

Fiscal Note

State of Alaska
2018 Legislative Session

Bill Version: HB 149
Fiscal Note Number: _____
() Publish Date: _____

Identifier: HB149-DFG-CO-02-09-18
Title: BOARDS OF FISHERIES AND GAME MEETINGS
Sponsor: CHENAULT
Requester: House Fisheries Committee

Department: Department of Fish and Game
Appropriation: Statewide Support Services
Allocation: Commissioner's Office
OMB Component Number: 2175

Expenditures/Revenues

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

(Thousands of Dollars)

	FY2019 Appropriation Requested	Included in Governor's FY2019 Request	Out-Year Cost Estimates				
OPERATING EXPENDITURES	FY 2019	FY 2019	FY 2020	FY 2021	FY 2022	FY 2023	FY 2024
Personal Services	(24.8)		(37.7)	(19.4)	(17.0)	(33.5)	(22.4)
Travel	(121.1)		(140.7)	(113.3)	(7.9)	(87.0)	(181.0)
Services	(19.3)		(32.2)	(8.8)	(26.4)	(25.3)	(2.3)
Commodities	(3.0)		(8.2)	(1.8)	(6.8)	(14.4)	(2.0)
Capital Outlay							
Grants & Benefits							
Miscellaneous							
Total Operating	(168.2)	0.0	(218.8)	(143.3)	(58.1)	(160.2)	(207.7)

Fund Source (Operating Only)

1004 Gen Fund (UGF)	(168.2)		(218.8)	(143.3)	(58.1)	(160.2)	(207.7)
Total	(168.2)	0.0	(218.8)	(143.3)	(58.1)	(160.2)	(207.7)

Positions

Full-time							
Part-time							
Temporary							

Change in Revenues

None							
Total	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Estimated SUPPLEMENTAL (FY2018) cost: 0.0 (separate supplemental appropriation required)
(discuss reasons and fund source(s) in analysis section)

Estimated CAPITAL (FY2019) 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If yes, by what date are the regulations to be adopted, amended or repealed? n/a

Why this fiscal note differs from previous version/comments:

Initial version.

Prepared By: Glenn Haight, Executive Director
Division: Boards Support Section
Approved By: Carol Petraborg, Director
Agency: Division of Administrative Service

Phone: (907)465-6095
Date: 02/09/2018
Date: 02/10/18

FISCAL NOTE ANALYSIS

STATE OF ALASKA
2018 LEGISLATIVE SESSION

BILL NO. HB 149

Analysis

Section 1.

HB 149 moves the Board of Fisheries (board) meeting cycle from 3 to 5 years. Briefly, “meeting cycle” refers the planned schedule the board holds to cover all fishing regions and species across Alaska. Currently, and since 1990, the board covers all regions and species within a 3 year timespan.

In total there are currently 12 distinct meetings, 11 of which are regulatory. Attachment I lists the meetings, the number of days, and the 3 groupings of meetings that occur over the three year period.

This analysis spreads these regulatory meetings out over five years and attempts to assign revised costs. In short, this measure will likely save money fluctuating from year to year. The financial information is based on the difference, year-by-year, between running a 3-year meeting cycle versus a five-year meeting cycle.

Assumptions

Meetings: The general rule in the analysis is by spreading the 11 regulatory meetings out from 3- to 5-years, there will be one or two less meeting a year. Put another way, anywhere between 2 to 10 meeting days a year. While this analysis offers a potential schedule, it is under the purview of the board to decide its meeting schedule. Any alteration by the board to rearrange the meeting schedule used in this analysis will impact cost.

It should be noted that while this legislation will prescribe the board move to a 5-year cycle, there appears to be nothing preventing the board from meeting on these subjects in the interim. If the board finds there is a need and chooses to set a meeting, it will increase costs in contrast to this analysis.

Meeting locations: The board often moves its meeting locations for the various meetings. This affects costs in two ways. The first are those costs associated with the meeting venue. Often in small communities meeting facility and related costs are much less while lodging tends to be more. In Anchorage, meeting facility costs are higher than rural areas. The second way location impacts cost relates to staff travel. A significant number of Fish and Game employees who work at board meetings are stationed in Anchorage. For Anchorage based meetings, this can mean less travel costs. To the extent staff live outside of Anchorage and must travel to Anchorage this will add to costs. This occurs on an inconsistent basis depending on the meeting subject.

Costs: The analysis looks at costs across six appropriations – Boards, Advisory Committees, Divisions of Subsistence, Sport Fish, Commercial Fisheries, and the Commissioner’s Office. For the last five appropriations, all costs relate to travel. For the Boards appropriation, the analysis measures personal services related to board honorariums, travel, services related to meeting facility rental, and commodities such as coffee and supplies.

The costs provided in the Boards appropriation are based on the most recent historical costs for the meeting at the prescribed location or projected costs for an upcoming meeting where contracts are already set. Travel costs for the other components are rough estimates for airfare, lodging, per diem, and transportation matched against each division’s best estimate of the number of staff that must travel to that location. It should be understood the staff travel estimates are based on current work stations which may change over time. It is also based on the meeting location in this analysis, which as pointed out earlier is not static when the board sets its schedule.

FISCAL NOTE ANALYSIS

STATE OF ALASKA
2018 LEGISLATIVE SESSION

BILL NO. HB 149

Analysis

Impact on workload: It is a generally accepted that spreading out the meeting cycle will increase the board's workload. To what degree is difficult to determine. Currently the board will receive anywhere between 250-400 on-time proposals in a given year. If the board delays meeting on subjects by two additional years, it is more than likely this will increase proposals for each of the regulatory meetings. This will increase the time it takes to hold a meeting.

In addition to on-time proposals, the board also accepts agenda changes requests each year. Agenda change requests allow the public to ask the board to take up subjects outside of its regular meeting cycle. For instance, in a year when the board is not contemplating Southeast Finfish regulations, an individual might seek a bag limit change on trout in Southeast through an agenda change request. The board considers these requests each year at its annual work session. The number of agenda change requests vary from between 10-30 each year, of which roughly 25% are accepted into the meeting cycle. Again, with a span of two more years to take up regulatory matters, it is expected that the number of request received and accepted will increase.

The other main mechanism to bring regulatory subjects before the board is through emergency petitions which will be heard as they are received. The frequency of emergency petitions varies widely from 5 to 15 in a year. There is very little pattern to petitions, but consistent with on-time proposals and agenda change requests, it is believed these will increase with longer time between meetings. Emergency petitions often occur outside of regulatory meetings. Emergency petition meetings, which may occur roughly 10% of the time, cost a just under \$2K in personal services to the board members as honorarium. A potential increase in cost from this outcome is not part of the analysis.

To accommodate this largely unpredictable increase in workload, the longer Southeast and Upper Cook Inlet meetings were increased by two days. The other meetings were increased by one, including the annual work session which will need to accommodate an increase in agenda change requests.

Attachment II (Revised Five-Year Schedule) provides a look by fiscal year of how the meeting format would change based on the meeting groupings. As the years progress, the two dueling meeting cycles, each with varied costs by year, lead to an inconsistent reduction in money by year.

Section 2.

Absent more information, fiscal impacts associated with Section 2 are indeterminable.