

**State of Alaska**  
**FY2003 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 four components: Public Communications, Administrative Services, Boards of Fisheries and Game, and Advisory Committees.

The mission, services provided, goals and strategies, key issues, and major accomplishments 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 FY2002 – 2003

See component information.

### Major BRU Accomplishments in 2001

See component information.

### Key Performance Measures for FY2003

**Measure:**

The total number of vendor payments made within 30 days or less compared to the total number of vendor payments.  
Sec 72.b.2. Ch 90 SLA 2001(HB 250)

**Alaska's Target & Progress:**

The Department of Fish and Game processed a total of 84,661 invoices for payment during FY01. 80% or 67,333 were processed within 30 days. 20% or 17,328 were processed in 30+ days. Overall, the department's average payment time was 24 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.3. Ch 90 SLA 2001(HB 250)

**Alaska's Target & Progress:**

The department sold 11,300 licenses, tags and stamps over the Internet in 2001, generating approximately \$1 million in revenue. This represents 1.4% of the total licenses sold, and 4.2% of the revenue. The Internet "store" generated the highest revenue of any single vendor.

In 2000, the department sold 8,400 pieces of stock over the Internet, generating \$727.1 in revenue.

**Benchmark Comparisons:**

Because this is a 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 \$23 million. There are 1,500 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 \$1.2 million each year in compensation.

The Internet site has been available to the public for two 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.4. Ch 90 SLA 2001(HB 250)

**Alaska's Target & Progress:**

During 2001, the Board of Fisheries accepted two out of seventeen agenda change requests. This compares to four out of seventeen in 2000, nine out of twenty-one in 1999, and fourteen out of thirty-seven in 1998.

During 2001, the Board of Game accepted six agenda change requests. This amount is an increase from the past few board cycles. The increase is due to the board's scheduling of a predator control/wildlife management plan in Unit 19-D. For comparison, the Board of Game accepted one agenda change request 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 recently changed its criteria for accepting agenda change requests in order to reduce the number of "off-cycle" issues it takes up each year. 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 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.5. Ch 90 SLA 2001(HB 250)

**Alaska's Target & Progress:**

In 2001, the Board of Fisheries considered fisheries in Bristol Bay, Arctic-Yukon-Kuskokwim, and Alaska Peninsula/Aleutian Islands areas. The Board of Game considered Southeast and Southcentral Region issues. In all, fifty-two out of eighty-one advisory committees were able to hold meetings for these board issues. Because of the

issues being considered, the Southeast Region only saw three of twenty-three advisory committees meet, while the Southwest and Interior Regions saw the most activity with eleven of twelve and thirteen of fourteen advisory committees meeting, respectively.

**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.

**Administration and Support  
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
<b>Formula Expenditures</b>	None.											
<b>Non-Formula Expenditures</b>												
Public Communications	0.0	0.0	81.9	81.9	0.0	0.0	135.7	135.7	0.0	0.0	136.9	136.9
Administrative Services	964.0	1,051.1	3,909.5	5,924.6	972.2	1,049.9	2,965.3	4,987.4	994.6	1,067.4	3,243.4	5,305.4
Boards of Fisheries and Game	659.6	0.0	169.9	829.5	748.8	337.5	169.9	1,256.2	759.2	337.5	169.9	1,266.6
Advisory Committees	411.5	26.5	0.0	438.0	371.7	180.0	0.0	551.7	377.3	180.0	0.0	557.3
<b>Totals</b>	<b>2,035.1</b>	<b>1,077.6</b>	<b>4,161.3</b>	<b>7,274.0</b>	<b>2,092.7</b>	<b>1,567.4</b>	<b>3,270.9</b>	<b>6,931.0</b>	<b>2,131.1</b>	<b>1,584.9</b>	<b>3,550.2</b>	<b>7,266.2</b>

**Administration and Support**

**Proposed Changes in Levels of Service for FY2003**

See component information.

**Administration and Support**

**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>
<b>FY2002 Authorized</b>	<b>2,092.7</b>	<b>1,567.4</b>	<b>3,270.9</b>	<b>6,931.0</b>
<b>Adjustments which will continue current level of service:</b>				
-Public Communications	0.0	0.0	1.2	1.2
-Administrative Services	22.4	17.5	51.7	91.6
-Boards of Fisheries and Game	10.4	0.0	0.0	10.4
-Advisory Committees	5.6	0.0	0.0	5.6
<b>Proposed budget increases:</b>				
-Administrative Services	0.0	0.0	226.4	226.4
<b>FY2003 Governor</b>	<b>2,131.1</b>	<b>1,584.9</b>	<b>3,550.2</b>	<b>7,266.2</b>