

STATE OF ALASKA VOICES FOR VISION BUDGET SURVEY

FEBRUARY 2015



Prepared for
Governor Bill Walker and
Lieutenant Governor Byron Mallott,
State of Alaska

Master of Public Administration
School of Management
University of Alaska Southeast
E-mail: mpa@uas.alaska.edu
www.uas.alaska.edu/som/mpa
Toll Free: 1-800-478-9069

SCHOOL OF MANAGEMENT

UAS UNIVERSITY OF ALASKA
SOUTHEAST

learn • engage • change

STATE OF ALASKA VOICES FOR VISION BUDGET SURVEY

Prepared by:

Dr. Kathy DiLorenzo
Director, Master of Public Administration Program
School of Management, University of Alaska Southeast

Katy Jordan
Community Outreach Coordinator
School of Management, University of Alaska Southeast

Acknowledgements

This survey was prepared in partnership with the University of Alaska Southeast Master of Public Administration program and the State of Alaska. The research team would like to thank Dr. Nicole Cundiff of the University of Alaska Fairbanks, School of Management and Dr. Diane Hirschberg of the University of Alaska Anchorage, Institute for Social and Economic Research for their invaluable support and expertise. We would also like to specially recognize the University of Alaska students who participated in this important research: UAS MPA Candidates: Katie Parrott, Sarai Timothy, Stacey Norman, Amy Manuel, Carlen Williams, Michelle Webb, Julie McBrien, Lissa Hughes, Neely Perisich and Tiffany Zulkosky; UAA MPA Candidate: Lee Kearney; UAF MBA Candidate: Robert Christie; and UAF BBA Students: Luke Bonnewell, Patrick Lassell, Richard Stout, Esul "Pomi" Chafin and Rick Rifley. Their enthusiasm, dedication and insight were instrumental to the completion of this analysis.

STATE OF ALASKA VOICES FOR VISION BUDGET SURVEY

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	1
Definitions and Data Explanations	4
Considerations and Definitions	4
Top Level Themes and Codes	4
Subthemes	5
Areas of Government and Codes – Employee Survey	7
Areas of Government and Codes – Citizen Survey	7
Descriptive Survey Results	8
Top Level Themes by Department – Employee Survey	8
Top Level Themes by Area of Government – Citizen Survey	11
Public Employees Survey Results	13
Administration	13
Commerce, Community and Economic Development	15
Corrections	16
Court System	18
Education and Early Development	19
Environmental Conservation	20
Fish and Game	22
Health and Social Services	24
Labor and Workforce Development	26
Law	27
Military and Veterans Affairs	28
Natural Resources	29
Public Safety	30
Revenue	31
State Legislature	33
Transportation and Public Facilities	34
Alaska Citizens Survey Results	36
Administration	36
Education	37
Environmental Conservation	39
Fish and Game	39
Health and Social Services	40
Labor and Workforce Development	42
Natural Resources	43
Public Safety	44
State Legislature	45
Transportation and Infrastructure	46
Consumer Energy	47
Other	48

STATE OF ALASKA VOICES FOR VISION BUDGET SURVEY

Executive Summary

With the Voices of Vision Budget Survey Governor Bill Walker and Lieutenant Governor Byron Mallott sought to access two of the state of Alaska's most important stakeholders, the public employees charged with ensuring the responsible stewardship of public resources, and the citizens of Alaska who expect public servants to make strategic and effective decisions about how those resources are managed.

This report is an overview of the Voices of Vision survey results and provides an examination of the suggestions by both public employees and Alaska citizens in relation to the efficient and effective use of State of Alaska resources in this time of declining revenue.

The surveys were organized into four Top Level Themes that respondents were able to address in relation to the various areas of state government. The Themes of **Additional Revenue**, **Spending Cuts**, **Partnerships** and **Restructuring** were the context for open ended comments where public employees and Alaska citizens were encouraged to be creative and innovative in their responses. The information in this report will serve to inform public servants at all levels in their important effort to shape the path to a strong economic future for the state of Alaska.

A total of 2,778 surveys were completed with the following breakdown¹:

- Public Employees completed 1,836 surveys
- Alaska Citizens completed 942 surveys.
- Total number of comments summarized and categorized was 4,000

In comparing the public employee's and the Alaska citizen's surveys it was demonstrated that they favor the same Top Level Themes at almost the same rate. The breakdown of those Themes between the two are as follows:

Public Employees favored the Top Level Themes in the following order:

1. Restructuring
2. Additional Revenue
3. Spending Cuts
4. Partnerships

Alaska Citizens favored the Top Level Themes in the following order:

5. Restructure
6. Spending Cuts
7. Additional Revenue
8. Partnerships

¹ Sample Size dictates that an adequate sample for a population of 736,000 with a MoE of ± 3 and a confidence level of 95% is 1,066.

STATE OF ALASKA VOICES FOR VISION BUDGET SURVEY

It was revealed across the comments that the public employees and the Alaska citizens both favored the **Restructuring** of departments. We can also infer from the data that neither population indicated that **Partnerships** were a high consideration in their comments.

While **Additional Revenue** and **Spending Cuts** occupy the third and fourth spots in either set of data, the public employee's comments favored seeking avenues for **Additional Revenue** before attempting **Spending Cuts**. The Alaska citizens were more inclined to submit comments favoring **Spending Cuts**, though there was not a large discrepancy with the total number of comments for those two categories.

Comments concerning Areas of Government followed along the above mentioned Top Level Themes and can be summarized as:

Public Employees Comments: Area of Government	Referenced with MORE Frequency	Referenced with LESS Frequency
Administration	X	
Commerce, Community and Economic Development		X
Corrections	X	
Court System	X	
Education and Early Development	X	
Environmental Conservation		X
Fish and Game	X	
Health and Social Services	X	
Labor and Workforce Development		X
Law		X
Military and Veteran's Affairs		X
Natural Resources	X	
Public Safety	X	
Revenue	X	
State Legislature	X	
Transportation and Public Facilities	X	

Alaska Citizens Comments: Areas of Government	Referenced with MORE Frequency	Referenced with LESS Frequency
Administration	X	
Education	X	
Environmental Conservation		X
Fish and Game	X	
Health and Social Services	X	
Labor and Workforce Development		X
Natural Resources	X	
Public Safety		X
State Legislature	X	
Transportation and Infrastructure	X	
Consumer Energy	X	
Other	X	

STATE OF ALASKA VOICES FOR VISION BUDGET SURVEY

Overall, comments were generally positive and insightful. **Public employees** were willing to suggest slight cuts in working hours or travel to demonstrate their commitment to providing solutions:

"When the price of oil dropped in the mid-80's the Department of Environmental Conservation, collectively, decided to reduce its work hours for all staff from 37.5 to 32 hours. The department decided to do this rather than cut staff. I suggest that approach be applied across all departments except corrections and public safety and DMV. It would show Alaskans that state employees are willing to do their part to cut the budget."

"The State of Alaska is huge and many of us need to travel to complete our work. With that said, a lot of travel is either unnecessary, or the cost far outweighs the benefit. I feel it would benefit the State immensely if all departments reviewed travel plans for employees and cut out travel that does not yield much in return."

Alaska Citizens commented specifically about creative incentives for Permanent Fund Dividends and on possible new tax structures:

"Is it possible to use the PFD as a tool to allow individuals to begin to prepay for long term care needs? Could it be set up like the college tuition prepayment program? Could the incentive be to allow these individuals a higher preference on the waitlist?"

"Allow Alaskans to use their perm fund dividends to buy equity into the natural gas pipeline proposed. Allow Alaskans to get excited by helping the State fund the cost of construction and take ownership of the project."

"Have a state income tax, BUT if one qualifies for the PFD, they then get a rebate of all their state income tax liabilities. This would capture all the out of state oil field, commercial fisheries, mining, tourism workers that come into the state, make their money and leave with it."

The information presented in the following report is meant to inform and provide context for decision making in regards to addressing the important fiscal issues facing the State of Alaska. The design created for analysis provides an additional avenue for Alaska's citizens and public employees to provide input into the policy process. This connection to a broader stakeholder population is a great step forward in the continuing development of a meaningful public input process to help to inform public servants in Alaska in their decision making processes.

Definitions and Data Explanations

The initial surveys were created by State of Alaska staff and distributed through the Survey Monkey electronic format. This served two purposes, 1) to acquire a broad representation of Alaska citizens in a limited amount of time, and 2) to give the public employees a confidential place outside of the State of Alaska system to provide their comments.

The analysis team received the survey data from the State of Alaska and began a comparison method for determining consistencies across categories of the data. This was an iterative process of implementing an open coding approach where the team initially coded for consistencies. Meetings were scheduled with frequency while coding to examine the connections, or lack of connections, between the coding and adjustments were made where appropriate. The process then followed an axial coding and selective coding structure to ensure that data reflected appropriate cross category consistencies.²

Frequencies (counts and percentages) were run for all categories. In addition cross tabs were run to provide a more complex and dynamic analysis of the data. Those crosstabs can be accessed in the Descriptive Survey Results section, which contains sub level data linking categorized Sub Themes to specific individual public employee and Alaska citizen's comments.

Considerations and Definitions

- (n) = the number of respondents for the particular Theme, Subthemes or Areas of Government. Totals of Count and % of Respondents may not add up to (n) due to the ability of respondents to select multiple themes, subthemes and areas of government.
- Count = number of responses in each Theme, Subtheme or Areas of Government category
- % of Respondents = percentage of responses for particular Sub Themes or Areas of Government out of those who responded in each Theme, Subtheme or Areas of Government.
- The University of Alaska does have a specific Area of Government categorization. The comments for the University can be found in various Subtheme areas directly related to the issue in the comment. Comments concerning the university can be found by a direct search of the entire comments using key words.

Top Level Themes and Codes

Top Level Theme	Code
Additional Revenue	REV
Spending Cuts	CUT
Partnerships	PARTNER
Restructuring	RESTRUCT
Other	OTHER
Non-Comment	NONCOM

² Strauss, A. & Corbin, J. (1990). [Basics of Qualitative Research: Grounded Theory Procedures and Techniques](#). Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

STATE OF ALASKA VOICES FOR VISION BUDGET SURVEY

Subthemes

- **Policy and process review** – Includes recommendations that require legislative or administrative action; policy changes or administrative rules revision; streamlining or restructuring department or unit processes.
- **Efficient use of resources** – Includes ethical and responsible use of equipment, supplies, resources; reduce or eliminate waste and misuse; purchasing assets vs. leasing/renting; maintenance improvements; increased employee and citizen accountability measures.
- **Efficient personnel and administrative functions** – Includes streamlining tasks or processes, cutting or adding positions, leveraging existing positions, reducing redundancies; paid time off alternatives, leave without pay, voluntary furloughs; reclassification of positions; positions cuts by attrition; utilization of internships; increased training opportunities; hiring freezes.
- **Review travel cost and procedures** – Cut or reduce travel, use technology, use mileage, limit travel benefits, increase accountability and efficiency of travel.
- **Review and diversify current tax and fee structures** – Includes oil, mining, and natural resource fee and taxes; casinos, state lottery, or other gaming opportunities; elimination of subsidies and tax breaks.
- **Improve inter- and intra- departments efficiencies** – Includes consolidation of departments, improve internal coordination.
- **Fully fund specific departments and programs** – Includes recommendations to fully fund, increase funding to, transfer funds to, create, implement or otherwise support a specific department, program, project, or initiative.
- **Leverage technology to increase efficiencies** – Includes technology to improve efficiency of job functions or state processes, such as electronic systems, paper-less systems, improved efficiencies, use of teleconferencing, web-meetings; energy efficiency, cost-reduction, and innovation.
- **Determine value of top level administration positions** – Includes evaluation of top administrative and leadership positions, for example division directors and commissioners, or levels/structure of administration.
- **Restructure specific departments and programs** – Reorganizing, adjusting work in existing departments to increase efficiency or utilizing existing employees and resources in a different way for better use. This could be merging two departments or divisions, shifting workloads, restructuring or moving units, giving responsibilities or resources to another division, or employee, etc.
- **Eliminate departments, programs, and projects** – Includes the complete elimination of a department, program or project.
- **Retirement incentives (RIP)** – Includes offering early retirement incentivizes and/or retirement programs.
- **Leverage public and private partnerships** – Includes accessing federal funds, matching funds, private sponsorships and partners; non-duplication of federal or municipal functions; local

STATE OF ALASKA VOICES FOR VISION BUDGET SURVEY

contributions; community-based solutions; tribal partnerships and funding; tribal sovereignty; private education; volunteerism.

- **Across the board cuts** – Includes assessing formula funding cuts, departmental cuts, and across the board cuts; incentivizing fiscal efficiency and cost-cutting.
- **Eliminate Universal State Space Standards** – Includes the complete elimination of the space standards policy.
- **Implementation of a state income tax** – Includes various options for implementation of a state income tax.
- **Use Alaska Permanent Fund** – Includes using the Alaska Permanent Fund to increase revenues (i.e. cap dividends & reinvest overage, tax dividends, dividends set aside for school funding, retirement, etc.).
- **Implementation of a state sales tax** – Includes various schemes for the implementation of a state sales tax.
- **Contracting out services or projects** – Includes contracting of government services to outside entities; outsourcing of functions or programs.
- **Access stakeholder input & expertise** – Includes increasing public input; utilizing internal expertise; seeking employees' suggestions/solutions; seeking in-state experts and consultants.
- **Privatize** – Complete transfer of all public services to private sector entities, including operations and funding.

STATE OF ALASKA VOICES FOR VISION BUDGET SURVEY

Areas of Government and Codes – Employee Survey

Areas of Government	Code
Administration	ADMIN
Commerce, Community and Economic Development	CCED
Corrections	CORR
Court System	COURT
Education and Early Development	EED
Environmental Conservation	DEC
Fish and Game	FG
Health and Social Services	HSS
Labor & Workforce Development	DOL
Law	LAW
Military and Veterans Affairs	MVA
Natural Resources	DNR
Public Safety	PUBSAF
Revenue	REV
State Legislature	LEG
Transportation and Public Facilities	DOT

Areas of Government and Codes – Citizen Survey

Areas of Government	Code
Administration	ADMIN
Education	EDU
Environmental Conservation	DEC
Fish and Game	FG
Health and Social Services	HSS
Labor & Workforce Development	DOL
Natural Resources	DNR
Public Safety	PUBSAF
State Legislature	LEG
Transportation and Infrastructure	DOT
Consumer Energy	CONENG
Other	OTHER
All Departments	ALL

STATE OF ALASKA VOICES FOR VISION BUDGET SURVEY

Descriptive Survey Results

Top Level Themes by Department – Employee Survey

The tables in this section represent the Top Level Themes of **Additional Revenue**, **Spending Cuts**, **Partnerships** and **Restructuring** in relation to the 16 Areas of Government as addressed by the Alaska Public Employees who answered in each respective area. For the public employee survey there were 1,836 total surveys completed. The Count represents the total number of comments for each Area of Government. The analysis indicates that the majority of comments for the overall categories were directed towards the Themes of **Spending Cuts** and **Restructuring**. Administration and Health and Social Services were located within the top three spots of all Top Level Themes, except for **Additional Revenue** where Administration saw fewer comments.

Additional Revenue (REV) – Employees (n = 523)			
Area of Government	Dept. Code	Count	% of Respondents
Fish and Game	FG	71	14%
Health and Social Services	HSS	71	14%
Revenue	REV	65	12%
Public Safety	PUBSAF	48	9%
Education and Early Development	EED	42	8%
Corrections	CORR	40	8%
Transportation and Public Facilities	DOT	39	7%
Natural Resources	NR	31	6%
Commerce, Community and Economic Dev.	CCED	20	4%
Environmental Conservation	EC	19	4%
Administration	ADMIN	19	4%
Law	LAW	18	3%
Court System	COURT	17	3%
Labor & Workforce Development	DOL	8	2%
Military and Veterans Affairs	MVA	8	2%
State Legislature	LEG	6	1%
All Departments	ALL	0	0%
Other	Other	1	0%

STATE OF ALASKA VOICES FOR VISION BUDGET SURVEY

Spending Cuts (CUT) – Employees (n = 1,237)			
Area of Government	Dept. Code	Count	% of Respondents
Administration	ADMIN	345	28%
State Legislature	LEG	154	12%
Health and Social Services	HSS	119	10%
Transportation and Public Facilities	DOT	109	9%
Corrections	CORR	108	9%
Fish and Game	FG	66	5%
Public Safety	PUBSAF	59	5%
Court System	COURT	42	3%
Revenue	REV	42	3%
Commerce, Community and Economic Dev.	CCED	41	3%
Natural Resources	NR	34	3%
Labor & Workforce Development	DOL	31	3%
Environmental Conservation	EC	26	2%
Law	LAW	24	2%
Education and Early Development	EED	19	2%
Military and Veterans Affairs	MVA	10	1%
Other	Other	8	1%
All Departments	ALL	0	0%

Partnerships (PARTNER) – Employees (n = 315)			
Area of Government	Dept. Code	Count	% of Respondents
Health and Social Services	HSS	41	13%
Administration	ADMIN	36	11%
Corrections	CORR	30	10%
Fish and Game	FG	28	9%
Natural Resources	NR	25	8%
Public Safety	PUBSAF	24	8%
Transportation and Public Facilities	DOT	24	8%
Commerce, Community and Economic Dev.	CCED	20	6%
Labor & Workforce Development	DOL	18	6%
Court System	COURT	17	5%
Education and Early Development	EED	16	5%
Environmental Conservation	EC	13	4%
Law	LAW	7	2%
Military and Veterans Affairs	MVA	7	2%
State Legislature	LEG	5	2%
Revenue	REV	4	1%
All Departments	ALL	0	0%
Other	Other	0	0%

STATE OF ALASKA VOICES FOR VISION BUDGET SURVEY

Restructure (RESTRUCT) – Employees (n = 1,088)			
Area of Government	Dept. Code	Count	% of Respondents
Administration	ADMIN	259	24%
Health and Social Services	HSS	148	14%
Transportation and Public Facilities	DOT	99	9%
Corrections	CORR	81	7%
Fish and Game	FG	72	7%
Public Safety	PUBSAF	66	6%
Natural Resources	NR	63	6%
Court System	COURT	53	5%
Environmental Conservation	EC	45	4%
Labor & Workforce Development	DOL	46	4%
Commerce, Community and Economic Dev.	CCED	29	3%
State Legislature	LEG	35	3%
Education and Early Development	EED	23	2%
Law	LAW	23	2%
Revenue	REV	26	2%
Military and Veterans Affairs	MVA	10	1%
Other	Other	6	1%
All Departments	ALL	4	0%

STATE OF ALASKA VOICES FOR VISION BUDGET SURVEY

Top Level Themes by Area of Government – Citizen Survey

The tables in this section represent the Top Level Themes of **Additional Revenue**, **Spending Cuts**, **Partnerships** and **Restructuring** in relation to the 11 Areas of Government as addressed by the Alaska Citizens who answered in each respective area. For the Citizen survey there were 942 total surveys completed. The Count represents the total number of comments for each Area of Government. As with the public employees analysis, the Alaska citizen’s comments indicate that the majority of comments for the overall categories were directed towards the Top Level Themes of **Spending Cuts** and **Restructuring**. Administration was again at the top of both of the categories with Education having the second most comments in the **Restructuring** category and Transportation and Infrastructure acquiring a high number of comments in the **Spending Cuts** Theme.

Additional Revenue (REV) – Citizens (n = 293)			
Area of Government	Dept. Code	Count	% of Respondents
Administration	ADMIN	57	19%
Other	OTHER	57	19%
Education	EDU	48	16%
Fish & Game	FG	30	10%
Natural Resources	DNR	28	10%
Transportation & Infrastructure	TRANS	23	8%
Health and Social Services	HSS	14	5%
Public Safety	PUBSAF	14	5%
Labor and Workforce Development	DOL	7	2%
Environmental Conservation	EC	4	1%
State Legislature	LEG	3	1%
Consumer Energy	CONENG	4	1%
All Departments	ALL	4	1%

Spending Cuts (CUT) – Citizens (n = 539)			
Area of Government	Dept. Code	Count	% of Respondents
Administration	ADMIN	120	22%
Transportation & Infrastructure	TRANS	88	16%
State Legislature	LEG	65	12%
Other	OTHER	67	12%
Education	EDU	61	11%
All Departments	ALL	25	5%
Health and Social Services	HSS	23	4%
Public Safety	PUBSAF	21	4%
Fish & Game	FG	17	3%
Natural Resources	DNR	18	3%
Environmental Conservation	EC	12	2%
Labor and Workforce Development	DOL	12	2%
Consumer Energy	CONENG	10	2%

STATE OF ALASKA VOICES FOR VISION BUDGET SURVEY

Partnerships (PARTNER) – Citizens (n = 138)			
Area of Government	Dept. Code	Count	% of Respondents
Education	EDU	26	19%
Health and Social Services	HSS	22	16%
Transportation & Infrastructure	TRANS	18	13%
Administration	ADMIN	14	10%
Natural Resources	DNR	13	9%
Other	OTHER	13	9%
Consumer Energy	CONENG	10	7%
Environmental Conservation	EC	5	4%
Labor and Workforce Development	DOL	6	4%
Fish & Game	FG	4	3%
All Departments	ALL	4	3%
Public Safety	PUBSAF	2	1%
State Legislature	LEG	1	1%

Restructure (RESTRUCT) – Citizens (n = 549)			
Area of Government	Dept. Code	Count	% of Respondents
Education	EDU	118	21%
Administration	ADMIN	116	21%
Health and Social Services	HSS	51	9%
Transportation & Infrastructure	TRANS	51	9%
Other	OTHER	35	6%
Fish & Game	FG	32	6%
Natural Resources	DNR	31	6%
All Departments	ALL	25	5%
Public Safety	PUBSAF	23	4%
Consumer Energy	CONENG	21	4%
State Legislature	LEG	19	3%
Labor and Workforce Development	DOL	15	3%
Environmental Conservation	EC	12	2%

STATE OF ALASKA VOICES FOR VISION BUDGET SURVEY

Public Employees Survey Results

The tables in this section represent the 16 Areas of Government that were designated in the public employees Survey. Each Area of Government is categorized into the Top Level Themes of **Additional Revenue, Spending Cuts, Partnerships** and **Restructuring**. The Count of the comments is categorized into Subthemes under the Top Level Themes.

ADMINISTRATION

Administration (ADMIN) – Employees (n = 19)		
Additional Revenue (REV)	Count	% of Respondents
Review and diversify current tax and fee structures	4	21%
Review of travel cost and procedures	3	16%
Policy and process review	3	16%
Implement income tax	2	11%
Use Alaska Permanent Fund	2	11%
Retirement incentives (RIP)	2	11%
Efficient use of resources	1	5%
Leverage technology to increase efficiencies	1	5%
Determine value of top level administration positions	1	5%

Administration (ADMIN) – Employees (n = 345)		
Spending Cuts (CUT)	Count	% of Respondents
Review of travel cost and procedures	74	21%
Eliminate Universal State Space Standards	68	20%
Leverage technology to increase efficiencies	37	11%
Policy and process review	32	9%
Retirement incentives (RIP)	31	9%
Efficient personnel and administrative functions	30	9%
Efficient use of resources	26	8%
Determine value of top level administration positions	19	6%
Restructure specific departments and programs	7	2%
Improve inter- and intra- departments efficiencies	5	1%
Implement income tax	4	1%
Eliminate departments, programs, and projects	3	1%
Fully fund specific departments and programs	3	1%
Across the board cuts	2	1%
Review and diversify current tax and fee structures	2	1%
Use Alaska Permanent Fund	1	0%
Implement sales tax	1	0%

STATE OF ALASKA VOICES FOR VISION BUDGET SURVEY

Administration (ADMIN) – Employees (n = 36)		
Partnerships (PARTNER)	Count	% of Respondents
Efficient personnel and administrative functions	8	22%
Improve inter- and intra- departments efficiencies	6	17%
Efficient use of resources	4	11%
Leverage technology to increase efficiencies	4	11%
Policy and process review	3	8%
Leverage public and private partnerships	3	8%
Review of travel cost and procedures	2	6%
Across the board cuts	2	6%
Use Alaska Permanent Fund	1	3%
Eliminate Universal State Space Standards	1	3%
Review and diversify current tax and fee structures	1	3%
Restructure specific departments and programs	1	3%

Administration (ADMIN) – Employees (n = 243)		
Restructuring (RESTRUCT)	Count	% of Respondents
Efficient personnel and administrative functions	41	16%
Policy and process review	39	15%
Determine value of top level administration positions	35	14%
Review of travel cost and procedures	28	11%
Efficient use of resources	22	8%
Leverage technology to increase efficiencies	21	8%
Restructure specific departments and programs	18	7%
Retirement incentives (RIP)	17	7%
Improve inter- and intra- departments efficiencies	15	6%
Across the board cuts	7	3%
Eliminate Universal State Space Standards	6	2%
Fully fund specific departments and programs	3	1%
Access stakeholder input & expertise	2	1%
Leverage public and private partnerships	2	1%
Review and diversify current tax and fee structures	2	1%
Use Alaska Permanent Fund	1	0%

STATE OF ALASKA VOICES FOR VISION BUDGET SURVEY

COMMERCE, COMMUNITY AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

Commerce, Community and Econ Dev. (CCED) – Employees (n = 20)		
Additional Revenue (REV)	Count	% of Respondents
Review and diversify current tax and fee structures	10	50%
Efficient use of resources	4	20%
Fully fund specific departments and programs	4	20%
Review of travel cost and procedures	1	5%
Policy and process review	1	5%

Commerce, Community and Econ Dev. (CCED) – Employees (n = 41)		
Spending Cuts (CUT)	Count	% of Respondents
Efficient use of resources	11	27%
Leverage technology to increase efficiencies	6	15%
Review of travel cost and procedures	5	12%
Eliminate departments, programs, and projects	5	12%
Efficient personnel and administrative functions	4	10%
Restructure specific departments and programs	2	5%
Review and diversify current tax and fee structures	2	5%
Determine value of top level administration positions	1	2%
Retirement incentives (RIP)	1	2%
Eliminate Universal State Space Standards	1	2%
Improve inter- and intra- departments efficiencies	1	2%
Across the board cuts	1	2%
Policy and process review	1	2%

Commerce, Community and Econ Dev. (CCED) – Employees (n = 20)		
Partnerships (PARTNER)	Count	% of Respondents
Policy and process review	4	20%
Leverage public and private partnerships	4	20%
Review and diversify current tax and fee structures	3	15%
Improve inter- and intra- departments efficiencies	3	15%
Leverage technology to increase efficiencies	2	10%
Across the board cuts	1	5%
Determine value of top level administration positions	1	5%
Efficient use of resources	1	5%
Restructure specific departments and programs	1	5%

STATE OF ALASKA VOICES FOR VISION BUDGET SURVEY

Commerce, Community and Econ Dev. (CCED) – Employees (n = 27)		
Restructuring (RESTRUCT)	Count	% of Respondents
Efficient personnel and administrative functions	9	31%
Policy and process review	4	14%
Review and diversify current tax and fee structures	4	14%
Efficient use of resources	2	7%
Restructure specific departments and programs	2	7%
Determine value of top level administration positions	1	3%
Leverage technology to increase efficiencies	1	3%
Eliminate departments, programs, and projects	1	3%
Review of travel cost and procedures	1	3%
Eliminate Universal State Space Standards	1	3%
Improve inter- and intra- departments efficiencies	1	3%
Fully fund specific departments and programs	1	3%
Implement sales tax	1	3%

CORRECTIONS

Corrections (CORR) – Employees (n = 40)		
Additional Revenue (REV)	Count	% of Respondents
Fully fund specific departments and programs	9	23%
Policy and process review	7	18%
Efficient use of resources	6	15%
Review and diversify current tax and fee structures	4	10%
Efficient personnel and administrative functions	4	10%
Review of travel cost and procedures	3	8%
Use Perm Fund	2	5%
Improve inter- and intra- departments efficiencies	2	5%
Determine value of top level administration positions	1	3%
Across the board cuts	1	3%
Leverage technology	1	3%

STATE OF ALASKA VOICES FOR VISION BUDGET SURVEY

Corrections (CORR) – Employees (108)		
Spending Cuts (CUT)	Count	% of Respondents
Policy and process review	27	25%
Efficient use of resources	19	18%
Review of travel cost and procedures	19	18%
Efficient personnel and administrative functions	13	12%
Retirement incentives (RIP)	6	6%
Determine value of top level administration positions	5	5%
Improve inter- and intra- departments efficiencies	4	4%
Across the board cuts	4	4%
Eliminate departments, programs, and projects	3	3%
Leverage technology to increase efficiencies	3	3%
Review and diversify current tax and fee structures	2	2%
Restructure specific departments and programs	2	2%
Fully fund specific departments and programs	1	1%

Corrections (CORR) – Employees (n = 30)		
Partnerships (PARTNER)	Count	% of Respondents
Improve inter- and intra- departments efficiencies	5	17%
Review of travel cost and procedures	4	13%
Policy and process review	4	13%
Leverage public and private partnerships	4	13%
Fully fund specific departments and programs	3	10%
Efficient use of resources	3	10%
Leverage technology to increase efficiencies	3	10%
Efficient personnel and administrative functions	2	7%
Restructure specific departments and programs	1	3%
Determine value of top level administration positions	1	3%

Correction (CORR) – Employees (n = 81)		
Restructuring (RESTRUCT)	Count	% of Respondents
Efficient use of resources	20	25%
Policy and process review	17	21%
Efficient personnel and administrative functions	13	16%
Review of travel cost and procedures	9	11%
Leverage technology to increase efficiencies	5	6%
Improve inter- and intra- departments efficiencies	4	5%
Determine value of top level administration positions	4	5%
Restructure specific departments and programs	4	5%
Review and diversify current tax and fee structures	2	2%
Use Alaska Permanent Fund	1	1%
Retirement incentives (RIP)	1	1%
Fully fund specific departments and programs	1	1%

STATE OF ALASKA VOICES FOR VISION BUDGET SURVEY

COURT SYSTEM

Court System (COURT) – Employees (n = 17)		
Additional Revenue (REV)	Count	% of Respondents
Review and diversify current tax and fee structures	4	24%
Leverage technology to increase efficiencies	3	18%
Efficient use of resources	2	12%
Fully fund specific departments and programs	2	12%
Efficient personnel and administrative functions	2	12%
Policy and process review	2	12%
Improve inter- and intra- departments efficiencies	1	6%
Restructure specific departments and programs	1	6%

Court System (COURT) – Employees (n = 42)		
Spending Cuts (CUT)	Count	% of Respondents
Leverage technology to increase efficiencies	9	21%
Policy and process review	9	21%
Efficient use of resources	8	19%
Review of travel cost and procedures	6	14%
Efficient personnel and administrative functions	2	5%
Determine value of top level administration positions	2	5%
Across the board cuts	2	5%
Retirement incentives (RIP)	1	2%
Improve inter- and intra- departments efficiencies	1	2%
Review and diversify current tax and fee structures	1	2%
Restructure specific departments and programs	1	2%

Court System (COURT) – Employees (n = 17)		
Partnerships (PARTNER)	Count	% of Respondents
Leverage technology to increase efficiencies	5	29%
Improve inter- and intra- departments efficiencies	4	24%
Review of travel cost and procedures	3	18%
Leverage public and private partnerships	2	12%
Policy and process review	1	6%
Efficient use of resources	1	6%
Determine value of top level administration positions	1	6%

STATE OF ALASKA VOICES FOR VISION BUDGET SURVEY

Court System (COURT) – Employees (n = 53)		
Restructuring (RESTRUCT)	Count	% of Respondents
Policy and process review	14	26%
Efficient use of resources	12	23%
Leverage technology to increase efficiencies	9	17%
Efficient personnel and administrative functions	5	9%
Restructure specific departments and programs	3	6%
Review of travel cost and procedures	2	4%
Determine value of top level administration positions	2	4%
Review and diversify current tax and fee structures	1	2%
Retirement incentives (RIP)	1	2%
Across the board cuts	1	2%
Improve inter- and intra- departments efficiencies	1	2%
Fully fund specific departments and programs	1	2%
Eliminate departments, programs, and projects	1	2%

EDUCATION AND EARLY DEVELOPMENT

Education and Early Development (EED) – Employees (n = 42)		
Additional Revenue (REV)	Count	% of Respondents
Fully fund specific departments and programs	17	40%
Review and diversify current tax and fee structures	12	29%
Policy and process review	7	17%
Efficient use of resources	3	7%
Determine value of top level administration positions	1	2%
Use Alaska Permanent Fund	1	2%
Review of travel cost and procedures	1	2%

Education and Early Development (EED) – Employees (n = 19)		
Spending Cuts (CUT)	Count	% of Respondents
Efficient personnel and administrative functions	4	21%
Efficient use of resources	4	21%
Restructure specific departments and programs	2	11%
Retirement incentives (RIP)	2	11%
Leverage technology to increase efficiencies	2	11%
Policy and process review	2	11%
Eliminate departments, programs, and projects	1	5%
Review of travel cost and procedures	1	5%
Review and diversify current tax and fee structures	1	5%

STATE OF ALASKA VOICES FOR VISION BUDGET SURVEY

Education and Early Development (EED) – Employees (n = 18)		
Partnerships (PARTNER)	Count	% of Respondents
Improve inter- and intra- departments efficiencies	6	38%
Restructure specific departments and programs	2	13%
Leverage public and private partnerships	2	13%
Policy and process review	2	13%
Efficient personnel and administrative functions	1	6%
Review and diversify current tax and fee structures	1	6%
Efficient use of resources	1	6%
Retirement incentives (RIP)	1	6%
Restructure specific departments and programs	2	13%

Education and Early Development (EED) – Employees (n = 23)		
Restructuring (RESTRUCT)	Count	% of Respondents
Policy and process review	8	35%
Restructure specific departments and programs	3	13%
Improve inter- and intra- departments efficiencies	3	13%
Efficient use of resources	3	13%
Retirement incentives (RIP)	2	9%
Review of travel cost and procedures	1	4%
Leverage technology to increase efficiencies	1	4%
Efficient personnel and administrative functions	1	4%
Determine value of top level administration positions	1	4%

ENVIRONMENTAL CONSERVATION

Environmental Conservation (DEC) – Employees (n = 19)		
Additional Revenue (REV)	Count	% of Respondents
Review and diversify current tax and fee structures	9	47%
Improve inter- and intra- departments efficiencies	2	11%
Review of travel cost and procedures	2	11%
Efficient use of resources	2	11%
Fully fund specific departments and programs	2	11%
Across the board cuts	1	5%
Retirement incentives (RIP)	1	5%

STATE OF ALASKA VOICES FOR VISION BUDGET SURVEY

Environmental Conservation (DEC) – Employees (n = 26)		
Spending Cuts (CUT)	Count	% of Respondents
Efficient use of resources	7	27%
Efficient personnel and administrative functions	6	23%
Policy and process review	4	15%
Review of travel cost and procedures	3	12%
Retirement incentives (RIP)	2	8%
Improve inter- and intra- departments efficiencies	1	4%
Across the board cuts	1	4%
Review and diversify current tax and fee structures	1	4%
Restructure specific departments and programs	1	4%

Environmental Conservation (DEC) – Employees (n = 13)		
Partnerships (PARTNER)	Count	% of Respondents
Efficient personnel and administrative functions	4	31%
Leverage public and private partnerships	3	23%
Improve inter- and intra- departments efficiencies	2	15%
Review of travel cost and procedures	2	15%
Determine value of top level administration positions	1	8%
Policy and process review	1	8%

Environmental Conservation (DEC) – Employees (n = 45)		
Restructuring (RESTRUCT)	Count	% of Respondents
Efficient personnel and administrative functions	13	29%
Policy and process review	10	22%
Efficient use of resources	7	16%
Determine value of top level administration positions	4	9%
Restructure specific departments and programs	3	7%
Improve inter- and intra- departments efficiencies	3	7%
Leverage technology to increase efficiencies	2	4%
Review and diversify current tax and fee structures	1	2%
Contract out	1	2%
Review of travel cost and procedures	1	2%

STATE OF ALASKA VOICES FOR VISION BUDGET SURVEY

FISH AND GAME

Fish and Game (FG) - Employees (n = 71)		
Additional Revenue (REV)	Count	% of Respondents
Review and diversify current tax and fee structures	37	52%
Policy and process review	12	17%
Fully fund specific departments and programs	6	8%
Determine value of top level administration positions	4	6%
Efficient personnel and administrative functions	2	3%
Efficient use of resources	2	3%
Restructure specific departments and programs	2	3%
Across the board cuts	2	3%
Eliminate Universal State Space Standards	1	1%
Review of travel cost and procedures	1	1%
Implement sales tax	1	1%
Leverage technology to increase efficiencies	1	1%

Fish and Game (FG) - Employees (n = 66)		
Spending Cuts (CUT)	Count	% of Respondents
Efficient use of resources	12	18%
Efficient personnel and administrative functions	10	15%
Review of travel cost and procedures	9	14%
Leverage technology to increase efficiencies	7	11%
Determine value of top level administration positions	5	8%
Policy and process review	5	8%
Retirement incentives (RIP)	4	6%
Review and diversify current tax and fee structures	3	5%
Eliminate departments, programs, and projects	2	3%
Restructure specific departments and programs	2	3%
Across the board cuts	2	3%
Eliminate Universal State Space Standards	2	3%
Improve inter- and intra- departments efficiencies	1	2%
Implement income tax	1	2%
Leverage public and private partnerships	1	2%

STATE OF ALASKA VOICES FOR VISION BUDGET SURVEY

Fish and Game (FG) - Employees (n = 72)		
Restructuring (RESTRUCT)	Count	% of Respondents
Policy and process review	16	22%
Improve inter- and intra- departments efficiencies	15	21%
Efficient personnel and administrative functions	9	13%
Determine value of top level administration positions	6	8%
Retirement incentives (RIP)	6	8%
Review and diversify current tax and fee structures	6	8%
Efficient use of resources	4	6%
Review of travel cost and procedures	2	3%
Leverage technology to increase efficiencies	2	3%
Fully fund specific departments and programs	2	3%
Restructure specific departments and programs	1	1%
Eliminate Universal State Space Standards	1	1%
Across the board cuts	1	1%
Eliminate departments, programs, and projects	1	1%

Fish and Game (FG) - Employees (n = 28)		
Partnerships (PARTNER)	Count	% of Respondents
Leverage public and private partnerships	8	29%
Improve inter- and intra- departments efficiencies	8	29%
Policy and process review	4	14%
Review and diversify current tax and fee structures	3	11%
Efficient use of resources	2	7%
Use Alaska Permanent Fund	1	4%
Implement sales tax	1	4%
Review of travel cost and procedures	1	4%

STATE OF ALASKA VOICES FOR VISION BUDGET SURVEY

HEALTH AND SOCIAL SERVICES

Health and Social Services (HSS) - Employees (n = 148)		
Additional Revenue (REV)	Count	% of Respondents
Efficient personnel and administrative functions	37	25%
Policy and process review	27	18%
Efficient use of resources	22	15%
Improve inter- and intra- departments efficiencies	15	10%
Determine value of top level administration positions	12	8%
Review of travel cost and procedures	9	6%
Leverage technology to increase efficiencies	7	5%
Restructure specific departments and programs	5	3%
Fully fund specific departments and programs	4	3%
Review and diversify current tax and fee structures	3	2%
Retirement incentives (RIP)	2	1%
Across the board cuts	2	1%
Eliminate departments, programs, and projects	1	1%
Implement income tax	1	1%
Leverage public and private partnerships	1	1%

Health and Social Services (HSS) - Employees (n = 41)		
Partnerships (PARTNER)	Count	% of Respondents
Policy and process review	9	22%
Leverage public and private partnerships	8	20%
Efficient personnel and administrative functions	8	20%
Efficient use of resources	6	15%
Improve inter- and intra- departments efficiencies	5	12%
Restructure specific departments and programs	2	5%
Review and diversify current tax and fee structures	1	2%
Leverage technology to increase efficiencies	1	2%
Review of travel cost and procedures	1	2%

STATE OF ALASKA VOICES FOR VISION BUDGET SURVEY

Health and Social Services (HSS) - Employees (n = 119)		
Spending Cuts (CUT)	Count	% of Respondents
Efficient use of resources	39	33%
Policy and process review	14	12%
Efficient personnel and administrative functions	14	12%
Review of travel cost and procedures	13	11%
Leverage technology to increase efficiencies	9	8%
Determine value of top level administration positions	9	8%
Across the board cuts	6	5%
Improve inter- and intra- departments efficiencies	4	3%
Restructure specific departments and programs	3	3%
Eliminate departments, programs, and projects	2	2%
Eliminate Universal State Space Standards	2	2%
Fully fund specific departments and programs	2	2%
Review and diversify current tax and fee structures	1	1%
Retirement incentives (RIP)	1	1%

Health and Social Services (HSS) - Employees (n = 148)		
Restructuring (RESTRUCT)	Count	% of Respondents
Efficient personnel and administrative functions	37	25%
Policy and process review	27	18%
Efficient use of resources	22	15%
Improve inter- and intra- departments efficiencies	15	10%
Determine value of top level administration positions	12	8%
Review of travel cost and procedures	9	6%
Leverage technology to increase efficiencies	7	5%
Restructure specific departments and programs	5	3%
Fully fund specific departments and programs	4	3%
Review and diversify current tax and fee structures	3	2%
Retirement incentives (RIP)	2	1%
Across the board cuts	2	1%
Eliminate departments, programs, and projects	1	1%
Implement income tax	1	1%
Leverage public and private partnerships	1	1%

STATE OF ALASKA VOICES FOR VISION BUDGET SURVEY

LABOR AND WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT

Labor and Workforce Development (DOL) – Employees (n = 8)		
Additional Revenue (REV)	Count	% of Respondents
Fully fund specific departments and programs	3	38%
Review and diversify current tax and fee structures	3	38%
Improve inter- and intra- departments efficiencies	2	25%

Labor and Workforce Development (DOL) – Employees (n = 31)		
Spending Cuts (CUT)	Count	% of Respondents
Efficient personnel and administrative functions	8	26%
Efficient use of resources	7	23%
Review of travel cost and procedures	4	13%
Improve inter- and intra- departments efficiencies	4	13%
Determine value of top level administration positions	2	6%
Leverage technology to increase efficiencies	2	6%
Review and diversify current tax and fee structures	1	3%
Policy and process review	1	3%
Across the board cuts	1	3%
Eliminate departments, programs, and projects	1	3%

Labor and Workforce Development (DOL) - Employees (n = 18)		
Partnerships (PARTNER)	Count	% of Respondents
Policy and process review	4	22%
Improve inter- and intra- departments efficiencies	4	22%
Leverage technology to increase efficiencies	4	22%
Efficient personnel and administrative functions	3	17%
Restructure specific departments and programs	1	6%
Leverage public and private partnerships	1	6%
Efficient use of resources	1	6%

STATE OF ALASKA VOICES FOR VISION BUDGET SURVEY

Labor and Workforce Development (DOL) - Employees (n = 46)		
Restructuring (RESTRUCT)	Count	% of Respondents
Efficient personnel and administrative functions	8	17%
Policy and process review	8	17%
Improve inter- and intra- departments efficiencies	7	15%
Determine value of top level administration positions	5	11%
Efficient use of resources	4	9%
Restructure specific departments and programs	4	9%
Leverage technology to increase efficiencies	3	7%
Leverage public and private partnerships	2	4%
Retirement incentives (RIP)	2	4%
Review and diversify current tax and fee structures	2	4%
Review of travel cost and procedures	1	2%

LAW

Law (LAW) - Employees (n = 18)		
Additional Revenue (REV)	Count	% of Respondents
Policy and process review	5	28%
Efficient use of resources	4	22%
Review and diversify current tax and fee structures	3	17%
Fully fund specific departments and programs	3	17%
Efficient personnel and administrative functions	1	6%
Improve inter- and intra- departments efficiencies	1	6%
Leverage technology to increase efficiencies	1	6%

Law (LAW) - Employees (n = 24)		
Spending Cuts (CUT)	Count	% of Respondents
Efficient use of resources	9	38%
Policy and process review	8	33%
Efficient personnel and administrative functions	2	8%
Retirement incentives (RIP)	1	4%
Review and diversify current tax and fee structures	1	4%
Review of travel cost and procedures	1	4%
Across the board cuts	1	4%
Leverage technology to increase efficiencies	1	4%

STATE OF ALASKA VOICES FOR VISION BUDGET SURVEY

Law (LAW) - Employees (n = 7)		
Partnerships (PARTNER)	Count	% of Respondents
Policy and process review	2	29%
Leverage public and private partnerships	2	29%
Review of travel cost and procedures	1	14%
Efficient personnel and administrative functions	1	14%
Leverage technology to increase efficiencies	1	14%

Law (LAW) – Employees (n = 8)		
Restructuring (RESTRUCT)	Count	% of Respondents
Policy and process review	9	39%
Efficient use of resources	7	30%
Efficient personnel and administrative functions	3	13%
Restructure specific departments and programs	2	9%
Improve inter- and intra- departments efficiencies	1	4%
Review of travel cost and procedures	1	4%

MILITARY AND VETERANS AFFAIRS

Military and Veterans Affairs (MVA) - Employees (n = 8)		
Additional Revenue (REV)	Count	% of Respondents
Policy and process review	3	38%
Fully fund specific departments and programs	2	25%
Leverage technology to increase efficiencies	1	13%
Review and diversify current tax and fee structures	1	13%
Retirement incentives (RIP)	1	13%

Military and Veterans Affairs (MVA) - Employees (n = 10)		
Spending Cuts (CUT)	Count	% of Respondents
Policy and process review	3	30%
Efficient personnel and administrative functions	2	20%
Efficient use of resources	2	20%
Determine value of top level administration positions	1	10%
Review of travel cost and procedures	1	10%
Review and diversify current tax and fee structures	1	10%

Military and Veterans Affairs (MVA) - Employees (n = 7)		
Partnerships (PARTNER)	Count	% of Respondents
Policy and process review	2	29%
Leverage public and private partnerships	2	29%
Review of travel cost and procedures	1	14%
Efficient use of resources	1	14%
Leverage technology to increase efficiencies	1	14%

STATE OF ALASKA VOICES FOR VISION BUDGET SURVEY

Military and Veterans Affairs (MVA) - Employees (n = 10)

Restructuring (RESTRUCT)	Count	% of Respondents
Improve inter- and intra- departments efficiencies	3	30%
Efficient personnel and administrative functions	3	30%
Restructure specific departments and programs	1	10%
Review and diversify current tax and fee structures	1	10%
Determine value of top level administration positions	1	10%
Policy and process review	1	10%

NATURAL RESOURCES

Natural Resources (NR) - Employees (n = 31)

Additional Revenue (REV)	Count	% of Respondents
Review and diversify current tax and fee structures	19	61%
Efficient use of resources	4	13%
Fully fund specific departments and programs	4	13%
Policy and process review	3	10%
Review of travel cost and procedures	1	3%

Natural Resources (NR) - Employees (n = 34)

Spending Cuts (CUT)	Count	% of Respondents
Efficient personnel and administrative functions	9	26%
Efficient use of resources	7	21%
Review of travel cost and procedures	6	18%
Review and diversify current tax and fee structures	3	9%
Leverage technology to increase efficiencies	2	6%
Across the board cuts	2	6%
Policy and process review	1	3%
Eliminate departments, programs, and projects	1	3%
Improve inter- and intra- departments efficiencies	1	3%
Eliminate Universal State Space Standards	1	3%
Fully fund specific departments and programs	1	3%

Natural Resources (NR) – Employees (n = 25)

Partnerships (PARTNER)	Count	% of Respondents
Improve inter- and intra- departments efficiencies	10	40%
Leverage public and private partnerships	6	24%
Policy and process review	4	16%
Review and diversify current tax and fee structures	3	12%
Efficient personnel and administrative functions	2	8%

STATE OF ALASKA VOICES FOR VISION BUDGET SURVEY

Natural Resources (NR) - Employees (n = 63)		
Restructuring (RESTRUCT)	Count	% of Respondents
Efficient use of resources	12	19%
Efficient personnel and administrative functions	12	19%
Policy and process review	11	17%
Improve inter- and intra- departments efficiencies	5	8%
Leverage technology to increase efficiencies	5	8%
Eliminate departments, programs, and projects	4	6%
Determine value of top level administration positions	3	5%
Restructure specific departments and programs	3	5%
Retirement incentives (RIP)	2	3%
Review of travel cost and procedures	2	3%
Review and diversify current tax and fee structures	2	3%
Implement income tax	1	2%
Leverage public and private partnerships	1	2%

PUBLIC SAFETY

Public Safety (PUBSAF) - Employees (n = 48)		
Additional Revenue (REV)	Count	% of Respondents
Fully fund specific departments and programs	17	35%
Review and diversify current tax and fee structures	11	23%
Efficient use of resources	10	21%
Policy and process review	4	8%
Efficient personnel and administrative functions	3	6%
Review of travel cost and procedures	1	2%
Across the board cuts	1	2%
Leverage technology to increase efficiencies	1	2%

Public Safety (PUBSAF) - Employees (n = 48)		
Spending Cuts (CUT)	Count	% of Respondents
Fully fund specific departments and programs	17	35%
Review and diversify current tax and fee structures	11	23%
Efficient use of resources	10	21%
Policy and process review	4	8%
Efficient personnel and administrative functions	3	6%
Review of travel cost and procedures	1	2%
Across the board cuts	1	2%
Leverage technology to increase efficiencies	1	2%

STATE OF ALASKA VOICES FOR VISION BUDGET SURVEY

Public Safety (PUBSAF) - Employees (n = 24)		
Partnerships (PARTNER)	Count	% of Respondents
Improve inter- and intra- departments efficiencies	8	33%
Policy and process review	5	21%
Efficient use of resources	3	13%
Review of travel cost and procedures	2	8%
Leverage public and private partnerships	2	8%
Contract out	1	4%
Fully fund specific departments and programs	1	4%
Efficient personnel and administrative functions	1	4%
Review and diversify current tax and fee structures	1	4%

Public Safety (PUBSAF) - Employees (n = 66)		
Restructuring (RESTRUCT)	Count	% of Respondents
Efficient use of resources	14	21%
Improve inter- and intra- departments efficiencies	10	15%
Efficient personnel and administrative functions	10	15%
Policy and process review	10	15%
Determine value of top level administration positions	5	8%
Review and diversify current tax and fee structures	3	5%
Restructure specific departments and programs	3	5%
Retirement incentives (RIP)	3	5%
Review of travel cost and procedures	2	3%
Fully fund specific departments and programs	2	3%
Eliminate Universal State Space Standards	1	2%
Eliminate departments, programs, and projects	1	2%
Contract out	1	2%
Leverage technology to increase efficiencies	1	2%

REVENUE

Revenue (REV) – Employees (n = 65)		
Additional Revenue (REV)	Count	% of Respondents
Review and diversify current tax and fee structures	19	29%
Implement income tax	15	23%
Policy and process review	7	11%
Efficient use of resources	7	11%
Implement sales tax	5	8%
Fully fund specific departments and programs	4	6%
Use Alaska Permanent Fund	4	6%
Review of travel cost and procedures	2	3%
Retirement incentives (RIP)	1	2%
Across the board cuts	1	2%

STATE OF ALASKA VOICES FOR VISION BUDGET SURVEY

Revenue (REV) - Employees (n = 42)		
Spending Cuts (CUT)	Count	% of Respondents
Policy and process review	8	19%
Efficient personnel and administrative functions	6	14%
Review and diversify current tax and fee structures	5	12%
Retirement incentives (RIP)	3	7%
Use Alaska Permanent Fund	3	7%
Efficient use of resources	3	7%
Fully fund specific departments and programs	3	7%
Leverage technology to increase efficiencies	2	5%
Review of travel cost and procedures	2	5%
Determine value of top level administration positions	2	5%
Leverage public and private partnerships	2	5%
Across the board cuts	1	2%
Eliminate departments, programs, and projects	1	2%
Restructure specific departments and programs	1	2%

Revenue (REV) - Employees (n = 4)		
Partnerships (PARTNER)	Count	% of Respondents
Improve inter- and intra- departments efficiencies	1	25%
Restructure specific departments and programs	1	25%
Leverage technology to increase efficiencies	1	25%
Policy and process review	1	25%

Revenue (REV) - Employees (n = 26)		
Restructuring (RESTRUCT)	Count	% of Respondents
Efficient personnel and administrative functions	5	19%
Determine value of top level administration positions	4	15%
Use Alaska Permanent Fund	3	12%
Review and diversify current tax and fee structures	2	8%
Policy and process review	2	8%
Restructure specific departments and programs	2	8%
Efficient use of resources	2	8%
Contract out	1	4%
Review of travel cost and procedures	1	4%
Fully fund specific departments and programs	1	4%
Improve inter- and intra- departments efficiencies	1	4%
Implement income tax	1	4%
Leverage technology to increase efficiencies	1	4%

STATE OF ALASKA VOICES FOR VISION BUDGET SURVEY

STATE LEGISLATURE

State Legislature (LEG) - Employees (n = 6)		
Additional Revenue (REV)	Count	% of Respondents
Policy and process review	3	50%
Review and diversify current tax and fee structures	1	17%
Efficient use of resources	1	17%
Implement sales tax	1	17%

State Legislature (LEG) - Employees (n = 154)		
Spending Cuts (CUT)	Count	% of Respondents
Review of travel cost and procedures	49	32%
Efficient use of resources	30	19%
Policy and process review	23	15%
Efficient personnel and administrative functions	13	8%
Across the board cuts	10	6%
Leverage technology to increase efficiencies	9	6%
Improve inter- and intra- departments efficiencies	4	3%
Review and diversify current tax and fee structures	3	2%
Eliminate Universal State Space Standards	3	2%
Determine value of top level administration positions	3	2%
Implement income tax	2	1%
Retirement incentives (RIP)	2	1%
Eliminate departments, programs, and projects	1	1%
Restructure specific departments and programs	1	1%
Use Alaska Permanent Fund	1	1%

State Legislature (LEG) – Employees (n = 5)		
Partnerships (PARTNER)	Count	% of Respondents
Efficient personnel and administrative functions	2	40%
Efficient use of resources	2	40%
Access stakeholder input & expertise	1	20%

STATE OF ALASKA VOICES FOR VISION BUDGET SURVEY

State Legislature (LEG) - Employees (n = 35)		
Restructuring (RESTRUCT)	Count	% of Respondents
Policy and process review	9	26%
Efficient use of resources	6	17%
Leverage technology to increase efficiencies	4	11%
Review of travel cost and procedures	4	11%
Across the board cuts	4	11%
Efficient personnel and administrative functions	3	9%
Restructure specific departments and programs	2	6%
Improve inter- and intra- departments efficiencies	1	3%
Review and diversify current tax and fee structures	1	3%
Access stakeholder input & expertise	1	3%

TRANSPORTATION AND PUBLIC FACILITIES

Transportation and Public Facilities - Employees (n = 39)		
Additional Revenue (REV)	Count	% of Respondents
Review and diversify current tax and fee structures	10	26%
Efficient use of resources	9	23%
Efficient personnel and administrative functions	7	18%
Policy and process review	6	15%
Fully fund specific departments and programs	4	10%
Determine value of top level administration positions	1	3%
Review of travel cost and procedures	1	3%
Leverage technology to increase efficiencies	1	3%

Transportation and Public Facilities - Employees (n = 109)		
Spending Cuts (CUT)	Count	% of Respondents
Efficient use of resources	40	37%
Efficient personnel and administrative functions	17	16%
Review of travel cost and procedures	13	12%
Policy and process review	12	11%
Eliminate departments, programs, and projects	11	10%
Across the board cuts	5	5%
Retirement incentives (RIP)	3	3%
Review and diversify current tax and fee structures	2	2%
Improve inter- and intra- departments efficiencies	1	1%
Leverage public and private partnerships	1	1%
Fully fund specific departments and programs	1	1%
Leverage technology to increase efficiencies	1	1%
Determine value of top level administration positions	1	1%
Implement sales tax	1	1%

STATE OF ALASKA VOICES FOR VISION BUDGET SURVEY

Transportation and Public Facilities - Employees (n = 24)		
Partnerships (PARTNER)	Count	% of Respondents
Policy and process review	8	33%
Improve inter- and intra- departments efficiencies	5	21%
Leverage public and private partnerships	3	13%
Eliminate departments, programs, and projects	2	8%
Efficient personnel and administrative functions	2	8%
Efficient use of resources	1	4%
Access stakeholder input & expertise	1	4%
Fully fund specific departments and programs	1	4%
Leverage technology to increase efficiencies	1	4%

Transportation and Public Facilities - Employees (n = 99)		
Restructuring (RESTRUCT)	Count	% of Respondents
Efficient personnel and administrative functions	21	21%
Efficient use of resources	21	21%
Policy and process review	13	13%
Improve inter- and intra- departments efficiencies	12	12%
Restructure specific departments and programs	9	9%
Eliminate departments, programs, and projects	7	7%
Review of travel cost and procedures	5	5%
Determine value of top level administration positions	5	5%
Retirement incentives (RIP)	4	4%
Across the board cuts	1	1%
Fully fund specific departments and programs	1	1%

STATE OF ALASKA VOICES FOR VISION BUDGET SURVEY

Alaska Citizens Survey Results

The tables in this section represent the 11 Areas of Government that were designated in the Alaska citizens Survey. Each Area of Government is categorized into the Top Level Themes of **Additional Revenue, Spending Cuts, Partnerships** and **Restructuring**. The Count of the comments is categorized into Subthemes under the Top Level Themes.

ADMINISTRATION

Administration (ADMIN) – Citizens (n = 57)		
Additional Revenue (REV)	Count	% of Respondents
Implement income tax	18	32%
Review and diversify current tax and fee structures	13	23%
Implement sales tax	12	21%
Use Alaska Permanent Fund	10	18%
Policy and process review	3	5%
Efficient use of resources	1	2%

Administration (ADMIN) - Citizens (n = 120)		
Spending Cuts (CUT)	Count	% of Respondents
Efficient use of resources	26	22%
Policy and process review	19	16%
Efficient personnel and administrative functions	19	16%
Across the board cuts	17	14%
Review of travel cost and procedures	16	13%
Determine value of top level administration positions	6	5%
Retirement incentives (RIP)	5	4%
Eliminate departments, programs, and projects	5	4%
Eliminate Universal State Space Standards	3	3%
Restructure specific departments and programs	2	2%
Implement sales tax	1	1%
Leverage technology to increase efficiencies	1	1%

Administration (ADMIN) - Citizens (n = 14)		
Partnerships (PARTNER)	Count	% of Respondents
Leverage public and private partnerships	6	43%
Policy and process review	3	21%
Privatize	2	14%
Contract out	2	14%
Efficient use of resources	1	7%

STATE OF ALASKA VOICES FOR VISION BUDGET SURVEY

Administration (ADMIN) - Citizens (n = 116)		
Restructuring (RESTRUCT)	Count	% of Respondents
Policy and process review	31	27%
Efficient use of resources	24	21%
Restructure specific departments and programs	17	15%
Retirement incentives (RIP)	9	8%
Improve inter- and intra- departments efficiencies	7	6%
Determine value of top level administration positions	7	6%
Efficient personnel and administrative functions	5	4%
Leverage technology to increase efficiencies	5	4%
Review of travel cost and procedures	4	3%
Leverage public and private partnerships	2	2%
Use Alaska Permanent Fund	1	1%
Implement income tax	1	1%
Eliminate departments, programs, and projects	1	1%
Eliminate Universal State Space Standards	1	1%
Review and diversify current tax and fee structures	1	1%

EDUCATION

Education (EDU) - Citizens (n = 118)		
Additional Revenue (REV)	Count	% of Respondents
Policy and process review	25	21%
Improve inter- and intra- departments efficiencies	24	20%
Determine value of top level administration positions	14	12%
Restructure specific departments and programs	12	10%
Efficient personnel and administrative functions	10	8%
Contract out	7	6%
Fully fund specific departments and programs	6	5%
Efficient use of resources	6	5%
Leverage technology to increase efficiencies	3	3%
Review and diversify current tax and fee structures	2	2%
Use Alaska Permanent Fund	2	2%
Retirement incentives (RIP)	2	2%
Leverage public and private partnerships	2	2%
Review of travel cost and procedures	1	1%
Implement sales tax	1	1%
Implement income tax	1	1%

STATE OF ALASKA VOICES FOR VISION BUDGET SURVEY

Education (EDU) - Citizens (n = 61)		
Spending Cuts (CUT)	Count	% of Respondents
Policy and process review	13	21%
Eliminate departments, programs, and projects	12	20%
Efficient personnel and administrative functions	9	15%
Review of travel cost and procedures	5	8%
Efficient use of resources	5	8%
Restructure specific departments and programs	4	7%
Determine value of top level administration positions	4	7%
Improve inter- and intra- departments efficiencies	3	5%
Across the board cuts	3	5%
Implement sales tax	1	2%
Leverage technology to increase efficiencies	1	2%
Fully fund specific departments and programs	1	2%

Education (EDU) - Citizens (n = 26)		
Partnerships (PARTNER)	Count	% of Respondents
Contract out	8	31%
Leverage public and private partnerships	7	27%
Policy and process review	6	23%
Fully fund specific departments and programs	2	8%
Restructure specific departments and programs	1	4%
Efficient use of resources	1	4%
Leverage technology to increase efficiencies	1	4%

Education (EDU) - Citizens (n = 118)		
Restructuring (RESTRUCT)	Count	% of Respondents
Policy and process review	25	21%
Improve inter- and intra- departments efficiencies	24	20%
Determine value of top level administration positions	14	12%
Restructure specific departments and programs	12	10%
Efficient personnel and administrative functions	10	8%
Contract out	7	6%
Fully fund specific departments and programs	6	5%
Efficient use of resources	6	5%
Leverage technology to increase efficiencies	3	3%
Review and diversify current tax and fee structures	2	2%
Use Alaska Permanent Fund	2	2%
Retirement incentives (RIP)	2	2%
Leverage public and private partnerships	2	2%
Review of travel cost and procedures	1	1%
Implement sales tax	1	1%
Implement income tax	1	1%

STATE OF ALASKA VOICES FOR VISION BUDGET SURVEY

ENVIRONMENTAL CONSERVATION

Environmental Conservation (DEC) - Citizens (n = 4)		
Additional Revenue (REV)	Count	% of Respondents
Review and diversify current tax and fee structures	2	50%
Fully fund specific departments and programs	1	25%
Policy and process review	1	25%

Environmental Conservation (DEC) - Citizens (n = 12)		
Spending Cuts (CUT)	Count	% of Respondents
Eliminate departments, programs, and projects	4	33%
Across the board cuts	3	25%
Efficient use of resources	2	17%
Policy and process review	2	17%
Fully fund specific departments and programs	1	8%

Environmental Conservation (DEC) - Citizens (n = 5)		
Partnerships (PARTNER)	Count	% of Respondents
Leverage public and private partnerships	4	80%
Review of travel cost and procedures	1	20%

Environmental Conservation (DEC) - Citizens (n = 12)		
Restructuring (RESTRUCT)	Count	% of Respondents
Policy and process review	3	25%
Improve inter- and intra- departments efficiencies	3	25%
Restructure specific departments and programs	3	25%
Leverage public and private partnerships	1	8%
Efficient use of resources	1	8%
Leverage technology to increase efficiencies	1	8%

FISH AND GAME

Fish and Game (FG) - Citizens (n = 30)		
Additional Revenue (REV)	Count	% of Respondents
Review and diversify current tax and fee structures	22	73%
Policy and process review	3	10%
Fully fund specific departments and programs	2	7%
Efficient use of resources	1	3%
Review of travel cost and procedures	1	3%
Determine value of top level administration positions	1	3%

STATE OF ALASKA VOICES FOR VISION BUDGET SURVEY

Fish and Game (FG) – Citizens (n = 17)		
Spending Cuts (CUT)	Count	% of Respondents
Efficient use of resources	6	35%
Policy and process review	3	18%
Eliminate departments, programs, and projects	3	18%
Efficient personnel and administrative functions	2	12%
Review and diversify current tax and fee structures	1	6%
Across the board cuts	1	6%
Implement income tax	1	6%

Fish and Game (FG) - Citizens (n = 4)		
Partnerships (PARTNER)	Count	% of Respondents
Leverage public and private partnerships	3	75%
Policy and process review	1	25%

Fish and Game (FG) - Citizens (n = 32)		
Restructuring (RESTRUCT)	Count	% of Respondents
Policy and process review	10	31%
Improve inter- and intra- departments efficiencies	5	16%
Restructure specific departments and programs	4	13%
Efficient personnel and administrative functions	4	13%
Efficient use of resources	3	9%
Review and diversify current tax and fee structures	2	6%
Access stakeholder input & expertise	2	6%
Leverage technology to increase efficiencies	1	3%
Implement sales tax	1	3%

HEALTH AND SOCIAL SERVICES

Health and Social Services (HSS) - Citizens (n = 14)		
Additional Revenue (REV)	Count	% of Respondents
Fully fund specific departments and programs	7	50%
Policy and process review	6	43%
Review and diversify current tax and fee structures	1	7%

STATE OF ALASKA VOICES FOR VISION BUDGET SURVEY

Health and Social Services (HSS) - Citizens (n = 23)		
Spending Cuts (CUT)	Count	% of Respondents
Policy and process review	6	26%
Eliminate departments, programs, and projects	6	26%
Review of travel cost and procedures	3	13%
Efficient use of resources	3	13%
Restructure specific departments and programs	2	9%
Across the board cuts	1	4%
Efficient personnel and administrative functions	1	4%
Fully fund specific departments and programs	1	4%

Health and Social Services (HSS) - Citizens (n = 22)		
Partnerships (PARTNER)	Count	% of Respondents
Leverage public and private partnerships	14	64%
Contract out	2	9%
Policy and process review	1	5%
Efficient use of resources	1	5%
Privatize	1	5%
Improve inter- and intra- departments efficiencies	1	5%
Efficient personnel and administrative functions	1	5%
Fully fund specific departments and programs	1	5%

Health and Social Services (HSS) - Citizens (n = 51)		
Restructuring (RESTRUCT)	Count	% of Respondents
Policy and process review	27	53%
Restructure specific departments and programs	8	16%
Efficient personnel and administrative functions	5	10%
Efficient use of resources	4	8%
Fully fund specific departments and programs	3	6%
Leverage technology to increase efficiencies	1	2%
Determine value of top level administration positions	1	2%
Improve inter- and intra- departments efficiencies	1	2%
Leverage public and private partnerships	1	2%

STATE OF ALASKA VOICES FOR VISION BUDGET SURVEY

LABOR AND WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT

Labor and Workforce Development (DOL) - Citizens (n = 7)		
Additional Revenue (REV)	Count	% of Respondents
Fully fund specific departments and programs	3	43%
Policy and process review	2	29%
Retirement incentives (RIP)	1	14%
Implement sales tax	1	14%

Labor and Workforce Development (DOL) - Citizens (n = 12)		
Spending Cuts (CUT)	Count	% of Respondents
Efficient use of resources	4	33%
Policy and process review	3	25%
Review of travel cost and procedures	2	17%
Improve inter- and intra- departments efficiencies	1	8%
Across the board cuts	1	8%
Restructure specific departments and programs	1	8%

Labor and Workforce Development (DOL) - Citizens (n =6)		
Partnerships (PARTNER)	Count	% of Respondents
Policy and process review	2	33%
Efficient personnel and administrative functions	2	33%
Review and diversify current tax and fee structures	1	17%
Leverage public and private partnerships	1	17%

Labor and Workforce Development (DOL) - Citizens (n = 15)		
Restructuring (RESTRUCT)	Count	% of Respondents
Policy and process review	7	47%
Restructure specific departments and programs	2	13%
Determine value of top level administration positions	1	7%
Leverage public and private partnerships	1	7%
Improve inter- and intra- departments efficiencies	1	7%
Efficient use of resources	1	7%
Contract out	1	7%
Implement income tax	1	7%

STATE OF ALASKA VOICES FOR VISION BUDGET SURVEY

NATURAL RESOURCES

Natural Resources (NR) - Citizens (n = 28)		
Additional Revenue (REV)	Count	% of Respondents
Review and diversify current tax and fee structures	9	32%
Policy and process review	7	25%
Fully fund specific departments and programs	6	21%
Efficient use of resources	3	11%
Review of travel cost and procedures	1	4%
Determine value of top level administration positions	1	4%
Implement income tax	1	4%

Natural Resources (NR) - Citizens (n = 18)		
Spending Cuts (CUT)	Count	% of Respondents
Efficient use of resources	5	28%
Review and diversify current tax and fee structures	4	22%
Efficient personnel and administrative functions	4	22%
Policy and process review	2	11%
Eliminate departments, programs, and projects	2	11%
Implement income tax	1	6%

Natural Resources (NR) - Citizens (n = 13)		
Partnerships (PARTNER)	Count	% of Respondents
Leverage public and private partnerships	3	23%
Policy and process review	3	23%
Access stakeholder input & expertise	1	8%
Review and diversify current tax and fee structures	1	8%
Restructure specific departments and programs	1	8%
Improve inter- and intra- departments efficiencies	1	8%
Efficient personnel and administrative functions	1	8%
Contract out	1	8%
Privatize	1	8%

Natural Resources (NR) - Citizens (n = 29)		
Restructuring (RESTRUCT)	Count	% of Respondents
Review and diversify current tax and fee structures	8	26%
Policy and process review	7	23%
Improve inter- and intra- departments efficiencies	5	16%
Efficient use of resources	5	16%
Efficient personnel and administrative functions	2	6%
Fully fund specific departments and programs	1	3%
Review of travel cost and procedures	1	3%

STATE OF ALASKA VOICES FOR VISION BUDGET SURVEY

PUBLIC SAFETY

Public Safety (PUBSAF) - Citizens (n = 14)		
Additional Revenue (REV)	Count	% of Respondents
Fully fund specific departments and programs	8	57%
Implement sales tax	2	14%
Use Perm Fund	1	7%
Restructure specific departments and programs	1	7%
Across the board cuts	1	7%
Efficient personnel and administrative functions	1	7%

Public Safety (PUBSAF) - Citizens (n = 21)		
Spending Cuts (CUT)	Count	% of Respondents
Policy and process review	6	29%
Efficient use of resources	5	24%
Eliminate departments, programs, and projects	5	24%
Review of travel cost and procedures	2	10%
Across the board cuts	1	5%
Improve inter- and intra- departments efficiencies	1	5%
Implement income tax	1	5%

Public Safety (PUBSAF) - Citizens (n = 2)		
Partnerships (PARTNER)	Count	% of Respondents
Leverage public and private partnerships	2	100%

Public Safety (PUBSAF) - Citizens (n = 23)		
Restructuring (RESTRUCT)	Count	% of Respondents
Policy and process review	8	35%
Efficient use of resources	6	26%
Improve inter- and intra- departments efficiencies	3	13%
Determine value of top level administration positions	2	9%
Efficient personnel and administrative functions	1	4%
Review and diversify current tax and fee structures	1	4%
Restructure specific departments and programs	1	4%
Leverage technology to increase efficiencies	1	4%

STATE OF ALASKA VOICES FOR VISION BUDGET SURVEY

STATE LEGISLATURE

State Legislature (LEG) – Citizens (n = 3)		
Additional Revenue (REV)	Count	% of Respondents
Implement income tax	1	33%
Review and diversify current tax and fee structures	1	33%
Policy and process review	1	33%

State Legislature (LEG) - Citizens (n = 65)		
Spending Cuts (CUT)	Count	% of Respondents
Policy and process review	18	28%
Efficient use of resources	12	18%
Review of travel cost and procedures	8	12%
Determine value of top level administration positions	7	11%
Across the board cuts	6	9%
Efficient personnel and administrative functions	4	6%
Eliminate departments, programs, and projects	4	6%
Retirement incentives (RIP)	3	5%
Use Alaska Permanent Fund	1	2%
Restructure specific departments and programs	1	2%
Eliminate Universal State Space Standards	1	2%

State Legislature (LEG) - Citizens (n = 1)		
Partnerships (PARTNER)	Count	% of Respondents
Leverage public and private partnerships	1	100%

State Legislature (LEG) - Citizens (n = 3)		
Restructuring (RESTRUCT)	Count	% of Respondents
Policy and process review	10	53%
Review of travel cost and procedures	2	11%
Restructure specific departments and programs	2	11%
Efficient use of resources	2	11%
Efficient personnel and administrative functions	2	11%
Leverage public and private partnerships	1	5%

STATE OF ALASKA VOICES FOR VISION BUDGET SURVEY

TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE

Transportation and Infrastructure (TRANS) - Citizens (n = 23)		
Additional Revenue (REV)	Count	% of Respondents
Review and diversify current tax and fee structures	9	39%
Fully fund specific departments and programs	5	22%
Policy and process review	4	17%
Leverage technology to increase efficiencies	1	4%
Improve inter- and intra- departments efficiencies	1	4%
Implement sales tax	1	4%
Efficient use of resources	1	4%
Leverage public and private partnerships	1	4%

Transportation and Infrastructure (TRANS) - Citizens (n =88)		
Spending Cuts (CUT)	Count	% of Respondents
Eliminate departments, programs, and projects	41	47%
Policy and process review	17	19%
Efficient use of resources	15	17%
Efficient personnel and administrative functions	6	7%
Across the board cuts	3	3%
Review of travel cost and procedures	2	2%
Review and diversify current tax and fee structures	2	2%
Improve inter- and intra- departments efficiencies	1	1%
Restructure specific departments and programs	1	1%

Transportation and Infrastructure (TRANS) - Citizens (n = 18)		
Partnerships (PARTNER)	Count	% of Respondents
Leverage public and private partnerships	6	33%
Policy and process review	5	28%
Contract out	3	17%
Improve inter- and intra- departments efficiencies	1	6%
Review of travel cost and procedures	1	6%
Efficient personnel and administrative functions	1	6%
Restructure specific departments and programs	1	6%

STATE OF ALASKA VOICES FOR VISION BUDGET SURVEY

Transportation and Infrastructure (TRANS) - Citizens (n = 51)		
Restructuring (RESTRUCT)	Count	% of Respondents
Policy and process review	19	37%
Efficient use of resources	10	20%
Efficient personnel and administrative functions	7	14%
Restructure specific departments and programs	6	12%
Leverage technology to increase efficiencies	1	2%
Privatize	1	2%
Determine value of top level administration positions	1	2%
Review and diversify current tax and fee structures	1	2%
Contract out	1	2%
Eliminate departments, programs, and projects	1	2%
Improve inter- and intra- departments efficiencies	1	2%
Fully fund specific departments and programs	1	2%
Implement income tax	1	2%

CONSUMER ENERGY

Consumer Energy (CONENG) - Citizens (n = 4)		
Additional Revenue (REV)	Count	% of Respondents
Policy and process review	2	50%
Review and diversify current tax and fee structures	1	25%
Fully fund specific departments and programs	1	25%

Consumer Energy (CONENG) - Citizens (n = 10)		
Spending Cuts (CUT)	Count	% of Respondents
Efficient use of resources	3	30%
Policy and process review	3	30%
Eliminate departments, programs, and projects	3	30%
Leverage public and private partnerships	1	10%

Consumer Energy (CONENG) - Citizens (n = 10)		
Partnerships (PARTNER)	Count	% of Respondents
Policy and process review	5	50%
Leverage public and private partnerships	5	50%

STATE OF ALASKA VOICES FOR VISION BUDGET SURVEY

Consumer Energy (CONENG) - Citizens (n = 21)		
Restructuring (RESTRUCT)	Count	% of Respondents
Policy and process review	13	62%
Efficient use of resources	3	14%
Fully fund specific departments and programs	2	10%
Leverage technology to increase efficiencies	1	5%
Improve inter- and intra- departments efficiencies	1	5%
Eliminate departments, programs, and projects	1	5%

OTHER

Other (OTHER) - Citizens (n = 57)		
Additional Revenue (REV)	Count	% of Respondents
Implement income tax	14	25%
Policy and process review	12	21%
Review and diversify current tax and fee structures	10	18%
Use Alaska Permanent Fund	6	11%
Implement sales tax	4	7%
Fully fund specific departments and programs	3	5%
Across the board cuts	2	4%
Efficient use of resources	2	4%
Leverage public and private partnerships	1	2%
Determine value of top level administration positions	1	2%
Retirement incentives (RIP)	1	2%
Restructure specific departments and programs	1	2%

Other (OTHER) - Citizens (n = 67)		
Spending Cuts (CUT)	Count	% of Respondents
Efficient use of resources	17	25%
Policy and process review	14	21%
Eliminate departments, programs, and projects	11	16%
Review of travel cost and procedures	6	9%
Efficient personnel and administrative functions	5	7%
Across the board cuts	4	6%
Use Alaska Permanent Fund	4	6%
Retirement incentives (RIP)	3	4%
Determine value of top level administration positions	1	1%
Review and diversify current tax and fee structures	1	1%
Eliminate Universal State Space Standards	1	1%

STATE OF ALASKA VOICES FOR VISION BUDGET SURVEY

Other (OTHER) - Citizens (n = 13)		
Partnerships (PARTNER)	Count	% of Respondents
Policy and process review	5	38%
Leverage public and private partnerships	4	31%
Privatize	1	8%
Eliminate departments, programs, and projects	1	8%
Efficient personnel and administrative functions	1	8%
Fully fund specific departments and programs	1	8%

Other (OTHER) – Citizens (n = 35)		
Restructuring (RESTRUCT)	Count	% of Respondents
Policy and process review	12	34%
Use Alaska Permanent Fund	5	14%
Efficient use of resources	4	11%
Efficient personnel and administrative functions	4	11%
Restructure specific departments and programs	3	9%
Across the board cuts	2	6%
Improve inter- and intra- departments efficiencies	2	6%
Determine value of top level administration positions	1	3%
Retirement incentives (RIP)	1	3%
Review of travel cost and procedures	1	3%

MASTER OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION
UNIVERSITY OF ALASKA SOUTHEAST

**BUILDING A NETWORK OF
PUBLIC ADMINISTRATORS
ACROSS ALASKA AND THE
YUKON TERRITORY**

