

**2012 Legislature - Operating Budget
Transaction Compare - Governor Structure
Between Adj Base and Gov Amd**

Numbers and Language Differences Agencies: DEC

Agency: Department of Environmental Conservation

	Column	Trans Type	Total Expenditure	Personal Services	Travel	Services	Commodities	Capital Outlay	Grants	Misc	PFT	PPT	TMP
Administration													
Administrative Services													
Shared Departmental Costs	Gov Amd	IncM	280.0	228.5	5.0	37.5	9.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0	0	0
<i>Many positions in the Administrative Services component perform duties that serve the entire Department, including the travel coordinator, reception positions, and the Department's time tracking system coordinator. The current budget authority is not sufficient to budget all internal RSAs and is resulting in unnecessary administrative and accounting burden to staff. This will streamline and bring efficiency to the management and accounting of these services.</i>													
1007 I/A Rcpts (Other)			280.0										
* Allocation Difference *			280.0	228.5	5.0	37.5	9.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0	0	0
** Appropriation Difference **			280.0	228.5	5.0	37.5	9.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0	0	0
Environmental Health													
Food Safety & Sanitation													
Travel for Food Safety Inspections at High-Risk Facilities or to Meet Federally-Mandated Inspection Requirements	Gov Amd	Inc	124.6	0.0	114.6	0.0	10.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0	0	0
<i>Many establishments in remote communities with high-risk facilities and highly-susceptible populations or federally-mandated inspection requirements (e.g. school food services, Headstart Programs, and institutions) have not been inspected in over five years.</i>													
<i>There are 157 communities in Alaska that are not easily accessible by the road system. These include communities such as Deadhorse/Prudhoe Bay, Bethel, Barrow, Nome, Skagway, Wrangell, Coldfoot, Dillingham, Galena, Haines, King Salmon, Kotzebue, Naknek, Thorne Bay, and Yakutat. Particularly, the inspection staff will travel to communities to focus on high-risk facilities where the potential impacts of foodborne illness outbreaks would significantly impact the public's health and would cause economic harm.</i>													
<i>Within the 157 communities not easily accessible by the road system, there are a total of 577 facilities that have not been inspected within the last five years. The Department will focus their efforts on the high-risk facilities and inspect other risk categories in those communities as time allows.</i>													
<i>-- 163 high risk facilities</i>													
<i>-- 207 medium risk facilities</i>													
<i>-- 199 low risk facilities</i>													
<i>-- 8 unranked facilities</i>													
<i>This funding will be used for travel to address two high-risk areas:</i>													
<i>1. Highly-Susceptible Populations</i>													
<i>Examples of these at risk populations are the communities of Deadhorse and Prudhoe Bay. There are 75 facilities in these communities including labor camps providing exclusive food service to thousands of workers each day. In 2005, DEC staff and the Department of Health and Social Service's (DHSS) Section of Epidemiology investigated an outbreak of norovirus gastroenteritis at a large mining camp in Interior Alaska that employed and housed approximately 300 workers. Approximately one-third of workers reported vomiting or diarrhea that significantly disrupted mine productivity. Increasing inspection rates will reduce these outbreaks.</i>													
<i>2. Federally Mandated Inspection Requirements</i>													

**2012 Legislature - Operating Budget
Transaction Compare - Governor Structure
Between Adj Base and Gov Amd**

Numbers and Language Differences Agencies: DEC

Agency: Department of Environmental Conservation

	Column	Trans Type	Total Expenditure	Personal Services	Travel	Services	Commodities	Capital Outlay	Grants	Misc	PFT	PPT	TMP
Environmental Health (continued)													
Food Safety & Sanitation (continued)													
Travel for Food Safety Inspections at High-Risk Facilities or to Meet Federally-Mandated Inspection Requirements (continued)													
<i>The Department of Education and Early Development (DEED) recently cancelled a Memorandum of Understanding between DEC and the DHSS Child Nutrition Program due to lack of available funding and resources within DEED. This MOU supported the need for comprehensive food safety inspections in federal meal programs and to help fulfill the US Department of Agriculture requirement for food safety inspections in these agencies. The Food Safety inspectors will be required to travel to these remote communities to meet this federal inspection requirement.</i>													
			1004 Gen Fund (UGF)	94.6									
			1005 GF/Prgm (DGF)	30.0									
			* Allocation Difference *	124.6	0.0	114.6	0.0	10.0	0.0	0.0	0	0	0
Laboratory Services													
	Gov Amd	IncM	Add One Microbiologist and Related Costs to Continue to Support Shellfish Testing	84.0	54.0	0.0	0.0	30.0	0.0	0.0	1	0	0
<i>Continuing to perform Paralytic Shellfish Poison (PSP) testing necessary to support the increased demand from geoduck farms, wild harvest areas, and commercial Dungeness whole-crab sellers.</i>													
<i>The legislature approved a one-time increment of \$80.0 with one full-time position for FY2012. The work associated with this increment has not diminished and has in fact increased.</i>													
			1005 GF/Prgm (DGF)	84.0									
	Gov Amd	IncM	Expansion of Paralytic Shellfish Poison Testing	190.0	110.0	0.0	50.0	30.0	0.0	0.0	0	0	0
<i>Continuing to perform Paralytic Shellfish Poison (PSP) testing necessary to support the increased demand from geoduck farms, wild harvest areas, and commercial Dungeness whole-crab sellers.</i>													
<i>The legislature approved a one-time increment of \$80.0 with one full-time position for FY2012. The work associated with this increment has not diminished and has in fact increased.</i>													
<i>This funding allows for the testing of 540 of the 1,244 additional samples anticipated from a variety of fisheries. This includes the 180 samples received in FY2012 funded by the one-time-item. The State Environmental Health Lab is currently at testing capacity for PSP and cannot handle the increased testing required by these demands. The Division will use the Microbiologist position, contractual support, and non-permanent staff to meet this demand.</i>													
<i>Without this funding and the associated Microbiologist position, the Department will be unable to complete all requested PSP tests in a timely manner which will result in costly delays for the shellfish industry and prevent commercial Dungeness crab sellers from selling whole crab.</i>													
			1004 Gen Fund (UGF)	190.0									
	Gov Amd	IncM	Fish Tissue Testing Program	557.0	300.0	0.0	207.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0	0	0
<i>The Fish Tissue Testing Program will lose federal funding in FY2013.</i>													
<i>It is DEC's mission to make sure fish are safe to eat and to monitor environmental pollution. The State Environmental Health Lab is accredited by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) to test fish and</i>													

**2012 Legislature - Operating Budget
Transaction Compare - Governor Structure
Between Adj Base and Gov Amd**

Numbers and Language Differences Agencies: DEC

Agency: Department of Environmental Conservation

	Column	Trans Type	Total Expenditure	Personal Services	Travel	Services	Commodities	Capital Outlay	Grants	Misc	PFT	PPT	TMP
Environmental Health (continued)													
Laboratory Services (continued)													
Fish Tissue Testing Program (continued)													
<p><i>environmental samples for heavy metals. The Fish Tissue Testing Program allows the state to monitor the levels of contaminants in fish tissue to determine trends, advise the public of any health threats posed by consuming fish, assure other states and countries that Alaska's fish are safe to import, and participate in international efforts to address pollutant sources. This data is used to override the federal guidelines issued by the EPA that restrict fish consumption based on limited data. This program also provides a positive economic impact on industry and tourism, and proves our resource development activities are not harming Alaska's fish. In addition to the Department using the data to make regulatory decisions, this data is used by agencies like the Alaska Seafood Marketing Institute (ASMI), the Department of Fish and Game, and the Department of Health and Social Services for marketing and education. This data informs consumers it is safe for pregnant women and children to eat Alaskan salmon regularly.</i></p> <p><i>The program has been federally funded since FY2002 (funding sources include: Alaska Sustainable Salmon Fund, the Coastal Impact Assistance Program, as well as direct and pass through federal grants) but those funding sources have dried up and the Department has been unsuccessful in securing new federal funding sources. This funding supports one full-time Chemist, one full-time Lab Technician who helps prepare samples, and part of the State Veterinarian. When not analyzing fish, these positions work on other requests such as radiation from nuclear disasters, identifying mysterious substances such as the Kivalina goo, and developing new methods for assessing Paralytic Shellfish Poison (PSP) levels.</i></p> <p><i>Federal receipts authority is not being reduced in the FY2013 budget, as the department evaluated and reduced unrealizable fund sources for this component during the 2011 session.</i></p>													
	1004 Gen Fund (UGF)		557.0										
	* Allocation Difference *		831.0	464.0	0.0	257.0	110.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1	0	0
	** Appropriation Difference **		955.6	464.0	114.6	257.0	120.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1	0	0
Spill Prevention and Response													
Contaminated Sites Program													
	Cleanup of Contaminated Sites	Gov Amd	Inc	550.0	0.0	0.0	550.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0	0	0
<p><i>The Contaminated Sites program's federal funding currently exceeds its existing federal authority due to increases in grants from the Department of Defense, the EPA's Brownfield Program and the Federal Aviation Administration. The increased federal receipts authority would allow the Contaminated Sites program to accomplish additional priority cleanup work that would otherwise not be possible. This cleanup work would also help to create more private sector jobs through the use of contractual services. Additional cleanup work will help to reduce historical contamination, help to close exposure pathways (the means by which contamination may potentially reach humans or ecological receptors) and restore sites for reuse.</i></p>													
	1002 Fed Rcpts (Fed)		550.0										
	* Allocation Difference *		550.0	0.0	0.0	550.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0	0	0
	** Appropriation Difference **		550.0	0.0	0.0	550.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0	0	0

Water

**2012 Legislature - Operating Budget
Transaction Compare - Governor Structure
Between Adj Base and Gov Amd**

Numbers and Language Differences Agencies: DEC

Agency: Department of Environmental Conservation

	Column	Trans Type	Total Expenditure	Personal Services	Travel	Services	Commodities	Capital Outlay	Grants	Misc	PFT	PPT	TMP
Water (continued)													
Water Quality													
Alaska Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Primacy	Gov Amd	Inc	372.1	0.0	0.0	372.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0	0	0
<p><i>The Department of Environmental Conservation (DEC) is assuming the responsibility for all oil and gas wastewater discharge permitting from the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). The final phase of transfer of authority is for the Alaska Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (APDES) program. This funding will support this new workload, combined with the increase in activity already being seen. As exploration projects move into production, new production-based permits will need to be issued. These projects are highly complex, requiring an expert level permit writer whose permits are expected to be subjected to scrutiny and legal challenge. DEC will contract for this support.</i></p> <p><i>The increase in oil and gas lease sales and exploration activities in Alaska brings a corresponding increase in wastewater discharge permitting activities and workload. DEC is seeing an increase in applications for permitting for exploration projects. For example, recently a new oil rig was added to the Cook Inlet platforms for the first time in many years, and the Department expects more to be added in that area. Another example is potential shale oil projects on the North Slope that will require review for waste water discharge permits. The proposed project at Point Thomson is another example of a project that requires significant resources and numerous wastewater discharge permits from the Division of Water. These are the new projects that the Department is working on now, and with recent oil and gas lease sales and national interest in energy resources, we foresee even more work.</i></p> <p><i>On October 31, 2008, the EPA approved the State's application to administer the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) wastewater discharge permitting program. The State's program is called the APDES. DEC is responsible for wastewater permitting and compliance for discharges to surface waters. As part of the application process, DEC projected the resources needed to implement the program based on information known at that time (2006). Based on the experience implementing the program since October 2008, DEC has identified additional resources needed to support permitting the increase in permit work. The Department has identified a three-phase approach: Phase 1: Oil and Gas Permitting, Phase 2: Industrial Permitting and Phase 3: Antidegradation. This will fund Phase 1.</i></p>													
1004 Gen Fund (UGF)			372.1										
Mine Permitting	Gov Amd	Inc	200.0	188.0	0.0	12.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0	0	0
<p><i>Inter-agency receipts authority (I/A) is needed to account for mining receipts from the Department of Natural Resources.</i></p> <p><i>These funds are reimbursement from the Department of Natural Resources to pay for the permitting work related to mining projects by mining engineers. The current budget authority is not sufficient to budget all RSAs and is resulting in unnecessary administrative and accounting burden to staff. The proposed request will streamline and bring efficiency to the management and accounting of these receipts.</i></p>													
1007 I/A Rcpts (Other)			200.0										
* Allocation Difference *			572.1	188.0	0.0	384.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0	0	0
** Appropriation Difference **			572.1	188.0	0.0	384.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0	0	0
*** Agency Difference ***			2,357.7	880.5	119.6	1,228.6	129.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1	0	0
**** All Agencies Difference ****			2,357.7	880.5	119.6	1,228.6	129.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1	0	0

Column Definitions

Adj Base (FY13 Adjusted Base) - FY2012 Management Plan less one-time items, plus FY2013 adjustments for position counts, funding transfers, line item transfers, temporary increments (IncT) from prior years, and additions for statewide items (risk management and most salary and benefit increases). The Adjusted Base is the "first cut" of the FY2013 budget; it is the base to which the Governor's and the Legislature's increments, decrements, and fund changes are added.

Gov Amd (FY13 Governor Amended) - FY13 Governor's Amended Budget (Includes Governor's Dec 15th budget AND the Governor's Amendments submitted on February 17th)