

State of Alaska
FY2003 Governor's Operating Budget

Department of Natural Resources
Parks and Recreation Management
Budget Request Unit Budget Summary

Parks and Recreation Management Budget Request Unit

Contact: Jim Stratton, Director

Tel: (907) 269-8700 **Fax:** (907) 269-8907 **E-mail:** Jim-Stratton@dnr.state.ak.us

BRU Mission

The Division of Parks and Outdoor Recreation provides outdoor recreation opportunities and conserves and interprets natural, cultural, and historic resources for the use, enjoyment and welfare of the people. (Differs from SLA 2001, Ch. 90, Section 114)

BRU Services Provided

See component detail.

BRU Goals and Strategies

See component detail.

Key BRU Issues for FY2002 – 2003

See component detail.

Major BRU Accomplishments in 2001

See component detail.

Key Performance Measures for FY2003

Measure:

Parks Management - The percentage of park facilities open.
Sec 114(b)(1) Ch 90 SLA 2001(HB 250)

Alaska's Target & Progress:

To keep the park facilities open 100% during the scheduled season for each unit.

Benchmark Comparisons:

There is no benchmark for this measure. Other States have budget problems which force closure of Park Units, but no State Park system is alike.

Background and Strategies:

There are 121 park units currently open to the public. Our strategy is to keep these units safe, clean, and properly maintained. We employ over 700 volunteers and 60 summer seasonal Alaska Conservation Corps staff, as well as our permanent park staff, combined with contracts with private vendors in order to make visits to Alaska State Parks a safe and enjoyable experience. To meet this goal, staff and operational support are necessary at some level at all sites.

In previous years, some actions were taken in response to tight budget situations:

In 2000, one park unit, (Little Tonsina State Recreation Site) was closed. Some units opened late, and others closed early.

In 1999, one park unit (Wolf Lake State Recreation Site) was closed. Others were opened late, and closed early.

In 1998, 1997, selected units were closed early or opened late.

In 1996 - one park unit (Moose Creek State Recreation Site) was closed.

In 1995 - two park units (Centennial Lake, Anchor River State Recreation Site) were closed.

In 2001/2002, many other state park systems in the Lower 48 are experiencing budget tightening and are closing parks. Tennessee announced 4 park closings in fall 2001. Iowa is closing portions of some of their units.

Measure:

Parks Management - The number of visits by site and type of visit.
 Sec 114(b)(2) Ch 90 SLA 2001(HB 250)

Alaska's Target & Progress:

While we can't predict the factors that influence visitation (fish runs, weather, gas prices, etc), our target is to sustain and/or increase the number of park visits each year.

In FY01 we received 4.1 million recreational visits to one or more of our 121 facilities, broken down in 3.1 million resident visits and roughly 1.0 million non-residents visits in the following areas:

State Area	Resident	Non-Resident	Total
Northern	437,980	206,737	644,717
Mat-Su/CB	720,103	252,150	972,253
Chugach	860,597	105,061	965,658
Kenai/PWS	685,711	122,050	807,761
Kodiak	155,950	36,444	192,394
Wood-Tikchik	86,413	16,055	102,468
Southeast	230,569	245,656	476,225
Total	3,177,323	984,153	4,161,476

Benchmark Comparisons:

There is no benchmark for this measure.

Background and Strategies:

The number of visitors is difficult to define as many of them are repeat customers, so we measure the number of visits by site. All of this is captured in a very detailed "Cluster" booklet, which is available upon request.

Measure:

State Historic Preservation - The percentage of reported identified historic properties entered on the state inventory.
 Sec 114(b)(3) Ch 90 SLA 2001(HB 250)

Alaska's Target & Progress:

Targets:

Identify: 1,000 new sites reported

Document: 400 new sites entered into inventory, 350 site entries updated

Evaluate: 200 properties for historic significance

With current staff the percentage is expected to be at 65%.

Benchmark Comparisons:

There is no benchmark for this measure.

Background and Strategies:

Identifying, evaluating and documenting historic sites and buildings provides information on historic significance, which is used to protect sites potentially impacted by development or to identify opportunities for heritage tourism development. These activities are an integral part of the national historic preservation program the Office of History and Archaeology administers.

State Historic Preservation offices develop and maintain inventories of historic and prehistoric properties. In Alaska, this process has relied mainly on information provided by local governments and federal agencies. The information is stored in both electronic and paper formats.

Measure:

Parks Management - The amount of dollars generated from sources other than the state government for trail maintenance and site development.

Sec 114(b)(4) Ch 90 SLA 2001(HB 250)

Alaska's Target & Progress:

To secure a continued increase in the amount of federal and private dollars available for park facility development and trail maintenance.

1999	\$728.0	Available
2000	\$857.0	Available
2001	\$946.0	Available
2002	\$1,334.0	Estimate Available

Benchmark Comparisons:

There is no benchmark for this measure.

Background and Strategies:

While we cannot control the amount of money coming to Parks from the federal government through National Recreation Trail and Land and Water Conservation Fund grants, we can continue to educate local governments, trail clubs, and other decision makers about the importance of these programs to Alaska. We expect to see \$1,500.00 in 2003.

These figures do not include funds received from the federal highway administration through DOT or sportfish access funds through ADF&G. We regularly do millions of dollars of construction, through contracts with the private sector. During summer of 2002, we expect to have over \$15 million of projects in the works. However, these funds come into the state budget through DOT and ADF&G, so are not reflected here.

Measure:

Parks Management - The level of deferred maintenance in state parks.

Sec 114(b)(5) Ch 90 SLA 2001(HB 250)

Alaska's Target & Progress:

To steadily reduce the identified \$42 million in deferred maintenance and ADA upgrades in the park system.

Inventory of Deferred Maintenance in state parks:

1998 - \$35 million in deferred maintenance identified in division facility summary

2001 - \$42 million in deferred maintenance identified in division facility summary

Funding to address this Deferred Maintenance:

1996 - No funds for maintenance

1997 - \$150.0 in CIP for emergency repairs

1998 - \$200.0 in CIP for emergency repairs

1999 - \$200.0 in CIP for emergency repairs

2000 - \$200.0 in CIP for emergency repairs

2001 - \$286.0 in CIP for emergency repairs

2001 - \$168.0 in CIP for Park upgrades

2002 - \$286.0 in CIP for emergency repairs

At the current rate of funding our inventory of deferred maintenance will continue to grow.

Benchmark Comparisons:

There is no benchmark for this measure.

Background and Strategies:

Parks has been unable to address this growing backlog due to lack of CIP funds. For the years 1996 to 2002, Parks averaged only \$212.0 annually in the capital budget for deferred maintenance and then only for those repairs tied to health and human safety. Some facilities that are along a highway corridor can be upgraded with Federal Highway - TEA 21 funds so long as we fit the TEA 21 criteria. Campgrounds CANNOT be built or upgraded with TEA 21 funds. Parks has been successful in addressing some of its needs through this channel and will continue to do so. Facilities that involve powerboat and angler access can be fixed with our partnership with ADF&G for federal sportfish access funds for boat launch ramps.

Funds from TEA 21 and ADF&G, however, do not cover the majority of our deferred maintenance needs. Parks needs significant funds dedicated to this problem. The use of federal Land & water Conservation fund moneys can only be used for facility development if the state provides a 50% match. In addition to LWCF, Parks could address these problems through funds raised by bonds.

**Parks and Recreation Management
BRU Financial Summary by Component**

All dollars in thousands

	FY2001 Actuals				FY2002 Authorized				FY2003 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>												
State Historic Preservation	284.1	99.5	759.3	1,142.9	289.3	336.5	705.2	1,331.0	294.2	340.3	715.1	1,349.6
Parks Management	5,402.9	0.0	698.7	6,101.6	5,460.8	40.0	159.6	5,660.4	6,305.4	40.0	380.6	6,726.0
Parks & Recreation Access	0.0	22.5	2,077.8	2,100.3	0.0	23.4	2,048.1	2,071.5	0.0	23.5	1,989.1	2,012.6
Totals	5,687.0	122.0	3,535.8	9,344.8	5,750.1	399.9	2,912.9	9,062.9	6,599.6	403.8	3,084.8	10,088.2

Parks and Recreation Management
Proposed Changes in Levels of Service for FY2003

See component detail.

Parks and Recreation Management
Summary of BRU Budget Changes by Component
From FY2002 Authorized to FY2003 Governor

All dollars in thousands

	<u>General Funds</u>	<u>Federal Funds</u>	<u>Other Funds</u>	<u>Total Funds</u>
FY2002 Authorized	5,750.1	399.9	2,912.9	9,062.9
Adjustments which will continue current level of service:				
-State Historic Preservation	4.9	3.8	9.9	18.6
-Parks Management	83.7	0.0	106.0	189.7
-Parks & Recreation Access	0.0	0.1	-59.0	-58.9
Proposed budget increases:				
-Parks Management	760.9	0.0	115.0	875.9
FY2003 Governor	6,599.6	403.8	3,084.8	10,088.2