

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

**Department of Fish and Game
Administration and Support
Budget Request Unit Budget Summary**

Administration and Support Budget Request Unit

Contact: Kevin Brooks, Director

Tel: (907) 465-5999 **Fax:** (907) 465-6078 **E-mail:** Kevin_Brooks@fishgame.state.ak.us

BRU Mission

The Administration and Support BRU includes nine components: Commissioner's Office, Public Communications, Administrative Services, Boards of Fisheries and Game, Advisory Committees, State Subsistence, EVOS Trustee Council, State Facilities Maintenance, and State Facilities Rent.

Because of the number and diversity of functions included in this BRU, the mission, services provided, goals and strategies, key issues, and major accomplishments of each are contained in the component summary portion of the budget.

BRU Services Provided

See component information.

BRU Goals and Strategies

See component information.

Key BRU Issues for FY2003 – 2004

See component information.

Major BRU Accomplishments in 2002

See component information.

Key Performance Measures for FY2004

Measure:

The total number of vendor payments made within 30 days or less compared to the total number of vendor payments.

Sec 72.b.1 Ch 124 SLA 2002(HB 515)

Alaska's Target & Progress:

The Department of Fish and Game processed a total of 90,419 invoices for payment during FY02. 83% or 75,378 were processed within 30 days. 17% or 15,041 were processed in 30+ days. Overall, the department's average payment time was 21 days.

Benchmark Comparisons:

AS 37.05.285 requires that payment for purchases of goods or services must be made by the date specified by contract or within 30 days after receipt of a proper billing.

Background and Strategies:

State agencies should make timely payments to outside vendors with whom they do business.

Measure:

The number and percentage of fish and game licenses sold through an automated process.

Sec 72.b.2. Ch 124 SLA 2002(HB 515)

Alaska's Target & Progress:

The department sold 15,800 licenses, tags and stamps over the Internet in 2002, generating approximately \$1.3 million in revenue. This represents 2.4% of the total licenses sold, and 6.4% of the revenue. The Internet "store" generated the highest revenue of any single vendor.

In 2001, the department sold 12,424 pieces of stock over the Internet, generating \$1,029.2 in revenue.

Benchmark Comparisons:

Because this is a relatively new service offering, there is no benchmark level of sales to compare. The department expects sales to increase, but it is impossible to determine where they will level off.

Sales will be limited as long as we need to put a license in the mail. If there was a "paperless" option in place that enabled an individual to hunt or fish right away, Internet purchases would be much more attractive. A change of this nature would require a statutory revision.

Background and Strategies:

Alaska sells approximately 800,000 licenses, tags and stamps each year, generating revenue to the Fish and Game fund of over \$22 million. There are 1,300 active license vendors, but the top 20% account for 80% of all sales. Vendors retain a 5% commission, plus they receive \$1 per item sold as additional compensation. The state pays about \$1.9 million each year in compensation.

The Internet site has been available to the public for three years and has been very well received. It is an enhanced customer service that also saves the state money. Individuals can purchase their license using a credit card, and department staff mail the license the next business day.

Measure:

The number of issues that the Boards of Fisheries and Game must consider out of cycle.

Sec 72.b.3 Ch 124 SLA 2002(HB 515)

Alaska's Target & Progress:

During 2002, the Board of Fisheries accepted four out of twelve agenda change requests. This compares to two out of 17 in 2001, four out of 17 in 2000, nine out of 21 in 1999, and 14 out of 37 in 1998.

During 2002, the Board of Game accepted one agenda change request. For comparison, the Board of Game accepted six agenda change requests in 2001, one in 2000, three in 1999, and four in 1998.

Benchmark Comparisons:

This performance measure does not lend itself to comparisons with other agencies or jurisdictions because it measures progress in staying within the preplanned regulatory cycles specific for Alaska's fisheries and wildlife.

Background and Strategies:

Background: The public, state advisory committees, and the department plan and budget for each board's preplanned regulatory cycle (two years for Board of Game and three years for Board of Fisheries). The public has come to rely upon the consistency of the regulatory review time periods, and the two-year and three-year cycles provide an opportunity to experience a stable regulatory environment. To take up issues out of cycle may cause additional expense for the department and may be an additional burden for the public and state's advisory committee system.

Strategies: The Board of Fisheries has put into regulation its criteria for accepting agenda change requests in order to reduce the number of "off-cycle" issues it takes up each year; the department is encouraging the Board of Game to review its criteria. While agenda change requests are important to both boards in order to correct unforeseen effects of a regulation, etc., the department encourages each board to minimize the number of issues taken up out of the normal meeting cycle.

Measure:

The number and percentage of advisory committees from a region that meet in a year that the board cycles through their region.

Sec 72.b.4 Ch 124 SLA 2002(HB 515)

Alaska's Target & Progress:

In 2002, the Board of Fisheries considered changes to fisheries regulations for the Cook Inlet and Kodiak regions, and for king and Tanner crab fisheries statewide. The Board of Game considered Arctic and Interior regions issues. State advisory committees hold meetings when the boards are scheduled to consider their area. In all, 46 out of 81 advisory committees were able to hold meetings for these board issues. The table below provides a breakout by region.

	<u># of Advisory Committees</u>	<u># That Met</u>	<u>Percentage</u>
• Southeast	23	1	4%
• Southcentral	17	16	94%
• Southwest	12	5	42%
• Interior	15	14	93%
• Western	4	4	100%
• Arctic	10	6	60%

Benchmark Comparisons:

This performance measure does not lend itself to comparison with other agencies or other states, as a state-funded advisory committee system is unique to Alaska.

Background and Strategies:

Background: The state's advisory committee system is designed to provide a local forum for input into the fisheries and wildlife regulatory boards.

Strategies: The department will continue to keep the advisory committees informed of upcoming board meetings and issues and encourage each advisory committee to meet when boards meet in their areas and where budget allows.

Measure:

The average time taken to respond to complaints and questions that have been elevated to the commissioner's office.

Sec 72.b.5 Ch 124 SLA 2002(HB 515)

Alaska's Target & Progress:

During FY2002, the Commissioner's Office responded to 225 pieces of correspondence in an average of twenty-three days. During the first quarter of FY2003, the Commissioner's Office replied to 45 pieces of correspondence in an average of nineteen days.

Benchmark Comparisons:

The Commissioner's Office attempts to respond to all correspondence within two weeks.

Measure:

Number and percentage of Alaska communities in each region for which fisheries harvest data are collected and reported.

Sec 73.b.1 Ch 124 SLA 2002(HB 515)

Alaska's Target & Progress:

	<u>Total Communities</u>	<u>Number Collected</u>	<u>Percentage</u>
• Southeast	34	3	9%
• Southcentral	34	28	82%
• Southwest	41	30	73%
• Interior	43	40	93%
• Western	50	40	80%
• Northwest	26	18	69%
• Arctic	7	3	43%

Benchmark Comparisons:

This performance measure does not lend itself to comparisons with other agencies or jurisdictions because Alaska is the only state with a subsistence priority law.

Background and Strategies:

Subsistence salmon fisheries harvest data are collected annually in certain regions of the state (Western, Interior, Southwest, Northwest) and sporadically in other parts, as funding and project schedules allow. The regions with annual assessment generally are those with the greatest dependence on key species, such as salmon. Harvest information for other regions is collected as multiple purpose projects are activated. The aim is to develop a schedule of regional updates of harvest data, as resources are available. The division maintains a statewide subsistence harvest assessment report that contributes to the statewide harvest report of all uses.

Measure:

Number and percentage of Alaska communities in each region for which wildlife harvest data are collected and reported.

Sec 73.b.2 Ch 124 SLA 2002(HB 515)

Alaska's Target & Progress:

	<u>Total Communities</u>	<u>Number Collected</u>	<u>Percentage</u>
• Southeast	34	0	0%
• Southcentral	34	5	15%
• Southwest	41	17	41%
• Interior	43	17	40%
• Western	50	0	0%
• Northwest	26	5	19%
• Arctic	7	3	43%

Benchmark Comparisons:

This performance measure does not lend itself to comparisons with other agencies or jurisdictions because Alaska is the only state with a subsistence priority law.

Background and Strategies:

Subsistence wildlife harvest data are collected annually in certain regions of the state (Southwest, Interior, and Arctic) and sporadically in other parts, as funding and project schedules allow. The regions with annual assessment generally are those for which funding is available due to controversial or allocation concerns, such as big game in the Interior. The aim is to develop a schedule of regional updates of harvest data, as resources are available. Harvest information for other regions is collected as multiple purpose projects are activated.

Measure:

Number and percentage of subsistence proposals at meetings of the Board of Fisheries and the Board of Game for which subsistence data are assessed and recommendations are made.

Sec 73.b.3 Ch 124 SLA 2002(HB 515)

Alaska's Target & Progress:

<u>Board of Fisheries</u>	<u>Total Proposals</u>	<u>Subsistence Proposals</u>	<u>Percentage</u>
• Lower Cook Inlet	43	1	2%
• Upper Cook Inlet	111	15	14%
• Kodiak/Chignik	110	4	4%
• Statewide King & Tanner Crab	96	4	4%

<u>Board of Game</u>	<u>Total Proposals</u>	<u>Subsistence Proposals</u>	<u>Percentage</u>
• Western & Arctic	39	34	87%
• Interior	175	130	74%
• Statewide	62	30	48%

Benchmark Comparisons:

This performance measure does not lend itself to comparisons with other agencies or jurisdictions because Alaska is the only state with a subsistence priority law.

Background and Strategies:

Subsistence data from harvest assessment projects are used to analyze impacts of subsistence proposals to the Boards of Fisheries and Game. There are some areas or issues for which the division has not collected data or the data is outdated due to regulatory changes in the intervening years or uses are known to have changed but details are unknown. The division attempts to anticipate information needs of the boards and public through extensive public contacts such as local fish and game advisory committees and local harvest monitors. This information is useful to plan research priorities and schedules to address these issues as each board responds to public proposals. The goal is to have current subsistence information for every proposal that comes before each board.

Measure:

Number of proposed statutory and regulatory changes by federal and other state entities for which subsistence data are assessed and recommendations are made.

Sec 73.b.4 Ch 124 SLA 2002(HB 515)

Alaska's Target & Progress:

For state regulatory proposal and changes, see previous measure. Resolution of the state's subsistence dilemma in the form of a proposed constitutional amendment allowing a rural preference for the subsistence priority was the only statutory proposal for which subsistence data were used. In the most recent regulatory cycle, there were 46 wildlife proposals and 44 fisheries proposals to the Federal Subsistence Board for regulatory change. Subsistence data were used in analysis and comments on all the proposals to the federal program. The federal program does not conduct research; it relies on the state's subsistence information.

Benchmark Comparisons:

This performance measure does not lend itself to comparisons with other agencies or jurisdictions because Alaska is the only state with a subsistence priority law.

Background and Strategies:

Subsistence data from harvest assessment projects are used to analyze impacts of subsistence proposals to the Boards of Fisheries and Game and the Federal Subsistence Board. There are some areas or issues for which the division has not collected data or the data is outdated due to regulatory changes in the intervening years or uses are known to have changed but details are unknown. The division attempts to anticipate information needs of the boards and public through extensive public contacts such as local fish and game advisory committees, federal subsistence regional advisory councils, and local harvest monitors. This information is useful to plan research priorities and schedules to address these issues as each board responds to public proposals. The goal is to have current subsistence information for every proposal that comes before each board.

**Administration and Support
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
<u>Formula Expenditures</u>												
None.												
<u>Non-Formula Expenditures</u>												
Commissioner's Office	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	565.4	229.3	118.9	913.6
Public Communications	0.0	0.0	79.2	79.2	0.0	0.0	136.9	136.9	0.0	0.0	108.7	108.7
Administrative Services	912.8	1,299.8	4,174.4	6,387.0	994.6	1,067.4	3,243.4	5,305.4	974.7	1,324.2	3,339.1	5,638.0
Boards of Fisheries and Game	746.0	13.2	169.9	929.1	759.2	337.5	169.9	1,266.6	725.8	162.5	169.9	1,058.2
Advisory Committees	371.5	0.0	48.4	419.9	377.3	180.0	0.0	557.3	232.8	105.0	0.0	337.8
State Subsistence	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	224.1	2,253.5	1,977.4	4,455.0	1,024.9	2,121.3	1,131.8	4,278.0
EVOS Trustee Council	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	3,781.4	3,881.4
State Facilities Maintenance	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1,008.8	1,008.8
F&G State Facilities Rent	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	193.6	0.0	81.6	275.2
Totals	2,030.3	1,313.0	4,471.9	7,815.2	2,355.2	3,838.4	5,527.6	11,721.2	3,717.2	4,042.3	9,740.2	17,499.7

Administration and Support

Proposed Changes in Levels of Service for FY2004

The Commissioner's Office has been moved to the Administrative and Support BRU in order to streamline the budget process and internal budgeting and accounting for the Commissioner's Office.

Due to the reorganization of the Division of Habitat, the EVOS component has also been moved to the Administration and Support BRU, under the direction of the Commissioner's Office, and will be known as the EVOS Trustee Council component. Administrative savings are included in the Boards, Advisory Committees, Administrative Services and Subsistence components.

Administration and Support

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>
FY2003 Authorized	2,355.2	3,838.4	5,527.6	11,721.2
Adjustments which will continue current level of service:				
-Commissioner's Office	3.0	1.6	29.9	34.5
-Public Communications	0.0	0.0	-28.2	-28.2
-Administrative Services	0.4	256.8	23.2	280.4
-Boards of Fisheries and Game	1.8	-175.0	0.0	-173.2
-Advisory Committees	0.0	-75.0	0.0	-75.0
-State Subsistence	800.8	-132.2	-645.6	23.0
-EVOS Trustee Council	0.0	0.0	3,681.4	3,681.4
Proposed budget decreases:				
-Administrative Services	-20.3	0.0	0.0	-20.3
-Boards of Fisheries and Game	-35.2	0.0	0.0	-35.2
-Advisory Committees	-144.5	0.0	0.0	-144.5
-State Subsistence	0.0	0.0	-200.0	-200.0
Proposed budget increases:				
-Administrative Services	0.0	0.0	72.5	72.5
-EVOS Trustee Council	0.0	100.0	100.0	200.0
-F&G State Facilities Rent	11.8	0.0	0.0	11.8
FY2004 Governor	3,717.2	4,042.3	9,740.2	17,499.7