

1/18/02

MISSION

& MEAS.

DEPT.

PUB.SAF....

**HFIN**

**FILE**

**Missions and Measures Status Report  
Department of Public Safety  
House Finance Committee  
January 18, 2002**

# SCS CSHB250(FIN) Chapter 90, SLA2001

## Article 12. Department of Public Safety.

### Sec. 116. Department of Public Safety.

The mission of the Department of Public Safety is to ensure public safety and enforce fish and wildlife laws.

### Sec. 117. DPS – Division of Fish and Wildlife Protection.

The mission of the Division of Fish and Wildlife Protection is to protect the state's fish and wildlife resources.

#### Measure 1: Sport fishing violations

First Quarter FY2002: 1,002 angler violations were acted upon.
--

First Quarter FY2001: 1,255 angler violations were acted upon.
--

For the full Fiscal Year 2001: 2,729 angler violations were acted upon.

The Division of Fish and Wildlife Protection protects Alaska's wildlife resources by deterring violations or criminal activity through a combination of uniformed patrols, investigations and educational efforts. There are many difficulties associated with resource law enforcement and the Division routinely adjusts to address these challenges in the most productive manner.

Troopers devoted to wildlife law enforcement cannot provide the level of visibility in all fisheries and hunting areas to assure that resource users comply with Fish and Game regulations. Resource user contact is one way to track basic deterrence which depends on a clear enforcement presence.

Carefully structured regional enforcement programs heighten presence of uniformed patrols in an area one season but target another area the next. Undercover operations might be selected as an enforcement strategy in one problem area, while education might be selected to focus on another area where particularly complex regulations have recently changed.

#### Measure 2: Hunter contacts made by the division

First Quarter FY2002: 7,562 hunter contacts were made by FWP.
---

First Quarter FY2001: 7,880 hunter contacts were made by FWP.
---

For the full Fiscal Year 2001: 16,772 hunter contacts were made.

The Division of Fish and Wildlife Protection protects Alaska's wildlife resources by deterring violations or criminal activity through a combination of uniformed patrols, investigations and educational efforts. There are many difficulties associated with resource law enforcement and the Division routinely adjusts to address these challenges in the most productive manner.

Troopers devoted to wildlife law enforcement cannot provide the level of visibility in all fisheries and hunting areas to assure that resource users comply with Fish and Game regulations. Resource user contacts is one way to track basic deterrence which depends on a clear enforcement presence.

Carefully structured regional enforcement programs heighten presence by uniformed patrols in an area one season but target another area the next. Undercover operations might be selected as an enforcement strategy in one problem area, while education might be selected to focus on another area where particularly complex regulations have recently changed.

## Sec. 118. DPS – Division of Fire Prevention

The mission of the Division of Fire Prevention is to prevent the loss of life and property from fire and explosion.

### Measure 1: The percentage of inspected buildings found in compliance with legal standards

**Target:**

30% of all scheduled inspections to be found in compliance at time of inspection.

First Quarter FY2002: Of 242 conducted inspections, 10.33% were found to be in compliance at the time of inspection.
--

First Quarter FY2001: Of 158 conducted inspections, 15% were found to be in compliance at the time of inspection.
---

Total FY 2001 Results: Of 1,144 inspections 4.54% were found to be compliant with legal standards.

Not likely to achieve, but we expect to make significant progress. We estimate this to mean the percentage of the total number of scheduled inspections conducted that have been found to have no violations at the time of inspection. This is an educational process of the public related to regularly scheduled inspections. We anticipate that the percentage of buildings found in compliance will rise as we continue to inspect on an annual basis and provide for increased fire prevention education opportunities throughout the state.

The main reason for the 1<sup>st</sup> quarter decline between FY01 and FY02 is that this was the first time, in a number of years, we have inspected many of these occupancies. We have resumed annual inspections and anticipate the compliance rates to improve as a result.

### Measure 2: The number of fire prevention educational contacts made by the division

**Target:**

Make 15,000 contacts for fire prevention education.

First Quarter FY2002: 21,337 contacts were made. 142% of goal achieved.
---

First Quarter FY2001: 5,418 contacts made.
--

Total FY2001 Results: There were 13,419 educational contacts. This was 89.46% of our goal.

We have exceeded our goal, as we are able to field a full staff to conduct inspections and participate in a greater number of public forums to educate the public.

Approximately 10,000 public education contacts were made at the 2001 State Fair (FY2002).

**Measure 3: The average time required to conduct initial building plan reviews**

**Target:**

80% of all initial "comment letters" (preliminary plan reviews) or permits should be to the customer within 14 calendar days after receiving the fee.

First Quarter FY2002: plan review on time rate is 75%.
--

First Quarter FY2001: plan review on time rate was 78%.
---

Total FY 2001 Results: Average time to conduct plan reviews was 14.5 days based on 846 plan review submittals. This was 95.6% of our goal.

The major factor, in FY02, in reducing our on-time-rate was the increased number of complex plans submitted for review.

We are hiring another Building Plan Reviewer who will be dedicated to achieving our targeted goal.

**Measure 4: The number of priority occupancies inspected**

**Target:**

100 percent of 1670 priority occupancy inspections.\*

First Quarter FY2002: 242 inspections conducted.
--

First Quarter FY2001: 158 inspections conducted.
--

Total FY2001 Results: There were 1,144 inspections performed. This was 90% of our goal for that year.

The Southcentral Region office, which conducts 2/3rds of the scheduled inspections, now has all positions filled that were earlier vacant due to promotion and resignations for other jobs. We anticipate being at full staff, but, not full strength. Our newly hired deputy will be attending the Alaska Law Enforcement Academy this Spring, but training lead-time will not allow the full use of this new deputy until training is completed.

The term "priority occupancies" includes: assembly buildings; schools; headstart and daycare centers; TAPS facilities; jails; hospitals; respite/assisted living/residential care facilities; hotels and motels with more than 15 rooms.

\*It should be noted that the number of "priority occupancies" can and does vary from year-to-year. This is driven primarily by overall economic activity. For example:

totals for FY02 = 1670

totals for FY01 = 1269

## Sec. 119. DPS – Division of Alaska State Troopers

The mission of the Division of Alaska State Troopers is to preserve the public peace and to protect life and property.

### Measure 1: Homicides and the percent solved per year

#### Target:

To maintain the rate of homicides solved at 100%.

Within Alaska State Trooper primary jurisdiction:

CY2001 - 14 homicides: 100% solve rate
CY2000 - 9 homicides: 100% solve rate
CY1999 - 25 homicides: 96% solve rate (or 24 cases)

#### Benchmark Comparisons:

Calendar year 1999 is the benchmark year for the number of homicides and the percent solved per year.

	<u>National solve rate:</u>	<u>AST solve rate:</u>
2001	*	100%
2000	63%	100%
1999	69%	96%

As directed by the Finance subcommittee, the Division of Alaska State Troopers will be measuring the number of homicides by calendar year within Alaska State Trooper primary jurisdiction and calculating the solve rate. Alaska State Trooper homicide solve rate will be compared to the national average solve rate as provided by the U.S. Department of Justice, Federal Bureau of Investigation. Through the Uniform Crime Report (U.C.R.) all States report their data to the Department of Justice.

\*Data is unavailable. The U.C.R. is published in October; covering crimes from the previous calendar year.

**Measure 2: Rapes and the percent solved per year**

**Target:** Meet or exceed National solve rate.

Within Alaska State Trooper primary jurisdiction:

CY2001 - 137 rapes occurred with a 47% solve rate (or 65 cases)
CY2000 - 146 rapes occurred with a 53% solve rate (or 78 cases)
CY1999 - 156 rapes occurred with a 54% solve rate (or 85 cases)

**Benchmark Comparisons:**

Calendar year 1999 is the benchmark year for the number of rapes and the percent solved per year.

	<u>National solve rate:</u>	<u>AST solve rate:</u>
2001	*	47%
2000	46.9%	53%
1999	49%	54%

As directed by the Finance subcommittee, the Division of Alaska State Troopers will be measuring the number of rapes by calendar year within Alaska State Trooper primary jurisdiction and calculating the solve rate. Alaska State Trooper rape solve rate will be compared to the national average solve rate as provided by the U.S. Department of Justice, Federal Bureau of Investigation. Through the Uniform Crime Report (U.C.R.) all States report their data to the Department of Justice. Rape is defined as carnal knowledge of a female forcibly and against her will. Attempts to commit rape by force or threat of force are also included.

\*Data is unavailable. The U.C.R. is published in October; covering crimes from the previous calendar year.

**Measure 3: Burglaries and the percent solved per year**

**Target:** Meet or exceed National solve rate.

In the Alaska State Trooper primary jurisdiction:

CY2001 - 1,272 burglaries occurred with a 19% solve rate (or 236 cases)
CY2000 - 1,415 burglaries occurred with a 20% solve rate (or 285 cases)
CY1999 - 1,175 burglaries occurred with a 23% solve rate (or 266 cases)

**Benchmark Comparisons:**

Calendar year 1999 is the benchmark year for the number of burglaries and the percent solved per year.

	<u>National solve rate:</u>	<u>AST solve rate:</u>
2001	*	19%
2000	13.4%	20%
1999	14.0%	23%

As directed by the Finance subcommittee, the Division of Alaska State Troopers will be measuring the number of burglaries by calendar year within Alaska State Trooper primary jurisdiction and calculating the solve rate. Alaska State Trooper burglaries solve rate will be compared to the national average solve rate as provided by the U.S. Department of Justice, Federal Bureau of Investigation. Through the Uniform Crime Report (U.C.R.) all States report their data to the Department of Justice. Burglary is defined as the unlawful entry of a structure to commit a felony or theft. The use of force to gain entry is not required to classify an offense as burglary. Attempted burglaries are also reported.

\*Data is unavailable. The U.C.R. is published in October; covering crimes from the previous calendar year.

## Sec. 120. DPS - Alaska Police Standards Council

The mission of the Alaska Police Standards Council is to establish professional training and hiring standards for law enforcement officers in the state.

### Measure 1: Recruit training funded

#### Target:

Fund basic recruit training for 40 officers (25,760 hours)

Fund 10 officers (800 hours) in a re-certification\* academy.

FY2001: 49 officers (31,556 hours); 12 officers in re-certification (960 hours)
---

FY2000: 38 officers (24,172 hours); 11 officers in re-certification (880 hours)
---

In 1994 the legislature established the Alaska Police Training Fund, which benefits from surcharges assessed for violations of certain traffic offenses. In 1998 the legislature expanded the list of criminal offenses and violations on which a surcharge can be levied. These legislative measures have been successful in providing additional funding needed to support statewide police and corrections basic and in-service training.

Note: In prior years comparisons were based upon six months of data (July - December). Going forward, starting with this budget submission, comparisons will be based upon full fiscal year data (July - June).

\*Re-certification means: mandatory 80 hour class (topics include CPR, DWI, breath test instrument, criminal code and DV) for officers that are or were previously certified in other jurisdictions to meet Alaska eligibility.

### Measure 2: Advanced training funded

#### Target:

Fund 25,000 hours of in-service training

FY2001: 27,392 hours (876 officers)
-------------------------------------

FY2000: 25,126 hours (1,158 officers)
---------------------------------------

In 1994 the legislature established the Alaska Police Training Fund, which benefits from surcharges assessed for violations of certain traffic offenses. In 1998 the legislature expanded the list of criminal offenses and violations on which a surcharge can be levied. These legislative measures have provided additional funding needed to support statewide police and corrections basic and in-service training.

Note: In prior years comparisons were based upon six months of data (July - December). Going forward, starting with this budget submission, comparisons will be based upon full fiscal year data (July - June).

## Sec. 121. DPS - Violent Crimes Compensation Board

The mission of the Violent Crimes Compensation Board is to mitigate the effects of having been victimized.

### Measure 1: Average time from receipt of a claim to the board's final determination

#### Target:

The Board will strive to process claims within 90 to 150 calendar days in accordance with the nationally recognized benchmark of the U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Office for Victims of Crime recommendations for the 21st Century.

		Target	Actual
FY02	Goal	90 - 150 days	
FY01	Goal	90 - 150 days	70 days

The basic strategy is to decrease the amount of time it takes to process a claim through the various statutory and regulatory requirements connected with Board determination. The Board has delegated authority to close certain claims to the Board's Administrator and has implemented a claim review with recommendation process to expedite claim determinations.

## Sec. 122. DPS - Council on Domestic Violence and Sexual Assault

The mission of the Council on Domestic Violence and Sexual Assault is to reduce the causes and incidence and to alleviate the effects of domestic violence and sexual assault.

### Measure 1: The percentage of continuing clients

Total number of victims of domestic violence: 7,271 Total number of repeat victims of domestic violence: 3,563 Percentage: 49%
Total number of victims of sexual assault: 2,146 Total number of repeat victims of sexual assault: 500 Percentage: 23.3%

These numbers represent one full fiscal year of data (FY01). These numbers are gathered by the Council's database that was implemented on July 1, 2000. When we report to the legislature for FY03 we will be able to report two full years of data. The data represents clients served by Council funded programs.

The national average number of times a victim of domestic violence needs to be in a shelter prior to having enough resources, safety and confidence to permanently remove the victim from the violence is 12 visits.

It is the hope of the Council that victims of domestic violence and sexual assault return to programs for continuing services as long as they are in need of help. In these cases, of course, we will see repeat percentages increase.

**Measure 2: The percentage of the council's budget spent on prevention**

Council's budget, by fiscal year, allocated specifically for prevention efforts:

FY2002 - 38%
FY2001 - 45%
FY2000 - 42%

The budget amount represented here is calculated by the specific projects identified each year for system change and improvement, media outreach, prevention campaigns, outreach to rural areas, and specific one-time projects that have been identified and funded by federal grants. This amount does fluctuate based on the special project funds available on a federal level each year.

**Measure 3: The cost of shelter per night**

In FY01, the estimated cost of a shelter night was \$69.83 per night.
In FY00, the estimated cost of a shelter night was \$68.00 per night.

The difference between the cost of FY00 and FY01 was adjusted by using the increase in the CPI of 2.7%.

This estimate is determined by taking the costs of all direct services staff, rent, insurance, utilities and food costs and dividing this amount by the number of clients served. This is a simplistic and less than accurate method of determining costs as each shelter utilizes state funds in a different way. Based on the resources available on a local level, each program uses the state funds to balance the full costs each year. In most areas, the communities usually donate the shelters.

**Measure 4: The amount spent for and the percentage reduction in domestic violence and sexual assault compared to the amount spent for that purpose last year**

Estimated prevention funds scheduled to be spent in: FY02 \$3,769.0
Estimated prevention funds in: FY01 \$4,411.0 FY00 \$3,919.0

Percentage change in domestic violence and sexual assault cases from FY99-00 and from FY00-01.

DPS Sexual Assault cases: FY00 +12.8%      FY01 - 27%
DPS Domestic Violence cases: FY00 +39.9%      FY01 +10%
Combined DPS domestic violence and sexual assault cases: FY00 +30.8%      FY01 +5%

The amount of prevention funds include all federal funds that are provided to law enforcement, prosecution, courts, corrections and victims service programs to work towards ending domestic violence and sexual assault.

Only offenses reported the Department of Public Safety are included in the offense counts as there is no statewide database recording the information for this measure. It should be noted that the National Crime Victimization Study has revealed that only 10-16% of domestic violence and sexual assault offenses are reported to the police, thus it can be assumed that the actual occurrence of these crimes is much greater than that reflected in reports to the police. Also, prevention efforts and public education raise awareness of these offenses and increase the reporting rate. Changes in the number of these offenses reported to the police need to be analyzed with care to account for these factors.

**Measure 5: The incidence of reported domestic violence and sexual assault cases**

DPS reports domestic violence cases for:	FY00 2904	FY01 3208 +10%
DPS reports sexual assault cases for:	FY00 387	FY01 284 -27%
DPS reports sexual abuse of a minor for:	FY00 611	FY01 543 -11%

For this measure the data was drawn from cases addressed by the Alaska State Troopers. DPS only figures are used for this measure because there is no statewide database recording police reports of domestic violence or sexual assault of a minor. In 1998, DPS conducted a comparison of the rates of these crimes reported to DPS and reports to representative agencies in both urban and rural Alaska which showed that the annual change in DPS reports was comparable with reports to other agencies. Thus the readily available DPS figures are a reliable indicator of trends throughout the state.

**Measure 6: The number of homicides from domestic violence and sexual assault**

These numbers are based on calendar year not fiscal year.

CY2000 DV Related Homicides 5;	Percent change from previous year	- 23.5%
CY1999 DV Related Homicides 22;	Percent change from previous year	+ 6.6%
CY1998 DV Related Homicides 14		

The number of homicides resulting from these crimes is not consistently identified as such. Identifying homicides as being related to sexual assault is not consistently reported within the state's law enforcement agencies. The same can be true for domestic violence as there may have been domestic violence identified in the investigation but the crime is classified as a homicide with no reference to the domestic violence.

## **Sec. 123. DPS – Office of the Commissioner**

The mission of the Office of the Commissioner is to provide support and policy direction to divisions within the department.

### **Measure 1: The percentage of divisions that meet assigned performance measures**

**Target:**

The Department of Public Safety's target is to meet 100% of assigned performance measures.

Of the 27 measures, Public Safety met or exceeded the target for 21 (78 percent), and including this measure was short of the target for six (22 percent).

Each division director or program manager is responsible for taking appropriate management strategies to work toward achieving his or her performance measure(s).

### **Measure 2: The average time taken to respond to complaints and questions that have been elevated to the commissioner's office**

**Target:**

Respond to all written inquiries within a reasonable timeframe; not to exceed 15 calendar days.

Average response time for period January 2001 - September 2001: 15.5 calendar days.\*

\*Response time was calculated by dividing the sum of days lapsed (680) by number of inquiries (44).

This is a new measure. The department has instituted an electronic-based correspondence tracking system. In future years, this system will allow for historical comparisons and complete compliance with measure.

In developing this year's analysis ("number of inquiries") the department employed the following guidelines:

1. "Complaints and questions" must have been in writing;
2. only "public" inquiries were considered; and
3. "average time taken" was based upon calendar days.

## Sec. 124. DPS - Public Safety Academy

The mission of the Public Safety Academy is to train law enforcement officers.

### Measure 1: The cost per officer trained

#### Target:

Avoid increasing costs of attending an Alaska Law Enforcement Training (ALET) class.

The cost of ALET training from 1999 through 2001 has remained constant at \$6,041 per officer.
--

Tuition is an approximation of the direct costs related to room, board and training for an ALET student. The tuition includes most direct operating costs like linen cleaning, ammunition, vehicle maintenance expenses, guest instructor travel, and off site facility rentals.

Items not covered include staff salaries, vehicle fleet lease payments, and most other fixed costs.

### Measure 2: The graduation rate

#### Target:

Academy's target is to maintain a 90% or higher graduation rate.

Actual graduation rates:

FY2001	95.7% (67 of 70 recruits: Fall 2000 & Spring 2001 classes)
FY2000	98.5% (69 of 70 recruits: Fall 1999 & Spring 2000 classes)

There are no national standards for Academy graduation rates. The Anchorage Police Department Academy had an 87% graduation rate averaged over their last three basic officer classes.

According to University of Alaska Southeast requirements, the Academy counts enrollment at the end of the second week of the 14-week basis ALET course. Students arrive at the Academy from three main sources: Department of Public Safety (AST and FWP), municipal police departments, and the University of Alaska Southeast. Due to different recruitment and hiring processes, not all students are equally suited to the physical and mental stresses of Academy life. Furthermore, some students arrive with pre-existing injuries that become aggravated by physical conditioning training. Consequently, graduation figures are based on the numbers of students who graduate and were enrolled after the first two weeks.

### Measure 3: The percentage of officers who remain employed as law enforcement officers one year after graduating

#### Target:

The Academy goal is to train officers so well that they all successfully complete field training and remain employed after one year.

ALET Class #24 (Fall 2000):	76% (23 of 30 graduates) employed after one year.
ALET Class #23 (Spring 2000):	72% (18 of 25 graduates) employed after one year.
ALET Class #22 (Fall 1999):	34% (37 of 44 graduates) employed after one year.

National benchmark standards are not available for this measure. The Anchorage Police Department Academy reports that 66% of the graduates of its March 2000 basic officer course are still employed with APD 16 months later.

The Department of Public Safety began tracking this measure with the Spring 2000 ALET graduates.

The Academy attempted to contact all officers who graduated from the Spring 2000 ALET class. In some cases, they had left the state, but verification of their employment status was accomplished. The figures do not reflect college students who began the class unemployed or United States Coast Guard students who attend as basic students but who are in fact seasoned military law enforcement veterans.

There are many reasons that officers do not remain employed after a year. In some cases they decide law enforcement is not the career for them. In other cases, they are unable to engage with the public and properly do police work. Sometimes personal reasons require them to relocate to other states.

## Sec. 125. DPS – Division of Administrative Services

The mission of the Division of Administrative Services is to provide support services to departmental programs.

### Measure 1: The cost of administrative services as compared to the total personnel costs for the department

**Target:**

Since this measure was first included for FY01, that year's percentage ratio is being treated as a baseline target to maintain or improve (by reducing the percentage ratio).

FY02: $\$56,408.4/\$1,588.6 = 2.8\%$
--------------------------------------

FY01: $\$53,694.7/\$1,551.8 = 2.9\%$
--------------------------------------

This measure is calculated by dividing the personal services costs for the Administrative Services component by the department's total personal services costs.

This is an arithmetic calculation based upon "Enacted" personal services figures from all funding sources, per each year's "short form" published by the Legislative Finance Division.

### Measure 2: The number of department employee grievances as compared to the total number of grievances for all state departments

First quarter of FY02: 8 grievances/complaints or 4.08% of the 196 received by all departments
--

First quarter of FY01: 6 grievances/complaints (statewide totals unavailable)
---

Data is based upon information received from the Department of Administration.

While the measure states "grievances," our statewide data, as currently compiled by the Department of Administration, is based upon blended statistics which combine grievances and complaints. Both are disputes between labor union(s) and department management that have been submitted in writing on forms accepted by the State, but there are differences. Complaints do not involve contract application or interpretation; grievances can proceed to binding arbitration.

## Sec. 126. DPS - Laboratory Services

The mission of the Scientific Crime Laboratory is to provide forensic science services to law enforcement agencies.

### Measure 1: Average time from receipt of a case to issuance of a report

FY01 average time: 99 days
FY00 average time: 57 days.

A number of factors in FY01 (see notes below) made it impossible for the Lab to meet the FY00 57 day average turnaround time from receipt of a request to issuance of a laboratory report to law enforcement.

Calculation of the average response time:

TYPE OF ANALYSIS	NUMBER OF DAYS TO ISSUE A REPORT	
	FY 00	FY 01
Controlled Substances	22	15
Latent Fingerprints	59	137
Toxicology	11	17
Criminalistics	99	126
Firearms/Toolmarks	61	93
Trace Evidence	37	68
Serology	49	70
DNA	153	292
Crime Scene	21	72
AVERAGE	57	99

The average time from receipt of a case to issuance of a report is determined by utilizing a case access program to calculate the number of days between the date a case is received at the Scientific Crime Detection Laboratory and the date a report is written by an analyst. This task is complicated by the fact that many different types of analyses are performed at the Crime Lab, including: Controlled Substances, Fingerprints, Toxicology (blood alcohol only), Criminalistics (arson, footwear and tire track impressions, physical matching), Trace Evidence (hairs and fibers), Firearms/Toolmarks, Serology, DNA, and Crime Scenes. Once the average reporting time is calculated for each exam type, the overall average time from receipt of a case to issuance of a report can be determined.

The increased "average time," experienced in FY01, is due to the following:

- a. Many old DNA cases, with no known suspect, were pulled and analyzed with the hope of finding a CODIS match;
- b. New DNA personnel spent most of the year in forensic analysis training necessary to meet required new DNA Quality Assurance Standards;
- c. The same new DNA Quality Assurance Standards required all critical "reagents" (chemicals) used in DNA testing to be verified prior to use (contamination prevention) with the forensic evidence;
- d. All sections spent some time preparing for Lab accreditation (July 2001);
- e. Two criminalist positions were vacant in FY01;

- f. Two latent examiners resigned during the year;
- g. Accommodating DA requests to hold evidence, longer than normal, until decision is made whether to prosecute or not.

Additional resources provided to the Crime Lab in the FY02 budget should reverse the trend we witnessed between FY00 and FY01.

**Measure 2: Average cost per case**

FY01 average cost:	\$ 1,420
FY00 average cost:	\$ 1,249

Average cost is calculated by dividing the program's authorized budget by the number of cases analyzed in that particular year (FY01 1,700 cases / FY00 1,684 cases)

At the end of the fiscal year we know both the final authorized level of funding and the total number of cases that have been analyzed by the Scientific Crime Detection Laboratory. By dividing the Lab's fiscal year budget by the number of cases analyzed in that same fiscal year, the amount derived is the average cost per case.

The average cost per case can vary greatly depending on the type, such as DNA v fingerprint; the nature of the case, such as homicide v burglary; and number of items to be analyzed per case.

**State of Alaska**  
**FY2003 Governor's Operating Budget**

**Department of Fish and Game**  
**Performance Measures**

1/18/01

# Contents

**Department Mission** .....3  
     Governor's Key Department-wide Performance Measures for FY2003.....3  
**Commercial Fisheries Budget Request Unit** .....6  
     Key Performance Measures for FY2003 .....6  
**Sport Fisheries Budget Request Unit** .....8  
     Key Performance Measures for FY2003 .....8  
**Wildlife Conservation Budget Request Unit**.....13  
     Key Performance Measures for FY2003 .....13  
**Commissioner's Office/Administration and Support Budget Request Unit** .....15  
     Key Performance Measures for FY2003 .....15  
**Subsistence Budget Request Unit** .....18  
     Key Performance Measures for FY2003 .....18  
**Habitat and Restoration Budget Request Unit**.....22  
     Key Performance Measures for FY2003 .....22  
**Commercial Fisheries Entry Commission Budget Request Unit**.....24  
     Key Performance Measures for FY2003 .....24

**Commissioner: Frank Rue**

Tel: (907) 465-4100 Fax: (907) 465-2332 E-mail: Frank\_Rue@fishgame.state.ak.us

**Administrative Services Director: Kevin Brooks**

Tel: (907) 465-5999 Fax: (907) 465-6078 E-mail: Kevin\_Brooks@fishgame.state.ak.us

**Department Mission**

To protect, maintain, and improve the fish, game, and aquatic plant resources of the state, and manage their use and development in the best interest of the economy and the well-being of the people of the state, consistent with the sustained yield principle.

**Governor's Key Department-wide Performance Measures for FY2003**

**Measure:**

100% of contracted research reports on Stellar Sea Lions are submitted by the end of the federal contract completion date.

**Alaska's Target & Progress:**

The department is responsible for assessing the factors underlying the decline of the Steller sea lion and developing a science based recovery strategy. Development of a recovery strategy has advanced considerably in the past year in the areas of research and the application of that research. New studies have begun, guided by a team of state and federal scientists. The department has convened a sea lion recovery team that has begun to apply new information to sea lion protection plans. State and federal regulatory boards are using the information to protect sea lions with minimal effect on fisheries. Some information suggests the sea lion population may be stabilizing.

**Benchmark Comparisons:**

Progress will be evidenced initially by the department's ability to gain new information on the life history, habitat, and nutritional needs of the Steller sea lion. Further evidence of progress will be that this information is used in a federal recovery plan for sea lions that minimally affects those activities, including fishing, that are unrelated to sea lion recovery. Ultimately, success will be measured by the extent population surveys demonstrate sea lion populations have recovered and are no longer listed as endangered.

**Background and Strategies:**

**BACKGROUND:** The Western Gulf of Alaska and Bering Sea population of the Steller sea lion is listed as an endangered species under the federal Endangered Species Act. By court order, trawl fisheries in the vicinity of sea lion haul outs have been closed.

**STRATEGIES:** The department has provided information to National Marine Fisheries Service on all state-managed fisheries in the vicinity of sea lion concentrations. The department has applied for federal funds needed to engage in sea lion biological and ecological studies. The department will develop a research program designed to specify sea lion nutritional and habitat needs; the resulting information will be incorporated into the federal sea lion recovery plan.

**Measure:**

Maintain U.S./Canada trans-boundary salmon stocks at or above the escapement levels recorded in the 1999, 2000, and 2001 seasons.

**Alaska's Target & Progress:**

The department has responsibility to maintain, enhance and restore Pacific Northwest trans-boundary salmon stocks in accordance with the U.S./Canada Pacific Salmon Treaty. Restoration of these stocks has largely been accomplished. The current overall goal for these stocks is to establish management plans to prevent a recurrence of the previous declines. The department has complied with treaty requirements including necessary research to better enumerate and manage trans-boundary stocks. Management plans are based on establishing an annual abundance-based goal and managing harvests so as not to exceed that goal. These annual goals have been met in recent years.

**Benchmark Comparisons:**

Progress on meeting treaty requirements will be represented by the development of research and economic development strategies and plans consistent with the goals of the treaty and subsequent funding initiatives.

**Background and Strategies:**

**BACKGROUND:** The Pacific Salmon Treaty was successfully renegotiated and amended in 1999. Since then, additional federal treaty implementation funds for scientific research and economic development have become available.

**STRATEGIES:** The department will focus on developing and implementing a procedure whereby state agency staff and stakeholders will identify salmon research and economic development projects and priorities. These projects will be included in research and economic development plans for the region. Among the new projects will be a Taku River fish stock assessment, region-wide fish habitat gap analysis, and development of an improved chinook abundance model.

**Measure:**

Percentage of cooperative research plans implemented for the Yukon, Kuskokwim and Norton Sound drainages.

**Alaska's Target & Progress:**

The department is responsible for developing a program to regulate, manage, research and monitor the chronically depleted chum and chinook salmon stocks of Western Alaska. Success of this program is demonstrated by a substantial increase in research effort directed toward depressed stocks in the AYK region. For the first time, regional groups and the department have established cooperative research plans for these fish stocks and geographic areas. These research plans and their results will be used in part as a basis for all AYK pre-season management plans, as well as regulatory action by the Board of Fisheries in 2003 and 2006.

**Benchmark Comparisons:**

Progress toward meeting this measure will primarily be represented in the information compiled by the department and the actions of the Board of Fisheries in the course of the board's regulatory cycle.

**Background and Strategies:**

**BACKGROUND:** The Board of Fisheries and the department adopted the Sustainable Salmon Fisheries Policy for Alaska in March 2000, as a means to ensure sustainable salmon fishing and fisheries management. Implementation takes place primarily through the Board of Fisheries regulatory process, although the principles and criteria in the policy may apply more broadly to many department functions and initiatives.

**STRATEGIES:** The department prepares stock status reports on those salmon stocks being considered by the Board of Fisheries at each regular meeting. The department will identify stocks of concern, recommend new or modified management plans, and work with the board to develop action plans and research plans as needed. The department will consider the principles and criteria in the course of identifying research and other goals, apart from the board process.

**Measure:**

At least two new Invasive Species Action Plans will be developed annually.

**Alaska's Target & Progress:**

The department is responsible for developing a program to maintain, monitor and protect the health of Alaska's oceans and watersheds and their resources and habitat, for long-term viability and use. For each of the next five fiscal years, the department expects to produce at least two invasive species action plans.

**Benchmark Comparisons:**

Progress toward meeting the goals of the overall program will initially be represented by the extent to which project deadlines are met for critically important projects. In the coming year the department will focus on two projects: (1) invasive species (with an initial focus on Atlantic Salmon) and (2) identification of important marine fish habitat sites. Near-term goals include development of an Invasive Species Policy for the department, an Aquatic Nuisance Plan, and a Marine Protected Areas strategy. A specific long term goal is the development of 2 new Invasive Species Action Plans per year.

**Background and Strategies:**

**BACKGROUND:** The Office of the Governor, working with state resource agencies including ADF&G, developed the Oceans and Watersheds Initiative with the goal of protecting coastal and upland habitats with a focus on fish resources and habitat. The following principles will guide decisions and actions relating to Alaska's oceans and watersheds. A. Fisheries management shall ensure the conservation of fish and wildlife and the protection of important habitat. B. The health of Alaska's waters and marine ecosystems shall be maintained and protected for the benefit and use of all Alaskans. C. The health of Alaska's wild and traditional food sources shall be maintained and protected. D. State agencies shall manage Alaska's oceans and watersheds consistent with ecosystem-based management.

**STRATEGIES:**

As its part in the governor's Oceans and Watersheds Initiative the department has committed to completing a suite of projects in the areas of monitoring key environmental indicators, water quality, in-stream flow, invasive species, resource inventory, resource protection, data base development, and fisheries research. The time frame for completing these projects extends for the next several years, with emphasis on completing or making significant progress on key projects in the next 12 months.

## Commercial Fisheries Budget Request Unit

**Contact: Robert D. Mecum, Division Director**

Tel: (907) 465-4210 Fax: (907) 465-2604 E-mail: doug\_mecum@fishgame.state.ak.us

### BRU Mission

The mission of the Division of Commercial Fisheries is to manage, protect, rehabilitate, enhance, and develop fisheries and aquatic plant resources in the interest of the economy, consistent with the sustained yield principle and subject to allocations through public regulatory processes.

### Key Performance Measures for FY2003

#### Measure:

The number of escapement objectives met compared to the total number of objectives set per region.  
Sec 69.b.1. Ch 90 SLA 2001(HB 250)

#### Alaska's Target & Progress:

The current status of this measure is reflected in the table below. In 2001, of the 166 streams and rivers actively monitored for escapement by the Alaska Department of Fish and Game, 86% were within or above their escapement goal range. Lack of markets helped cause over escapements in many systems.

Region	Number of systems within goal range	Under range	Over range	Unknown	Percent within or above goal range
Southeast	10	2	10		91%
Central	36	3	7		93%
AYK	25	14	2	15	66%
Kodiak	21	4	32		93%
Total	92	23	51	15	86%

#### Benchmark Comparisons:

This performance measure does not lend itself to comparisons with other agencies or jurisdictions because it measures progress in achieving specific sustainable escapement goals for Alaska's waters.

#### Background and Strategies:

One measure of the performance of commercial salmon fisheries management is the success in achieving salmon escapement goals. Escapement goals are established by the department on the basis of the best available scientific information consistent with the Salmon Escapement Goal Policy and the Sustainable Salmon Fisheries Policy regulations. Fisheries are opened and closed by local department area managers by emergency order to ensure adequate escapements are obtained and surplus returns are harvested.

#### Measure:

The number of allocation objectives met compared to the total number of objectives set per region.  
Sec 69.b.2. Ch 90 SLA 2001(HB 250)

#### Alaska's Target & Progress:

The current status of this measure is reflected in the table below. Of the 15 fisheries with a regulatory requirement to actively manage the fishery to achieve allocation goals, in 2001, 60% of these fisheries fell within 10% of their allocative goal.

Region	# of fisheries with a regulatory	# of fisheries +/-	Percent +/- 10% of their

	requirement for active mgmt. to meet allocation goal	10% of their allocation goal	allocative goal
<b>Southeast</b>	5	3	60%
<b>Central</b>	8	4	50%
<b>Kodiak</b>	2	2	100%
<b>Total</b>	15	9	60%

**Benchmark Comparisons:**

This performance measure does not lend itself to comparisons with other agencies or jurisdictions because it measures progress in meeting regulatory allocations for specific Alaska fisheries or gear groups.

**Background and Strategies:**

The department opens and closes fisheries to obtain regulatory allocations established by the Alaska Board of Fisheries for some specific fisheries or gear groups. This measure should be refined to identify those fisheries where managers are required to achieve annual allocations versus long term allocation percentages that are reviewed by the Board of Fisheries.

## Sport Fisheries Budget Request Unit

**Contact: Kelly Hepler, Director**

Tel: (907) 267-2195 Fax: (907) 267-2224 E-mail: kelly\_hepler@fishgame.state.ak.us

### BRU Mission

The mission of the Sport Fish BRU is to protect and improve the state's recreational fishery resources.

### Key Performance Measures for FY2003

#### Measure:

For river systems that support a sport harvest of 100 or more king salmon, the number and percentage for which an escapement goal is established.

Sec 70.b.1. Ch 90 SLA 2001(HB 250)

#### Alaska's Target & Progress:

The division's target is to establish escapement goals within in the next 5 years for 100 percent of river systems supporting an annual harvest of 100 or more king salmon. The current status of this measure is reflected in the table below. These numbers are derived from data collected in 2000, which is the most current analyzed data available.

Region	# of Streams with a Sport Harvest of at least 100 King Salmon	# of Streams with a Sport Harvest of at least 100 King Salmon, which have an Escapement Goal	Percentage of Streams with Escapement Goals
I (Southeast)	3	2*	67%
II (Southcentral)	45	28	62%
III (Interior)	5	5	100%

\*Fish Creek, near Juneau, had a harvest of 442 king salmon in 2000. However, the only king salmon that enter Fish Creek are hatchery fish. Fish Creek does not support natural king salmon production. Therefore, there is no escapement goal.

#### Benchmark Comparisons:

Alaska's in river escapement goals cannot be compared with escapement goals in others states because every river system has its own unique characteristics and factors that influence overall escapement.

#### Background and Strategies:

The Division of Sport Fish conducts periodic review of king salmon fisheries that support an average harvest of 100 king salmon. The goal is to collect sufficient information to establish escapement objectives that assure sustained yield in these fisheries.

#### Measure:

For river systems that support a sport harvest of 100 or more king salmon, the number and percentage for which enumeration occurs annually.

Sec 70.b.2. Ch 90 SLA 2001(HB 250)

#### Alaska's Target & Progress:

The division's target is to annually count escapements for 100 percent of river systems supporting an annual harvest of 100 or more king salmon. The current status of this measure is reflected in the table below. These numbers are derived from data collected in 2000, which is the most current analyzed data available.

	# of Streams with	# of Streams with a Sport	

Region	a Sport Harvest of at least 100 King Salmon	Harvest of at least 100 King Salmon, which are Enumerated Annually	Percentage of Streams that are enumerated Annually
I (Southeast)	3	3	100%
II (Southcentral)	45	33	73%
III (Interior)	5	5	100%

**Benchmark Comparisons:**

Alaska's in river escapement goals cannot be compared with escapement goals in other states because every river system has its own unique characteristics and factors that influence overall escapement.

**Background and Strategies:**

The Division of Sport Fish conducts fishery performance and stock status assessments of fisheries that support an average harvest of 100 or more king salmon. The goal is to enumerate king salmon escapements in streams that support these fisheries.

**Measure:**

For river systems that support a sport harvest of 100 or more king salmon, the number and percentage of escapement objectives achieved annually.

Sec 70.b.3. Ch 90 SLA 2001(HB 250)

**Alaska's Target & Progress:**

The division's target is to achieve escapement goals within the next 5 years for 75 percent of river systems supporting an annual harvest of 100 or more king salmon. The current status of this measure is reflected in the table below. These numbers are derived from data collected in 2000, which is the most current analyzed data available.

Region	# of Streams with a Sport Harvest of at least 100 King Salmon	# of Streams with a Sport Harvest of at least 100 King Salmon where Escapement Goals were Achieved	Percentage of Streams where Escapement Goals were Achieved
I (Southeast)	3	2*	67%
II (Southcentral)	45	23	51%
III (Interior)	5	0**	0%

\*Fish Creek does not support natural king salmon production. Therefore there is no escapement goal. However, king salmon entering Fish Creek are enumerated in order to determine total hatchery production.

\*\* Of the five streams that did not meet the escapement goal, an under escapement occurred on only one stream. King salmon escapement could not be determined on the remaining streams due to poor weather and water conditions.

**Benchmark Comparisons:**

Alaska's in river escapement goals cannot be compared with escapement goals in other states because every river system has its own unique characteristics and factors that influence overall escapement.

**Background and Strategies:**

The Division of Sport Fish actively manages king salmon fisheries that support an average harvest of 100 king salmon. This includes proactive management through the Board of Fisheries regulatory process as well as in-season emergency order action. The goal is to annually achieve escapement objectives wherever they are established.

**Measure:**

The number of fish licenses sold and the total revenue generated.  
Sec 70.c.1. Ch 90 SLA 2001(HB 250)

**Alaska's Target & Progress:**

The division's target is to maintain or increase the number of sport fishing licenses sold to residents and nonresidents. Numbers of licenses sold and corresponding revenues generated for 1998 – 2000 are listed below.

	1998	1999	2000
# of Resident Licenses sold	174,885	173,362	177,366
Resident License Revenue	\$2,431,653	\$2,405,690	\$2,460,336
# of Non-Resident Licenses sold	249,552	264,792	276,754
Non-Resident License Revenue	\$6,566,436	\$6,823,431	\$7,047,002

**Benchmark Comparisons:**

We have looked at license sales, fees and structures of Washington and California. The license requirements and license fee structures are vastly different from those of Alaska, and therefore do not lend themselves to comparison.

**Background and Strategies:**

The division tracks the number of license sales each year, and maintains this information in an historical data base in order to spot decreasing license sales trends. We've recently conducted a survey of sport anglers designed to gather demographic and preference data which will assist with identifying who is losing interest in sport fishing and why, and where best to direct our public relations efforts.

**Measure:**

The percentage of Alaska residents between the ages of 16 and 59 who purchase fishing licenses.  
Sec 70.c.2. Ch 90 SLA 2001(HB 250)

**Alaska's Target & Progress:**

The division's target is to maintain or increase the number of sport fishing licenses sold to residents. Alaska residents between the ages of 16 and 60 are required to purchase and have in their possession a sport fishing license if they want to participate in any sport or personal use fishing in the state. According to the 2000 US Census Bureau report there are 400,610 Alaska residents between the ages of 18 and 64 years of age. DF&G license sales records indicate that 177,366 residents purchased sport fishing licenses in 2000. Therefore, 44 percent of all residents purchased sport fishing licenses in 2000.

**Benchmark Comparisons:**

We have looked at license sales, fees and structures of Washington and California. The license requirements and license fee structures are vastly different from those of Alaska, and therefore do not lend themselves to comparison.

**Background and Strategies:**

The division tracks the number of license sales each year, and maintains this information in an historical data base in order to spot decreasing license sales trends. We've recently conducted a survey of sport anglers designed to gather demographic and preference data which will assist with identifying who is losing interest in sport fishing and why, and where best to direct our public relations efforts.

**Measure:**

Begin construction on a minimum of one new boating access facility or upgrade of an existing facility per year in each of three regions (Southeast, Southcentral, and Interior).

**Alaska's Target & Progress:**

See Benchmark.

**Benchmark Comparisons:**

Existing boating access facilities statewide:

- 51 boat launch ramps
- 25 accessible restrooms
- 1,500 parking spaces
- 14 boarding docks
- 25 sewage pump-out and dump stations

**Background and Strategies:**

**Background:** The Federal Aid in Sport Fish Restoration Act requires that 15% of the federal funds received by the state be used for boating access projects. Since the beginning of the Boating Access Program in 1987, the Division of Sport Fish has built or renovated 51 boat launch ramps at 37 access sites throughout the state. These access sites also provide 25 accessible restrooms, 1500 parking spaces and 14 boarding docks. In addition, 25 sewage pump-out and dump stations have been provided at selected access sites and harbors.

An additional 13 projects, that were funded through FY00, are either under construction or will be started within the next year. Authority to expend CIP funds for four new boating projects is being requested for FY03. There are about 50 projects on the current backlog list waiting for funding. New project requests are received on a regular basis from local communities.

**Strategies:** The division works with local communities and outdoor sports organizations to solicit ideas for new boating access projects. These new projects are added to lists of potential access projects maintained within each region of the state. These lists are evaluated and prioritized annually. Authority to expend CIP funds for four new boating projects located across the state is being requested in FY03.

## Wildlife Conservation Budget Request Unit

**Contact: Wayne Regelin, Director**

Tel: (907) 465-4190 Fax: (907) 465-6142 E-mail: wayne\_regelin@fishgame.state.ak.us

### BRU Mission

The Division of Wildlife Conservation's mission is to conserve and enhance Alaska's wildlife and to provide for a wide range of uses for people.

### Key Performance Measures for FY2003

**Measure:**

The number of big game surveys completed for populations identified by the Board of Game as important for providing high levels of human consumptive use.

Sec 71.b.1. Ch 90 SLA 2001(HB 250)

**Alaska's Target & Progress:**

During FY01, big game surveys were done for 56 populations identified by the Board of Game for intensive management or high levels of human use.

**Benchmark Comparisons:**

A benchmark for this measure is not applicable. The populations identified by the Board of Game can vary from year to year.

**Background and Strategies:**

The division collects biological data on a variety of species to ensure continued population viability and harvest levels that are within sustained yield guidelines.

**Measure:**

The number of hunting and trapping licenses sold and the total revenue generated.

Sec 71.b.2. Ch 90 SLA 2001(HB 250)

**Alaska's Target & Progress:**

The division's target is to maintain or increase the number of hunting and trapping licenses sold to residents and nonresidents. Number of licenses sold and corresponding revenues generated for 1998-2000 are listed below.

Hunting & Trapping	1998	1999	2000
Number of Resident Licenses sold	110,523	110,348	113,290
Resident License Revenue	\$1,729,582	\$1,726,954	\$1,740,958
Number of Non-Resident Licenses sold	14,614	14,752	15,954
Non-Resident License Revenue	\$1,119,627	\$1,134,412	\$1,220,446
Number of Big Game Tags sold	23,124	24,779	26,617
Big Game Tag Revenue	\$5,319,312	\$5,579,844	\$5,781,358

**Benchmark Comparisons:**

A benchmark for this measure is not applicable.

**Background and Strategies:**

This measure will seek to document trends in license sales.

**Measure:**

The percentage of Alaska residents between the ages of 16 and 59 who purchase hunting and trapping licenses.  
Sec 71.b.3. Ch 90 SLA 2001(HB 250)

**Alaska's Target & Progress:**

The division's target is to maintain or increase the number of hunting and trapping licenses sold to residents. According to the 2000 US Census Bureau report there are 400,610 Alaska residents between the ages of 18 and 64 years of age. DF&G license sales records indicate that 113,290 residents purchased hunting and trapping licenses in 2000. Therefore, 28.3% of all residents purchased hunting and trapping licenses in 2000.

**Benchmark Comparisons:**

A benchmark for this measure is not applicable.

**Background and Strategies:**

This measure will provide an informational trend for this segment of the Alaska resident population.

**Measure:**

The number of drawing permits applied for each year and the total number of drawing permits issued.  
Sec 71.b.4. Ch 90 SLA 2001(HB 250)

**Alaska's Target & Progress:**

104,000 drawing and Tier II hunts were applied for and 25,000 drawing and Tier II permits were issued. Over \$500.0 in revenue was generated for the Fish and Game Fund.

**Benchmark Comparisons:**

A benchmark for this measure is not applicable.

**Background and Strategies:**

This measure will seek to document trends in drawing permit applications and permits.

**Measure:**

The total number of visitors visiting the state's wildlife viewing areas at Pack Creek, McNeil River, Potter's Marsh, and Creamer's Field.  
Sec 71.b.5. Ch 90 SLA 2001(HB 250)

**Alaska's Target & Progress:**

Access to Pack Creek and McNeil River is limited. Permits are required before traveling to either sanctuary.

Stan Price (Pack Creek) Bear Sanctuary: 1,400;  
McNeil River Falls: 230;

Access to Potter's Marsh and Creamer's Field is unlimited as they are continuously open to the public.

Potter's Marsh: between 30,000 - 40,000;  
Creamer's Refuge: 30,000+ visitors used the trail system and several thousand unrecorded visitors viewed waterfowl from the parking lot.

**Benchmark Comparisons:**

A benchmark for this measure is not applicable.

**Background and Strategies:**

This measure will seek to document trends in the viewing of wildlife at these four areas.

**Commissioner's Office/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 missions of the Office of the Commissioner and the Division of Administrative Services are to provide support and policy directions to departmental programs.

**Key Performance Measures for FY2003**

**Measure:**

The number and percentage of divisions that meet assigned performance measures.  
Sec 72.b.1. Ch 90 SLA 2001(HB 250)

**Alaska's Target & Progress:**

All of the divisions have met assigned performance measures.

**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.

**Measure:**

The average time taken to respond to complaints and questions that have been elevated to the commissioner's office. Sec 72.b.6. Ch 90 SLA 2001(HB 250)

**Alaska's Target & Progress:**

During the first quarter of FY2002, the Commissioner's Office responded to 127 pieces of correspondence in an average of six working days.

**Benchmark Comparisons:**

The Commissioner's Office attempts to respond to all correspondence within two weeks.

## Subsistence Budget Request Unit

**Contact: Mary C. Pete, Director**

Tel: (907) 465-4147 Fax: (907) 465-2066 E-mail: Mary\_Pete@fishgame.state.ak.us

### BRU Mission

To gather, quantify, evaluate, and report data about uses, users, and methods of subsistence hunting and fishing, and make recommendations on the impacts of federal and state laws and regulations on subsistence uses and users.

### Key Performance Measures for FY2003

#### Measure:

Percentage of Alaska communities in each region for which fisheries harvest data are collected and reported.  
Sec 73.b.1. Ch 90 SLA 2001(HB 250)

#### Alaska's Target & Progress:

- 10% in Southeast
- 5% in Southcentral
- 60% in Southwest
- 95% in Interior
- 95% in Western
- 55% in Northwest
- 25% in Arctic

#### Benchmark Comparisons:

This performance measure does not lend itself to comparisons with other agencies or jurisdictions because Alaska is the only state with a subsistence priority law.

#### Background and Strategies:

Subsistence salmon fisheries harvest data are collected annually in certain regions of the state (Western, Interior, Southwest, Northwest) and sporadically in other parts, as funding and project schedules allow. The regions with annual assessment generally are those with the greatest dependence on key species, such as salmon. Harvest information for other regions is collected as multiple purpose projects are activated. The aim is to develop a schedule of regional updates of harvest data, as resources are available. The division maintains a statewide subsistence harvest assessment report that contributes to the statewide harvest report of all uses.

#### Measure:

Percentage of Alaska communities in each region for which wildlife harvest data are collected and reported.  
Sec 73.b.2. Ch 90 SLA 2001(HB 250)

#### Alaska's Target & Progress:

- 40% in Southeast
- 10% in Southcentral
- 100% in Southwest
- 45% in Interior
- 25% in Western
- 15% in Northwest
- 25% in Arctic

#### Benchmark Comparisons:

This performance measure does not lend itself to comparisons with other agencies or jurisdictions because Alaska is the only state with a subsistence priority law.

#### Background and Strategies:

Subsistence wildlife harvest data are collected annually in certain regions of the state (Southwest, Interior, and Arctic) and sporadically in other parts, as funding and project schedules allow. The regions with annual assessment generally are those for which funding is available due to controversial or allocation concerns, such as big game in the Interior. The aim is to develop a schedule of regional updates of harvest data, as resources are available. Harvest information for other regions is collected as multiple purpose projects are activated.

**Measure:**

Percentage of subsistence proposals at meetings of the Board of Fisheries and the Board of Game for which subsistence data are assessed and recommendations are made.

Sec 73.b.3. Ch 90 SLA 2001(HB 250)

**Alaska's Target & Progress:**

- 100% in Southeast
- 100% in Southcentral
- 100% in Southwest
- 90% in Interior
- 75% in Western
- 100% in Northwest
- 100% in Arctic

**Benchmark Comparisons:**

This performance measure does not lend itself to comparisons with other agencies or jurisdictions because Alaska is the only state with a subsistence priority law

**Background and Strategies:**

Subsistence data from harvest assessment projects are used to analyze impacts of subsistence proposals to the Boards of Fisheries and Game. There are some areas or issues for which the division has not collected data or the data is outdated due to regulatory changes in the intervening years or uses are known to have changed but details are unknown. The division attempts to anticipate information needs of the boards and public through extensive public contacts such as local fish and game advisory committees and local harvest monitors. This information is useful to plan research priorities and schedules to address these issues as each board responds to public proposals. The goal is to have current subsistence information for every proposal that comes before each board.

**Measure:**

Number of proposed statutory and regulatory changes by federal and other state entities for which subsistence data are assessed and recommendations are made.

Sec 73.b.4. Ch 90 SLA 2001(HB 250)

**Alaska's Target & Progress:**

- 75 in Southeast
- 25 for Southcentral
- 25 for Southwest
- 30 in Interior
- 7 in Western
- 9 in Northwest
- 5 in Arctic

**Benchmark Comparisons:**

This performance measure does not lend itself to comparisons with other agencies or jurisdictions because Alaska is the only state with a subsistence priority law.

**Background and Strategies:**

Subsistence data from harvest assessment projects are used to analyze impacts of subsistence proposals to the Boards of Fisheries and Game and the Federal Subsistence Board. There are some areas or issues for which the division has not collected data or the data is outdated due to regulatory changes in the intervening years or uses are known to have changed but details are unknown. The division attempts to anticipate information needs of the boards and public through extensive public contacts such as local fish and game advisory committees, federal subsistence

regional advisory councils, and local harvest monitors. This information is useful to plan research priorities and schedules to address these issues as each board responds to public proposals. The goal is to have current subsistence information for every proposal that comes before each board.

## Habitat and Restoration Budget Request Unit

**Contact: Ellen Fritts, Acting Director**

Tel: (907) 465-4105 Fax: (907) 465-4759 E-mail: ellen\_fritts@fishgame.state.ak.us

### BRU Mission

The mission of the Habitat and Restoration Division is to protect, maintain, enhance, and restore habitat for fish and wildlife consistent with sound conservation and sustained yield principles.

### Key Performance Measures for FY2003

**Measure:**

95 percent of the Title 16 (anadromous waters) applications are approved or modified to protect, minimize, or mitigate habitat damage within an average of 20 days after receipt.

Sec 74.b.1. Ch 90 SLA 2001(HB 250)

**Alaska's Target & Progress:**

In FY2001, 1,999 Title 16 applications were received and reviewed within an average of 17 days. 99% were approved as proposed or with project modifications.

**Benchmark Comparisons:**

This performance measure does not lend itself to comparisons with other states because it measures progress unique to Alaska and Alaska's project review laws.

**Background and Strategies:**

The division routinely tracks the status of all permit review requests it receives, and prepares an annual report summarizing such statistics as the numbers and types of permits it issues, for what industries, and in which of its three regions (southeast, southcentral/southwestern/western, and interior/arctic). This allows division management to best direct permitting effort to the regions, sub-regions, and industries with the greatest demand for project review and permitting services. To process this number of permits expeditiously, the division requires an adequate number of staff who have a good basic education in fish and wildlife biology, training in specialized areas such as bioremediation and hydrology, and many years of experience in reviewing and monitoring a wide variety of construction activities.

**Measure:**

80 percent of the land use plans reviewed result in consensus on habitat related issues.

Sec 74.b.2. Ch 90 SLA 2001(HB 250)

**Alaska's Target & Progress:**

The division reviewed multiple actions under ten land use plans in 2001. Over 80% of the departments recommendations to protect fish and wildlife habitat, public hunting and fishing opportunities, and access to public lands and resources were adopted.

**Benchmark Comparisons:**

This performance measure does not lend itself to comparisons with other states because it measures progress unique to Alaska and Alaska's land use planning laws.

**Background and Strategies:**

The division initiates plans for legislatively designated State Game Refuges, Critical Habitat Areas, and Sanctuaries and participates in the development of all other land use plans to ensure adequate protection for fish and wildlife, their habitats and public access to public lands and waters. Any subsequent actions under these plans are also reviewed to make certain they meet the stated goals of the plan. Approved plans, resulting from a consensus building public review process, provide guidance on future allowable land uses and compliance with all fish and wildlife habitat requirements. To achieve this objective Habitat and Restoration Division needs to have well trained and experienced staff to respond to land use actions within statutory deadlines.

**Measure:**

95 percent of the project reviews for industrial development, road construction, and timber harvest are completed within an average of 25 days or less or within the scheduled time frame for complex projects.  
Sec 74.b.3. Ch 90 SLA 2001(HB 250)

**Alaska's Target & Progress:**

In FY 2001, 92% of reviews involving Fish and Game permits were reviewed within the permit deadline. Average time for Fish and Game permits was 17 days. 89% of projects involving other agency permits were reviewed within the permit deadline. Average time for comments on other agency permits was 16 days.

**Benchmark Comparisons:**

This performance measure does not lend itself to comparisons with other states because it measures progress unique to Alaska and Alaska's project review laws.

**Background and Strategies:**

The division routinely tracks the status of all permit review requests it receives, and prepares an annual report summarizing such statistics as the numbers and types of permits it issues, for what industries, and in which of its three regions (southeast, southcentral/southwestern/western, and interior/arctic). This allows division management to best direct permitting effort to the regions, sub-regions, and industries with the greatest demand for project review and permitting services.

**Measure:**

100 percent of the third party contracted restoration projects are completed by the end of the contract period.  
Sec 74.b.4. Ch 90 SLA 2001(HB 250)

**Alaska's Target & Progress:**

The division did not meet this measure for FY01. Of 28 approved projects, 21 (75%) were completed by the end of the federal contract completion date.

**Benchmark Comparisons:**

This performance measure does not lend itself to comparisons with other states because it measures progress unique to Alaska and Alaska's restoration funding sources.

**Background and Strategies:**

The Kenai River Restoration 50/50 Cost Share Project was initiated in 1995. From 1995 to date, 214 projects were contracted through the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) because the department has no direct granting authority. Eight (8) projects were never initiated due to changes in landowner's health or financial condition, and the contracts were terminated. Of the 206 projects that have active USFWS Cooperative Agreements ( 1995-8; 1996-32; 1997-53; 1998-29; 1999-34; 2000-22; 2001-28) 198 have been completed. The 8 remaining projects will be completed during the summer 2002. Since 1995, 100 percent of the contracts have been completed prior to reimbursement.

## Commercial Fisheries Entry Commission Budget Request Unit

**Contact: Mary McDowell, Commissioner**

Tel: (907) 790-6936 Fax: (907) 790-7036 E-mail: Mary\_McDowell@cfec.state.ak.us

### BRU Mission

The mission of the Commercial Fisheries Entry Commission is to limit entry into commercial fisheries for purposes of resource conservation and to prevent economic distress among fishermen and those dependent on them for a livelihood.

### Key Performance Measures for FY2003

**Measure:**

The commission processes 90 percent of all vessel licenses, permit renewals, and requests for duplicates within three days of receipt of a fully completed application.  
Sec 75.b.1. Ch 90 SLA 2001(HB 250)

**Alaska's Target & Progress:**

The commission is on target to achieve this performance measure for FY02.

**Benchmark Comparisons:**

Alaska's commercial fisheries permitting and licensing programs, requirements, and procedures are significantly different from those of other states and do not lend themselves to meaningful comparison.

**Background and Strategies:**

The commission seeks to process all license, permit renewal, and duplicate requests as quickly as possible to help applicants avoid lost fishing time. The commission has streamlined procedures and effectively used computer technology to meet this stringent performance standard for processing nearly 40,000 permit and license applications per year by our small staff.

**Measure:**

The commission processes 90 percent of all emergency transfer requests within four days of receipt of a fully completed application.  
Sec 75.b.2. Ch 90 SLA 2001(HB 250)

**Alaska's Target & Progress:**

The commission is on target to achieve this performance measure for FY02.

**Benchmark Comparisons:**

Alaska's laws and procedures governing emergency permit transfers are unique to Alaska's limited entry program and thus no meaningful comparison with other states can be made regarding transfer processing time.

**Background and Strategies:**

The commission seeks to process all emergency transfer requests as quickly as possible to help fishermen avoid lost fishing time and maintain income flow to families of permit holders struck with medical or other circumstances temporarily preventing their participation in the fishery. The commission has streamlined procedures and effectively used computer technology to meet this stringent performance standard for processing nearly a thousand emergency permit transfer requests per year with our small staff.

**Measure:**

The commission processes 90 percent of all permanent transfer requests within five days of receipt of a fully completed application.  
Sec 75.b.3. Ch 90 SLA 2001(HB 250)

**Alaska's Target & Progress:**

The commission is on target to achieve this performance measure for FY02.

**Benchmark Comparisons:**

Alaska's laws and procedures governing permanent permit transfers are unique to Alaska's limited entry program and thus no meaningful comparison with programs in other states can be made regarding transfer processing time.

**Background and Strategies:**

The commission seeks to process all permanent permit transfer requests as quickly as possible to help applicants avoid lost fishing time. The commission has streamlined procedures and effectively used computer technology to meet this stringent performance standard for processing nearly a thousand permanent permit transfers per year by our small staff.

**Measure:**

By June 30, 2002, the commission provides fishers with the option to renew licenses online.  
Sec 75.b.4. Ch 90 SLA 2001(HB 250)

**Alaska's Target & Progress:**

Contingent upon feasibility of timely acquiring and installing necessary technology, the commission is on target to achieve this performance measure for FY02.

**Benchmark Comparisons:**

Online licensing of crewmember and sport fisheries is now available in Alaska and other states. Provisions of Alaska's Limited Entry Act present some additional requirements and challenges for online licensing of Alaska's commercial fisheries, but the commission is committed to providing this service and has a plan in place and actions underway to achieve this performance measure.

**Background and Strategies:**

Online permit and vessel license renewal will provide the fishing public with more convenient, faster access to CFEC licensing functions and will reduce paper handling by commission staff.

NOTE: Since this measure is not achieved by the end of FY02, the commission recommends that it be deleted from legislation introduced during the 2002 legislative session setting forth FY03 performance measures.

**Measure:**

The commission maintains the number of hearing officer and paralegal decisions issued during the year at 70 or more.  
Sec 75.b.5. Ch 90 SLA 2001(HB 250)

**Alaska's Target & Progress:**

The commission is on target to achieve this performance measure for FY02.

**Benchmark Comparisons:**

Alaska's laws and procedures governing adjudication of limited entry permit eligibility claims are unique to Alaska's limited entry program. No meaningful comparison with programs in other jurisdictions can be made regarding the rate at which decisions are issued.

**Background and Strategies:**

The commission strives to move all appeals of limited entry permit application decisions through the adjudication process as quickly as possible for the benefit of applicants and all other participants in the fishery. The extensive due process afforded all limited entry permit applicants under Alaska's Limited Entry Act can require investment of significant time and effort by the commission. Under state statute, an applicant with an appeal pending at any stage of the adjudication process is eligible for an interim-use permit allowing their continued participation in the fishery until a final decision is rendered in their case. While care to ensure applicants' rights, render the fairest and best possible decisions that will withstand further challenge is paramount, this performance measure maintains pressure on hearing officers and paralegals to produce decisions and keep appeals moving through the process at a good rate.

**Measure:**

The commission maintains the number of final decisions issued by the commission during the year at 100 or more.  
Sec 75.b.6. Ch 90 SLA 2001(HB 250)

**Alaska's Target & Progress:**

The commission is on target to achieve this performance measure for FY02.

**Benchmark Comparisons:**

Alaska's laws and procedures governing adjudication of limited entry permit eligibility claims are unique to Alaska's limited entry program. No meaningful comparison with programs in other jurisdictions can be made regarding the rate at which decisions are issued.

**Background and Strategies:**

The commission strives to adjudicate all appeals as quickly as possible for the benefit of applicants and all other participants in the fishery. The extensive due process afforded all limited entry permit applicants under Alaska's Limited Entry Act can require investment of significant time and effort by the commission. The commission works very hard to issue the best possible decisions at the rate established by this performance measure. Extra care is particularly critical at the final commission decision level as the next level of appeal is to the Alaska Superior Court.

**Measure:**

By the end of the fiscal year, the commission maintains or decreases the net number of cases pending before hearing officers and the commissioners from the number that are pending at the beginning of the fiscal year.  
Sec 75.b.7. Ch 90 SLA 2001(HB 250)

**Alaska's Target & Progress:**

The commission is on target to achieve this measure for FY02.

**Benchmark Comparisons:**

Alaska's laws and procedures governing adjudication of limited entry permit eligibility claims are unique to Alaska's limited entry program. No meaningful comparison with programs in other jurisdictions can be made regarding the rate at which decisions are issued and/or appealed.

**Background and Strategies:**

The number of new, incoming cases added annually to the workload of paralegals, hearing officers, and commissioners is dependent on a number of factors, including the number, size, and complexity of fisheries newly coming under limitation. During the course of a year, it is important to maintain a rate of case resolution equal to or exceeding the rate at which cases are appealed to the commission, or the result would be a ever-increasing backlog. The commission strives to develop straightforward limitation systems, issue decisions of such quality as to minimize further appeals, and maintain a pace of adjudication of cases that will ensure the maintenance or reduction of the net number of pending cases.

**Measure:**

The commission maintains at 20 percent or less the number of appeals from final decisions of the commission that are filed with the superior court during the year.  
Sec 75.b.8. Ch 90 SLA 2001(HB 250)

**Alaska's Target & Progress:**

The commission is on target to achieve this performance measure for FY02.

**Benchmark Comparisons:**

Alaska's laws and procedures governing adjudication and appeals of limited entry permit eligibility claims are unique to Alaska's limited entry program. No meaningful comparison with programs in other jurisdictions can be made regarding the rate at which commission decisions are appealed.

**Background and Strategies:**

Under the Limited Entry Act, an applicant who disagrees with a final commission decision may appeal the decision to the Alaska Superior Court, and ultimately to the Alaska Supreme Court. Such appeals consume extensive time

and resources of both CFEC and the Department of Law. Additionally, rulings against commission actions or decisions in a single case may be applied retroactively by the court and thus reopen large numbers of previously settled cases, potentially causing great harm to an entire fishery. The commission makes every effort to ensure that all due process and legal issues are meticulously addressed in each of its decisions in order to provide the best possible service to the public and to avoid court appeals. The commission has been very successful in these efforts in recent years. In 1982, more than 150 court challenges to CFEC permit application decisions were pending. Today, even with the commission issuing more than 100 final decisions per year, only four court challenges are pending.