

State of Alaska
FY2002 Governor's Operating Budget
Performance Measures

Department of Military and Veterans Affairs

Department of Military and Veterans Affairs

Key Performance Measures for FY2002

Measure: Increase Guard members' educational level

(Not yet addressed by Legislature.)

Current Status:

In FY2001 the \$100,000 of University tuition wavers was fully obligated for the fall semester. The success rate of this training will be known once the semester is completed in early January 2001.

Benchmark:

Members of the Guard will complete mandatory educational requirements for promotion and retention. 100% of authorized positions filled due to success in recruitment and retention.

Background and Strategies:

Guard members received \$28,500 in state tuition assistance and \$100,000 in University of Alaska tuition waivers to assist Guard members in improving their educational levels. \$100,000 was obligated for the fall semester of 2000 demonstrating the need for this important program. However, demand outweighs the resources available to reach all members desiring to upgrade their educational levels. Only 126 soldiers in the Air and Army Guard received tuition waivers for the 2000 fall semester. During FY 2000, 51 Guard members received tuition assistance from the state. Most were enlisted members pursuing a degree program.

The strategies to reach our goal of increased educational levels within the Guard are to:

- Work with the University of Alaska to establish a partnership focused on enhancing Guard members' education levels.
- Make information pertaining to military and civilian education opportunities available to Guard members through a variety of communication channels in order to encourage Guard members to pursue their educational goals.
- Seek to establish Distance Learning sites at National Guard Readiness Centers to facilitate training/education.
- Facilitate expansion of Junior ROTC programs into rural schools to instill awareness and a desire for education skills.
- Target Rural Areas - such as the Yukon, Kuskokwim, Norton Sound Areas (Project Renew Hope).

Measure: The percentage reduction in accrued deferred maintenance projects

(Developed jointly with Legislature in FY2000.)

Current Status:

The Deferred Maintenance backlog is \$26.1 million (\$19 million Army Guard and \$7.1 million Air Guard) as of July 2000. With available resources, it is unlikely DMVA will achieve a 5% reduction in the backlog.

Benchmark:

Warranty and manufacturer's guides are used for replacement and renewal of building components. The building replacement benchmark is 50 years for NGB facilities, based upon the Federal contract agreement. The benchmark for retro-fitting buildings for energy conservation is 25 years.

Background and Strategies:

The average age of the buildings for the Alaska Army National Guard is 27 years old as of FY99. The oldest buildings are Training Sites averaging 34 years and State Armories at 31 years.

Scheduled Renewal category items will assist in determining current requirements for buildings, whether for accommodating additional personnel or complying with new codes. Examples would be, more electrical outlets for current computer needs, energy upgrades, enlarge a building for expansion, code compliance i.e., ADA & fuel tank upgrades, GFI circuit breakers; and even insulation for a building.

Scheduled Replacement deals with the life expectancy of a part or building. Included are the following: roofs - life expectancy 20 years, boiler - life 25 years, carpets - life 7 years. Many of these items also involve preventative maintenance to reach that specific life expectancy.

NGB regulations inform us that if a project exceeds 50% of the building's replacement value, NGB will no longer provide federal funds for the building.

Strategies include:

Performing Preventive Maintenance in accordance with manufacturer recommendations to extend the life expectancy of various buildings, components and machinery. Preventive Maintenance also decreases the likelihood of costly emergency replacements.

Review the National Guard Bureau, Project Inventory Report (PIER) and address the projects on the maintenance, renewal or replacement list, which if not addressed, are likely to result in the most facility damage. 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: Successfully apply Alaska Emergency Management System to 2 actual or simulated incidents involving state and borough offices including the activation of state interagency incident management teams.

(Revised from Legislature's FY2000 version.)

Current Status:

In FY2001 the Alaska Emergency Management System has not yet been applied. We will schedule simulations later in the fiscal year.

Benchmark:

The draft National Emergency Management Association recommendation for exercising state emergency management systems is twice yearly.

Background and Strategies:

Responded to two real incidents in SFY00 and exercised the system during the Y2K Millennium Turnover. From these events DES identified areas for improvement based on after action reviews.

Measure: Maintain the rate of success at 85% for Military Youth Academy graduates in school, or at work one year after graduation from the program

(Revised from Legislature's FY2000 version.)

Current Status:

Classes 99-1 and 99-2 have completed their 12-month post residential after care program phase and have a 90.5% and 91.2% success rate respectively. Class 99-3 graduated the residential phase March 24, 2000, and Class 00-1 graduated the residential phase September 15, 2000. Both classes are in their post residential after care program phase and success rate statistics are not yet available.

Benchmark:

Nation-wide average is 83% as reported in the National Guard Youth Challenge Program Annual Report 1999.

Background and Strategies:

Stressing the eight core components during the 22 week residential phase, using interactive computer teaming tools; continuing the partnership with Alyeska Central School; and introducing the Workforce Investment and the Step-up Initiative apprentice-training programs all provide excellent tools and means to improve the graduates' ability to

maintain their initial success level well beyond the post residential phase. These programs are critical to the placement of cadets into meaningful careers or employment.

Measure: No loss of life associated with AKANG SAR tasked missions

(Not yet addressed by Legislature.)

Current Status:

As of November no loss of life associated with AKANG SAR missions in FY01. In FY00 1576 hours were flown supporting 923 sorties, 126 lives were saved and 64 assists were performed, no lives were lost during these rescues.

Benchmark:

Maintain mission readiness in search and rescue (SAR) operations that results in increased responsiveness and zero loss of life in rescue operations.

Background and Strategies:

The Alaska Air National Guard (AKANG) operates the 11th Air Force Rescue Coordination Center (RCC) and the 210th Rescue Squadron. These two entities provide the highest level of SAR coordination and response in the United States. Because of the vast area and ruggedness of Alaska, activities of the AKANG operations are high. Both the RCC and 210th are designated as federal units assigned against federal military missions. However, the majority of operational missions are conducted in support of state SAR requirements.

Alaska is a rugged state with a significantly higher than average percentage of population that is involved in civil aviation. Additionally, Alaska is a popular tourist destination for visitors that seek a wilderness experience. Because of this, Alaska has a much higher rate of incidents that require SAR than any other state in the nation. The AKANG RCC and 210th Rescue Squadron serve a valuable purpose in providing an essential safety factor.

Air Guard strategy to reach our goal is to build upon the successes of the past year, to include developing a closer relationship with both federal and state agencies which rely on AKANG services for SAR. The AKANG plans to enhance the effectiveness of SAR in Alaska by realigning the RCC with the 176th Wing to provide greater efficiencies between that unit and the 210th Rescue Squadron. Increased interaction with Alaska Division of Emergency Services and the Alaska State Troopers will provide an ability to harness a more rapid response for state contingencies. In addition, as the United States Coast Guard (USCG) further reduces SAR operations in Alaska, the AKANG will be prepared to undertake those missions formerly handled by the USCG. Finally, increasing international activities that provide economic benefit to the state will be pursued, such as was accomplished with the SAR exercise operation in Seward between US, Canadian, and Russian SAR experts.

Status of FY2001 Performance Measures

	<i>Achieved</i>	<i>On track</i>	<i>Too soon to tell</i>	<i>Not likely to achieve</i>	<i>Needs modification</i>
● Increase Guard members's educational level		X			
● Reduce deferred maintenance backlog by 5%				X	
● Successfully apply Alaska Emergency Management System to 2 actual or simulated incidents involving state and borough offices including the activation of state interagency incident management teams.		X			
● Maintain the rate of success at 85% for Military Youth Academy graduates in school, or at work one year after graduation from the program		X			
● No loss of life associated with AKANG SAR tasked missions.		X			

Disaster Planning & Control

Key Performance Measures for FY2002

Measure: Preparedness as measured by after action reports

(Added by Legislature in FY2000 version.)

Current Status:

On track

Background and Strategies:

The Division of Emergency Services traditionally uses the after action reports to identify if improvements can be made to response efforts. Identified improvements are incorporated into plans as needed.

Measure: Average time to close out disasters

(Added by Legislature in FY2000 version.)

Benchmark:

Each Disaster will have a different time frame for close out depending on the size of the disaster and the number of people and communities involved.

The overall objective is to close the disasters as soon as possible so the impacted parties will have closure and any remaining funds will be returned to the Federal Government or to the Disaster Relief Fund.

Background and Strategies:

The Division of Emergency Services is placing a greater emphasis on closure of disasters. At the present time the Division is working with FEMA to close Southcentral Flood and Millers Reach. Closure will occur in the next few months. The Southcentral Flood occurred in 1995 and Miller's Reach in 1996, five and four years duration respectively. The 1999 Coastal Storm Avalanche disaster will be closed within an estimated 18 months.

Measure: Number of persons assisted

(Added by Legislature in FY2000 version.)

Background and Strategies:

This measure needs additional discussion with the Legislature. On one level, the Division works with communities statewide to plan response to various types of threats. In addition, the Division maintains emergency alerts systems that benefit each citizen of the state. Evaluated at this level, the number of persons assisted would equal the population of the State.

On another level, the Division, during an actual response to an event, assists each resident in the area that has been impacted and also the community in the disaster area. In these situations, a lesser number of individuals are assisted.

Measure: Number of lives saved

(Added by Legislature in FY2000 version.)

Background and Strategies:

More discussion with the legislature is required in order for the Division to properly report on this measure. The Division works on a community level on planning, response and recovery. It is difficult to determine how many lives the Division saves when the mission is to assist communities in the local response. Community level response (police, fire fighters etc) are in a position to actually save a life.

Measure: Update/revise the State Emergency Operations Plan (EOP). Add evacuation/sheltering, animal assistance/control and donation management functions.

(Revised from Legislature's FY2000 version.)

Current Status:

The State EOP was promulgated in 1994. Although still in use in SFY00, it needs to be updated/revise to make it consistent with current emergency management practice and the lessons learned from recent State disasters.

Benchmark:

The FEMA Capability Assessment for Readiness includes detailed guidelines for State Emergency Operations Plans.

Background and Strategies:

The content of the State EOP needs to be revised to reflect current State Emergency Coordination Center (SECC) organization, SECC preparedness levels and Disaster Policy Cabinet (DPC) organization, etc. Because of the lessons learned in the 94 Fall Flood Disaster, the 95 South Central Storm Disaster, the 96 Miller's Reach Disaster and the recent Western Alaska Fisheries Disasters the Division has a clear idea of the revisions that need to be made to the State EOP. What needs to happen now is for the Division to draft a revised EOP, coordinate/staff it with its State, Federal, local, private sector and volunteer agency partners, obtain executive level approval, and then publish and distribute it.

Measure: Successfully apply Alaska Emergency Management System to two actual or simulated incidents involving State and borough offices including the activation of State Interagency Incident Management Teams.

(Not yet addressed by Legislature.)

Current Status:

On Track in SFY00

Benchmark:

The Draft National Emergency Management Association recommendation for the exercising state emergency management systems is twice yearly.

Background and Strategies:

Responded to two real incidents to date in SFY00 and will exercise the system during the Y2K Millennium Turnover. From these events DES will identify areas for improvement for SFY01.

Measure: Develop an emergency warning system that is incorporated into the State Emergency Operations Plan with a regular schedule for testing and maintenance of the system.

(Not yet addressed by Legislature.)

Current Status:

Basic Warning annex included in the State Emergency Operations Plan in SFY00 needs revisions to reflect changes in the State Emergency Management System. A regular testing schedule is not currently available.

Benchmark:

The Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA), State Capability Assessment for Readiness (CAR) identifies benchmarks recommended for all State Emergency Management systems. The CAR indicates that all states should have emergency warning addressed in the State Plan with a regular schedule for testing and Maintenance of the system.

Background and Strategies:

The State is currently working with Tsunami Mitigation Funding to improve tsunami warning and preparedness statewide. This program provides for tsunami run-up mapping and warning sings for selected communities and the development of a tsunami warning exercise program. Since Tsunami's are the number one warning hazard in the State this will provide the foundation of work to meet this performance measure.

Measure: Develop deployment procedures for a Weapons of Mass Destruction (WMD) Response Team and identify State agency and local jurisdiction's response resource capabilities.

(Not yet addressed by Legislature.)

Current Status:

The State does not have a WMD response team in SFY00 but has obtained funding for a federal "RAID" team. The State is also in the process of applying for a federal grant that will provide response resource equipment to local jurisdictions.

Benchmark:

The FEMA State Capability Assessment for Readiness (CAR) identifies benchmarks recommended for all State Emergency Management systems. The CAR indicates that all states should have deployment procedures for a WMD Response Team and have adequate resources at the State and local jurisdictions to respond to a WMD incident.

Background and Strategies:

With the increase in domestic terrorist events the federal government has encouraged State's to improve their capabilities to respond and recover from WMD events in the future.

Measure: Develop Key functions for Disaster Recovery Centers and identify staff trained to assist with disaster applications.

(Not yet addressed by Legislature.)

Current Status:

As of SFY00 the State has identified functions and staff to assist in past disaster application centers and will apply lessons learned from these incidents to develop procedures and training for future responses.

Benchmark:

The FEMA State Capability Assessment for Readiness (CAR) identifies benchmarks recommended for all State Emergency Management systems. The CAR indicates that all states should identify key functions for Disaster Recovery Centers to include the identification of trained staff from State, local private and volunteer resources.

Background and Strategies:

In past operations the Disaster Recovery Center has been a key link to those suffering from the impact of disasters and our ability to assist them in the recovery process. Several unique issues in Alaska require extensive planning for effective Disaster Recovery Center Operations, such as language barriers, remote locations and the involvement of native organizations in our partnerships for recovery.

Status of FY2001 Performance Measures

	<i>Achieved</i>	<i>On track</i>	<i>Too soon to tell</i>	<i>Not likely to achieve</i>	<i>Needs modification</i>
● Preparedness as measured by the "after action" reports.			X		
● The average time to close out disasters.		X			
● The number of persons assisted and lives saved.		X			
● The number of updates to the State Emergency Plan.		X			
● Successfully apply Alaska Emergency Management System to two actual or simulated incidents involving State and borough offices including the activation of State Interagency Incident Management Teams.		X			

	<i>Achieved</i>	<i>On track</i>	<i>Too soon to tell</i>	<i>Not likely to achieve</i>	<i>Needs modification</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Develop an emergency warning system that is incorporated into the State Emergency Operations Plan with a regular schedule for testing and maintenance of the system. 					X
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Update/revise the State Emergency Operations Plan (EOP). Add evacuation/sheltering, animal assistance/control and donation management functions. 					X
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Develop deployment procedures for a Weapons of Mass Destruction (WMD) Response Team and identify State agency and local jurisdiction's response resource capabilities. 					X
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Develop Key functions for Disaster Recovery Centers and identify staff trained to assist with disaster applications. 					X

Office of the Commissioner

Key Performance Measures for FY2002

Measure: The percentage of divisions that meet assigned performance measures

(Added by Legislature in FY2000 version.)

Current Status:

Progress is made to define and implement procedures and reporting for the department's performance measures according to SB281.

Benchmark:

No benchmark is established - we will report to the legislature the progress of performance measures, and modifications we see are needed.

Background and Strategies:

The DMVA has certain federal performance measures and some of these are classified so we can not openly report against them, even though we are achieving the intended outcomes. A formal reporting mechanism will be established in FY01.

Measure: The reductions in per unit costs in the department's divisions.

(Added by Legislature in FY2000 version.)

Current Status:

There is no definition of a unit - so we recommend that this measure be deleted as we can not report against this.

Benchmark:

We suggest this measure be deleted. Our salaries are negotiated with the Unions. The missions of each on of our divisions are different and to report on the average cost per disaster, or the average cost per AMYA graduate, or the average cost for an air or army guard facility maintenance is not meaningful as there are too many variables.

Background and Strategies:

This measure is difficult to report on as there was no definition of the unit. We recommend this measure be better defined or dropped.

Measure: (Admin Services) The cost of administrative services as compared to the total personnel costs for the department.

(Added by Legislature in FY2000 version.)

Background and Strategies:

A standard way to measure the level of administrative services is its cost in relation to the department's personnel 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 a low as possible and provide the best quality of service with the funding and staffing provided. The division's statistics are FY 96, 9%; FY 97, 8%; FY 98, 9%; FY 99, 7%; FY 2000, 9%.

Measure: (Admin Services) The number of late penalties for payroll payments and the average vendor payment time.

(Added by Legislature in FY2000 version.)

Benchmark:

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

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

Background and Strategies:

The average vendor payment time for FY2000 was 19 days, and we did not have any penalties for late payroll payments.

Measure: (Admin Services) The number of audit exceptions.

(Not yet addressed by Legislature.)

Benchmark:

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. Our strategy is to have all accounting, payroll, and procurement actions comply with state rules and regulations and generally acceptable accounting and business practices.

Status of FY2001 Performance Measures

	<i>Achieved</i>	<i>On track</i>	<i>Too soon to tell</i>	<i>Not likely to achieve</i>	<i>Needs modification</i>
● Increase Guard members' educational level.			X		
● The percentage of divisions that meet assigned performance measures.			X		
● The reductions in per unit costs in the department's divisions.				X	
● (Admin Services) The cost of administrative services as compared to the total personnel costs for the department.		X			
● (Admin Services) The number of late penalties for payroll payments and the average vendor payment time.		X			
● The number of audit exceptions		X			

National Guard Military Headquarters

Key Performance Measures for FY2002

Measure: No loss of life associated with AKANG SAR tasked missions.

(Developed jointly with Legislature in FY1999.)

Current Status:

No lives lost as of November 2000. In FY00 1576 hours were flown to support 923 rescue sorties, 126 lives were saved and 64 assists were performed, with no lives lost during any of the rescues.

Benchmark:

Maintain mission readiness in search and rescue (SAR) operations, which results in increased responsiveness and zero loss of life in rescue operations.

Background and Strategies:

The Alaska Air National Guard (AKANG) operates the 11th Air Force Rescue Coordination Center (RCC) and the 210th Rescue Squadron. These two entities provide the highest level of SAR coordination and response in the United States. Because of the vast area and ruggedness of Alaska, activities of the AKANG operations are high. Both the RCC and 210th are designated as federal units assigned against federal military missions. However, the majority of operational missions are conducted in support of state SAR requirements.

Alaska is a rugged state with a significantly higher than average percentage of population that is involved in civil aviation. Additionally, Alaska is a popular tourist destination for visitors that seek a wilderness experience. Because of this, Alaska has a much higher rate of incidents that require SAR than any other state in the nation. The AKANG RCC and 210th Rescue Squadron serve a valuable purpose in providing an essential safety factor.

Air Guard strategy to reach our goal is to build upon the successes of the past year, to include developing a closer relationship with both federal and state agencies which rely on AKANG services for SAR. The AKANG plans to improve the effectiveness of SAR in Alaska by realigning the RCC with the 176th Wing to provide greater efficiencies between that unit and the 210th Rescue Squadron. Increased interaction with Alaska Division of Emergency Services and the Alaska State Troopers will provide an ability to harness a more rapid response for state contingencies. In addition, as the United States Coast Guard (USCG) further reduces SAR operations in Alaska, the AKANG will be prepared to undertake those missions formerly handled by the USCG. Finally, increasing international activities that provide economic benefit to the state will be pursued, such as was accomplished with the SAR exercise operation in Seward between US, Canadian, and Russian SAR experts.

Measure: Military efficiency and readiness ratings.

(Added by Legislature in FY2000 version.)

Current Status:

The National Guard will meet its mission.

Benchmark:

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

Background and Strategies:

We report back to the Department of Defense. These reports are classified and cannot be published.

Measure: The average response time for emergencies.
(Added by Legislature in FY2000 version.)

Current Status:

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 Rescue Squadron maintains rescue-ready assets at Kulis ANG Base in Anchorage and at Eielson AFB near Fairbanks. The 68th 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.

Benchmark:

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: The number of persons assisted.
(Added by Legislature in FY2000 version.)

Benchmark:

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: The amount and value of property protected.
(Added by Legislature in FY2000 version.)

Current Status:

We recommend this measure be dropped.

Status of FY2001 Performance Measures

	<i>Achieved</i>	<i>On track</i>	<i>Too soon to tell</i>	<i>Not likely to achieve</i>	<i>Needs modification</i>
● No loss of life associated with AKANG SAR tasked missions in FY2001.		X			
● Military efficiency and readiness ratings			X		
● The average response time for emergencies.			X		
● The number of persons assisted.			X		
● The amount and value of property protected.			X		

Army Guard Facilities Maintenance

Key Performance Measures for FY2002

Measure: Percentage reduction in accrued deferred maintenance projects

(Developed jointly with Legislature in FY2000.)

Current Status:

The deferred maintenance backlog is \$19 million as of July 2000. With available resources, it is unlikely DMVA will achieve a 5% reduction in the backlog.

Benchmark:

Warranty and manufacturers guide to replacement and renewal of building components.

Background and Strategies:

Based upon our 1999 Facility Statistical report the average age of the Alaska Army Guard buildings is 28.7 years. The oldest buildings are Training Sites. There are 63 Training Site buildings with the average age of 33.7 years.

Scheduled Renewal items are those that will assist the building in meeting the current requirements, whether for enlarged personnel or update to current standards or compliance with new codes. Examples would be, more electrical outlets for current computer needs, energy upgrades, enlarge a building for expansion, code compliance i.e., ADA & fuel tank upgrades, GFI circuit breakers; and even insulation for a building.

Scheduled Replacement deals with the life expectancy of a part or building. Included are the following: roofs - life expectancy 20 years, boiler - life 25 years, carpets - life 7 years. Many of these items also involve preventative maintenance to reach that specific life expectancy.

With regards to buildings, NGR regulations inform us that if a project exceeds 50% of the buildings replacement value, NGB will not fund it.

The Guard's strategies for meeting our goal include the following:

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 also decreases the possibility of costly emergency repairs or replacements.

Review the Project Inspection 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: Track the completion of time and material costs for work performed and analyze operational expenses from previous years.

(Developed jointly with Legislature in FY1999.)

Benchmark:

Previous year expenditures utilizing State Accounting program (AKSAS) and Computerized Maintenance Program (MAXIMO).

Background and Strategies:

By providing preventative maintenance, the cost of deferred maintenance is reduced. Fewer emergencies and a reduction in lost time and wages occur.

Measure: Complete construction projects on time and within budget

(Not yet addressed by Legislature.)

Benchmark:

Actual cost of completed project and compared to budgeted cost.

Background and Strategies:

Complete and thorough negotiation of changes and provision of correct interpretation of plans and specifications to avoid duplication of cost and additional fees.

Measure: Reduce Environmental notices of violation with no major fines and no criminal prosecutions.

(Not yet addressed by Legislature.)

Benchmark:

No violations, no fines and no criminal prosecutions

Background and Strategies:

Continual research and site inspections provide the background to determine if we are in compliance thus preventing future fines and violation notices. By providing training, being aware of potential problems and taking corrective actions, the issues may be addressed.

Measure: The number of days lost due to facility-related accidents

(Added by Legislature in FY2000 version.)

Current Status:

This measure will need clarification as we are not sure what to measure here. This could cover a variety of issues that we could report on, Workers' Compensation cases, Guardsmen, or just the maintenance crew, etc.

Measure: The expenditures and estimated cost savings related to energy efficiency measures

(Added by Legislature in FY2000 version.)

Background and Strategies:

As defined in the Cooperative Agreement, FMD is required to expend 2.5% of federal funding towards energy related projects. This amount plus special funding that FMD persuaded the National Guard to finance for energy saving projects came to approximately \$423,400 for FFY00. Regarding State Armories, Logistical Facilities, Training Sites and Federal Scout Armories, we are seeing a 10% increase in overall utility cost. The rising fuel, electrical and natural gas cost easily defines the 10% increase. Some rural areas have increased cost up to 30%. The overall rising cost have been offset by the energy program the exact savings have not been calculated.

Status of FY2001 Performance Measures

	<i>Achieved</i>	<i>On track</i>	<i>Too soon to tell</i>	<i>Not likely to achieve</i>	<i>Needs modification</i>
● Reduce deferred maintenance backlog by 5%			X		
● Cost per square foot verses standard for similar new construction and current compliance with DOD energy reduction goals.			X		

Component — Army Guard Facilities Maintenance

	<i>Achieved</i>	<i>On track</i>	<i>Too soon to tell</i>	<i>Not likely to achieve</i>	<i>Needs modification</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Track the completion of time and material costs for work performed and analyze operational expenses from previous years. ● Complete construction projects on time and within budget ● Reduce Environmental notices of violation with no major fines and no criminal prosecutions. ● The number of days lost due to facility-related accidents. ● The expenditures and estimated cost savings related to energy efficiency measures 			X		
			X		
			X		
					X
			X		

Air Guard Facilities Maintenance

Key Performance Measures for FY2002

Measure: Percentage of reduction in accrued deferred maintenance projects

(Developed jointly with Legislature in FY2000.)

Current Status:

The Deferred Maintenance backlog is \$7.1 million as of July 2000.

Benchmark:

Reduce Deferred Maintenance Backlog by 5%.

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

Background and Strategies:

The Air Guard Facility Maintenance Division's deferred maintenance program amounts to \$7.1 million. The combined effects of aging buildings and insufficient repair resources have caused this amount to increase yearly. We are operating much as do consumers who make only minimum payments on high-interest rate credit cards - their balance never decreases. The contractual agreement between the State of Alaska and the federal government requires the State to provide matching funds for operation and maintenance (O&M) of federal National Guard facilities. This is calculated at a rate of one state dollar to every three federal dollars. The federal government provides matching funds on the expectation that the state will match the federal contribution. Shortfalls in the state portion results in a loss of federal matching funds and causes deferred maintenance of these facilities. Deferred maintenance results in accelerated deterioration and obsolescence of these facilities

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 & fuel tank upgrades, GFI circuit breakers; and upgrading building insulation.

Strategies for decreasing the backlog:

Performing Preventative Maintenance in accordance with manufacturer's recommendations -- By doing this, DMVA is able to extend the life of various buildings, components and machinery. Preventive Maintenance also decreases the possibility of costly emergency replacements. Reviewing the deferred maintenance list and addressing the most pressing projects -- With Alaska terrain and weather, the most costly maintenance projects are usually foundations, roofs, and insulation. With the age of some of our facilities, more of these items need attention each year.

Measure: Number of days lost due to facility-related accidents

(Added by Legislature in FY2000 version.)

Current Status:

This measure will need clarification as we are not sure what to measure here. This could cover a variety of issues that we could report on, Workers' Compensation cases, Guardsmen, or just the maintenance crew, etc.

Measure: Expenditures and estimated cost savings related to energy efficiency measures

(Added by Legislature in FY2000 version.)

Background and Strategies:

As defined in the Cooperative Agreement, FMD is required to expend 2.5% of federal funding towards energy related projects. This amount plus special funding that FMD persuaded the National Guard to finance for energy saving projects came to approximately \$423,400 for FFY00. Regarding State Armories, Logistical Facilities, Training Sites and Federal Scout Armories, we are seeing a 10% increase in overall utility cost. The rising fuel, electrical and

natural gas cost easily defines the 10% increase. Some rural areas have increased cost up to 30%. The overall rising cost have been offset by the energy program the exact savings have not been calculated.

Status of FY2001 Performance Measures

	<i>Achieved</i>	<i>On track</i>	<i>Too soon to tell</i>	<i>Not likely to achieve</i>	<i>Needs modification</i>
● Percentage of reduction in deferred maintenance backlog			X		
● Number of days lost due to facility-related accidents			X		
● Expenditures and estimated cost savings related to energy efficiency measures			X		

Alaska Military Youth Academy

Key Performance Measures for FY2002

Measure: Graduates who receive their GEDs or reenter high school

(Added by Legislature in FY2000 version.)

Current Status:

Out of the 91 graduates from Class 00-1, 68.0% received their GED or have reentered high school.

Benchmark:

Nationwide average is 66.0% as reported in the National Guard Youth ChalleNGe Program Annual report, 1999.

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 & 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: Students increasing English or math comprehension one grade level or more

(Added by Legislature in FY2000 version.)

Current Status:

Out of the 91 graduates from Class 00-1, students on an average increased their English comprehension by 3.0 grade levels over the period of 20 weeks. The math comprehension was increased on an average of 2.2 grade levels during the same period. These are the highest levels of improvement the Academy has experienced since its beginning.

Benchmark:

Nationwide average is 1.4 grade levels for English and 1.7 grade levels for math as reported in the National Guard Youth ChalleNGe Program Annual report, 1999

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 military instructors, 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 English and math skills of its graduates.

Measure: Enrollees who graduate from the program

(Added by Legislature in FY2000 version.)

Current Status:

The August 2000 graduation of Class 00-1 equaled the highest number of graduates, 91, which was also the number of graduates from Class 99-2.

Benchmark:

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 110 will remain in the program and are enrolled in the 20-week residential ChalleNGe Program. The number of graduates has increased to 91 over the 7 year history of the Academy. However, in order to reach our goal of 100 graduates per class we need to increase our enrollment in the female platoon from 23 to its full capability of 35, and increase our retention rate over the 20-week residential phase of the program.

Measure: Percentage of Military Youth Academy graduates in school or at work one year after graduation from the program.

(Revised from Legislature's FY2000 version.)

Current Status:

Classes 99-1 and 99-2 have completed their 12-month post residential after care program phase and have a 90.5% and 91.2% success rate respectively. Class 99-3 graduated the residential phase March 24, 2000, and Class 00-1 graduated the residential phase September 15, 2000. Both classes are in their post residential after care program phase and success rate statistics are not yet available.

Benchmark:

Nationwide average is 83.0% as reported in the National Guard Youth ChalleNGe Program Annual report, 1999.

Background and Strategies:

Stressing the program eight core 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 Step-Up Initiative apprentice-training program will provide 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.

Status of FY2001 Performance Measures

	<i>Achieved</i>	<i>On track</i>	<i>Too soon to tell</i>	<i>Not likely to achieve</i>	<i>Needs modification</i>
● Graduates who receive their GEDs or reenter high school		X			
● Students increasing English or math comprehension one grade level or more		X			
● Enrollees who graduate from the program			X		
● Maintain the 85% level of successful Military Youth Academy graduates in school or at work one year after graduation from the program		X			

Educational Benefits

Key Performance Measures for FY2002

Measure: Increase Guard members' educational level
(Not yet addressed by Legislature.)

Current Status:

\$100,000 in University of Alaska tuition waivers were obligated in the fall of 2000. The success rate of the enrollees will be known in January 2001.

Benchmark:

On Track

Background and Strategies:

Guard members received \$28,500 in state tuition assistance and \$100,000 in University of Alaska tuition waivers to assist Guard members in reaching desired educational levels. \$100,000 was obligated for the fall semester of 2000 demonstrating the need for this important program. However, demand outweighs the resources available to reach all members who desire to pursue educational goals. At the current time, only 126 soldiers in the Air and Army Guard received tuition waivers for the fall semester of 2000. During FY 2000, 51 Guard members received tuition assistance from the state. Most of these were enlisted members pursuing a degree program.

The strategies to reach our goal of increased educational levels within the Guard are to:

- Work with the University of Alaska to establish a partnership focused on enhancing Guard members' education levels
- Make information pertaining to military and civilian education opportunities available to Guard members through a variety of communication channels in order to encourage Guard members to pursue their educational goals
- Seek to establish Distance Learning sites at National Guard Readiness Centers to facilitate training/education
- Facilitate expansion of Junior ROTC programs into rural schools to instill awareness and a desire for education skills

Status of FY2001 Performance Measures

	<i>Achieved</i>	<i>On track</i>	<i>Too soon to tell</i>	<i>Not likely to achieve</i>	<i>Needs modification</i>
● Increase Guard members' educational level		X			

Veterans' Services

Key Performance Measures for FY2002

Measure: The number of contacts with persons seeking information about veterans' benefits.
(Developed jointly with Legislature in FY2000.)

Current Status:

Too soon to tell

Background and Strategies:

This office is gathering statistics to report to the legislature on this measure

Measure: The number of trips to assist rural veterans.
(Developed jointly with Legislature in FY2000.)

Benchmark:

Too soon to tell

Background and Strategies:

The grantee is required to provide services statewide. Statistics will be provided to DMVA by the grantee on the number of visits to rural areas to assist rural veterans

Measure: The estimated monetary value of benefits obtained.
(Developed jointly with Legislature in FY2000.)

Background and Strategies:

Reporting of this statistic provides important information in determining whether the state is receiving a fair return for the money allocated to this service. Each year the Grantee provides information to DMVA on the total amount of benefits provided to Alaska veterans through the VSO's. Numbers for FY 2001 will be reported at the end of the year.

Status of FY2001 Performance Measures

	<i>Achieved</i>	<i>On track</i>	<i>Too soon to tell</i>	<i>Not likely to achieve</i>	<i>Needs modification</i>
● The number of contacts with persons seeking information about veterans' benefits.			X		
● The number of trips to assist rural veterans.			X		
● The estimated monetary value of benefits obtained.			X		