year.

**Measure:**

**STARBASE - Conduct a minimum of 700 hours of classroom contact in state fiscal year 2004**

**Alaska's Target & Progress:**

Alaska is fully prepared to achieve this target, based on class bookings since this school year started.

**Benchmark Comparisons:**

Department of Defense Instruction 1025.7, Section 6.6 states that STARBASE Academies shall offer 700 hours of classroom contact per year. A representative from ManTech (the consulting and data collection company that oversees the STARBASE programs nationwide) states that most new programs take up to two years to reach this objective.

**Background and Strategies:**

A 4 day program is run during the normal school year, with students attending for 5 hours per day. This comes to a total of 20 contact hours per class. Thirty-five classes are required to maintain this performance measure (140 school days). STARBASE has been fully booked since starting the program and fully expects demand to rise.

**Measure:**

**STARBASE - Increase awareness and demand for STARBASE services**

**Alaska's Target & Progress:**

Fourteen separate classes of students have been scheduled in the first semester that STARBASE has been open. As more students participate, word of mouth advertising will increase awareness of the program. Requests for classes have been received from the 21<sup>st</sup> Century Community Schools Program, Matanuska-Susitna Borough, Alyeska Central School District, and the Unalakleet-Bering Strait School District.

**Benchmark Comparisons:**

Since STARBASE is a new program, we have no comparisons at this time.

**Background and Strategies:**

Partnership with the Anchorage School District at the conception of STARBASE program has resulted in a close working relationship that is mutually beneficial. Strong ties with the school district have fostered a good client base, and given STARBASE the ability to reach further a field for Summer Schools and special classes.

**Alaska National Guard  
BRU Financial Summary by Component**

*All dollars in thousands*

	FY2002 Actuals				FY2003 Authorized				FY2004 Governor			
	General Funds	Federal Funds	Other Funds	Total Funds	General Funds	Federal Funds	Other Funds	Total Funds	General Funds	Federal Funds	Other Funds	Total Funds
<b><u>Formula Expenditures</u></b>	None.											
<b><u>Non-Formula Expenditures</u></b>												
Office of the Commissioner	1,249.2	339.8	382.8	1,971.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1,154.8	390.1	259.3	1,804.2
National Guard Military Hdqtrs	282.9	0.0	0.0	282.9	340.2	203.8	0.0	544.0	226.8	0.0	0.0	226.8
Army Guard Facilities Maint.	2,436.1	6,992.3	760.1	10,188.5	2,471.3	8,491.9	897.4	11,860.6	2,278.9	8,801.3	846.5	11,926.7
Air Guard Facilities Maint.	973.9	3,981.0	0.0	4,954.9	991.1	4,746.1	0.0	5,737.2	1,040.5	5,029.0	0.0	6,069.5
State Active Duty	0.0	0.0	98.0	98.0	0.0	0.0	320.0	320.0	0.0	0.0	320.0	320.0
Alaska Military Youth Academy	1,536.6	2,385.3	1,018.9	4,940.8	181.3	2,149.6	3,269.6	5,600.5	0.0	2,168.4	3,860.2	6,028.6
STARBASE	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	258.7	0.0	258.7	0.0	295.6	0.0	295.6
<b>Totals</b>	<b>6,478.7</b>	<b>13,698.4</b>	<b>2,259.8</b>	<b>22,436.9</b>	<b>3,983.9</b>	<b>15,850.1</b>	<b>4,487.0</b>	<b>24,321.0</b>	<b>4,701.0</b>	<b>16,684.4</b>	<b>5,286.0</b>	<b>26,671.4</b>

**Alaska National Guard**  
**Proposed Changes in Levels of Service for FY2004**

See specific detail at component level.

**Alaska National Guard**  
**Summary of BRU Budget Changes by Component**  
**From FY2003 Authorized to FY2004 Governor**

*All dollars in thousands*

	<u>General Funds</u>	<u>Federal Funds</u>	<u>Other Funds</u>	<u>Total Funds</u>
<b>FY2003 Authorized</b>	<b>3,983.9</b>	<b>15,850.1</b>	<b>4,487.0</b>	<b>24,321.0</b>
<b>Adjustments which will continue current level of service:</b>				
-Office of the Commissioner	5.6	2.3	6.2	14.1
-National Guard Military Hdqtrs	-113.4	0.0	0.0	-113.4
-Army Guard Facilities Maint.	0.0	20.5	0.8	21.3
-Air Guard Facilities Maint.	113.4	24.8	0.0	138.2
-Alaska Military Youth Academy	-181.3	18.8	21.2	-141.3
-STARBASE	0.0	1.9	0.0	1.9
<b>Proposed budget decreases:</b>				
-Office of the Commissioner	0.0	0.0	-91.7	-91.7
-National Guard Military Hdqtrs	0.0	-203.8	0.0	-203.8
-Army Guard Facilities Maint.	-192.4	-40.1	-51.7	-284.2
-Air Guard Facilities Maint.	-150.0	0.0	0.0	-150.0
<b>Proposed budget increases:</b>				
-Office of the Commissioner	105.0	0.0	55.7	160.7
-Army Guard Facilities Maint.	0.0	329.0	0.0	329.0
-Air Guard Facilities Maint.	86.0	258.1	0.0	344.1
-Alaska Military Youth Academy	0.0	0.0	569.4	569.4
-STARBASE	0.0	35.0	0.0	35.0
<b>FY2004 Governor</b>	<b>4,701.0</b>	<b>16,684.4</b>	<b>5,286.0</b>	<b>26,671.4</b>