

Fiscal Note

State of Alaska
2015 Legislative Session

Bill Version: HB 103
Fiscal Note Number: _____
() Publish Date: _____

Identifier: HB103-DFG-BDS-02-13-15
Title: BOARDS OF FISH/GAME REGULATION
AUTHORITY
Sponsor: WILSON
Requester: House Special Committee on Fisheries

Department: Department of Fish and Game
Appropriation: Administration and Support
Allocation: Fish and Game Boards and Advisory Committees
OMB Component Number: 2825

Expenditures/Revenues

Note: Amounts do not include inflation unless otherwise noted below.

(Thousands of Dollars)

	FY2016 Appropriation Requested	Included in Governor's FY2016 Request	Out-Year Cost Estimates				
OPERATING EXPENDITURES	FY 2016	FY 2016	FY 2017	FY 2018	FY 2019	FY 2020	FY 2021
Personal Services							
Travel							
Services							
Commodities							
Capital Outlay							
Grants & Benefits							
Miscellaneous							
Total Operating	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Fund Source (Operating Only)

None							
Total	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Positions

Full-time							
Part-time							
Temporary							

Change in Revenues							
---------------------------	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Estimated SUPPLEMENTAL (FY2015) cost: 0.0 (separate supplemental appropriation required)
(discuss reasons and fund source(s) in analysis section)

Estimated CAPITAL (FY2016) cost: 0.0 (separate capital appropriation required)
(discuss reasons and fund source(s) in analysis section)

ASSOCIATED REGULATIONS

Does the bill direct, or will the bill result in, regulation changes adopted by your agency? No
If yes, by what date are the regulations to be adopted, amended or repealed?

Why this fiscal note differs from previous version:

Initial fiscal note

Prepared By: Glenn Haight, Executive Director
Division: Boards Support Section
Approved By: Sunny Haight, Administrative Services Director
Agency: Fish & Game
Phone: (907)465-6095
Date: 02/13/2015 12:00 PM
Date: 02/13/15

FISCAL NOTE ANALYSIS

STATE OF ALASKA
2015 LEGISLATIVE SESSION

BILL NO. HB 103

Analysis

House Bill 103 would prohibit the Board of Fisheries (BOF) and the Board of Game (BOG) from adopting, amending, or repealing regulations unless it was recommended by an advisory committee, a state agency, or a person petitioning the board.

The BOF and BOG create "board generated proposals" to address emerging issues that are otherwise unaddressed by proposals within the normal cycles, by emergency petitions, or other approved means by the public. These proposals will often address immediate issues of importance and are required to adhere to the same regulatory timelines as other proposals in accordance with the Administrative Procedures Act AS 44.62.310.

Costs may be fairly assessed in the board process based on the number of proposals it receives. From FY2011-FY2014, the average number of proposals received between both boards in a year is 579 (337 for BOF and 242 for BOG). This generates a set number of meeting days in a year, which from FY11-FY14 is an average of 52 by both boards - 33 for BOF and 19 for BOG. Based on total proposals and number of meeting days, the average number of proposals per meeting day handled by the boards is approximately 11 proposals per day. The average for BOF is approximately 10, while the BOG is approximately 12.

Taking away the ability for the board to generate proposals in essence reduces their workload. It would not add cost. Rather, it may have the effect of reducing costs. However, the boards generate proposals on an infrequent basis. The BOF created less than 10 in the last four fiscal years. The BOG creates an estimate of no more than 5 annually. Board generated proposals are too infrequent to impact cost.

This analysis is predicated on the bill impacting only board generated proposals. If it impacts the ability of the boards to amend proposals before them at board meetings, it is uncertain what that would do to the workload of the boards.