

2008-09 Spending Plan	Lake George Park Commission
	Bruce E. Young, Chair

A. Overview of Proposed Plan

A.1 Overall Approach

Lake George Park Commission operates on a very small budget of \$1.5 million each fiscal year. The LGPC is funded from the Lake George Park Trust Fund, a special revenue-other account in the custody of the State Comptroller. Revenue to the Trust Fund is from the registration of boats and docks, enforcement fines and program re-imbursments. These "user fees" are established as means for people who enjoy the lake to provide for its preservation. The Commission has no capital projects and no local assistance budget. The Commission has special authority to enact regulations to protect the natural resources of the lake and its watershed, especially, its superior water quality. The Commission has special rules for recreation quality and operates a marine enforcement/safety patrol.

A.2 Achievement of Savings on a Recurring Basis

Continue agency management strategies to align spending within revenue levels. Reduce total number of full-time employees by 11% and reduce position grades for savings of personal services. Institute new equipment replacement schedules for marine units. Institute operational energy efficiencies. Monitor spending monthly against cash levels. Actions on FTEs, equipment, and reductions in travel result in recurring savings.

A.3 Protecting Key Priorities

The agency will retain the same number of public safety patrol units and generally the same hours of operation. Reductions to patrol routes and new operational guidelines target fuel reductions.

A.4 Treatment of New Initiatives

During 2007, the Commission began a process to implement new regulations for watershed and water quality protection that fulfill a legislative directive. When implemented, the regulations will increase the demand on staff resources in regulatory permits and enforcement. The additional needs must be met or the initiative abandoned. Cash targets can be achieved by downgrading an existing position and re-organizing other functions and priorities.

B. Summary of General Fund Financial Impacts: The Commission receives no General Fund appropriations.

GENERAL FUND -- SAVINGS SUMMARY			
	Required Reduction	2008-09 Savings	2009-10 Savings
Local Assistance	N/A		
Personal Service	N/A		
Non-personal Service	N/A		
Total State Operations			
Capital	N/A		
TOTAL			

GENERAL FUND -- YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE, AFTER SAVINGS			
	2007-08 Actual	Revised Projection	Percent Change
Local Assistance	N/A		
Personal Service	N/A		
Non-personal Service	N/A		
Total State Operations			
Capital	N/A		
TOTAL			

C. Identification of Proposed General Fund Actions

GENERAL FUND	2008-09 Cash	2009-10 Cash	2010-11 Cash
Local Assistance			
Not Applicable			

2008-09 Cash	2009-10 Cash	2010-11 Cash
-----------------	-----------------	-----------------

State Operations

Not Applicable

Capital Projects

Not Applicable

D. Summary of Impact on Other Funds

OTHER FUNDS -- SAVINGS SUMMARY			
	Required Reduction	2008-09 Savings	2009-10 Savings
Local Assistance	N/A		
Personal Service	(\$19,000)	(\$19,000)	(\$19,000)
Non-personal Service	(\$12,000)	(\$12,000)	(\$12,000)
Total State Operations	(\$31,000)	(\$31,000)	(\$31,000)
Capital	██████████		
TOTAL	(\$31,000)	(\$31,000)	(\$31,000)

OTHER FUNDS -- YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE, AFTER SAVINGS			
	2007-08 Actual	Revised Projection	Percent Change
Local Assistance	N/A	N/A	N/A
Personal Service	\$464,899	\$581,000	24.97%
Non-personal Service	\$408,187	\$638,000	56.3%
Total State Operations	\$873,086	\$1,219,000	39.62%
Capital	N/A	N/A	N/A
TOTAL	\$873,086	\$1,219,000	39.62%

*Cash estimates include required savings from the 3.35% State Operations Across the Board Cuts and revisions to state operations disbursements.

E. Identification of Proposed Other Fund Actions

2008-09 Cash	2009-10 Cash	2010-11 Cash
-----------------	-----------------	-----------------

2008-09 Cash	2009-10 Cash	2010-11 Cash
-----------------	-----------------	-----------------

OTHER FUNDS (Note the fund/s affected by each proposal, in parentheses at the end of each entry)

Local Assistance

Not Applicable

State Operations

1. Equipment replacement actions	\$5,000	\$5,000	\$5,000
2. Reduction in travel	\$7,000	\$7,000	\$7,000
3. Reduction in Full-Time Employees	\$19,000	\$19,000	\$19,000
4. Total	\$31,000	\$31,000	\$31,000

Capital Projects

Not Applicable

F. Plan to Manage the Workforce

F.1 Overall Approach

Personal services- regular actions will be implemented by attrition. No incumbent relocations, layoffs or terminations will be required.

F.2 Plan for Refill of Vacant Positions (both current and anticipated vacancies)

A current vacancy will be re-classified; another eliminated.

Workforce Impact -- All Funds	
a. Initial Target: x,xxx [for reference]	9
b. Current Fills PP# 3 or 4	9
c. Recurring impact of proposed actions (see Parts C & E)	1
d. Recurring impact of vacancy-refilling plan (see F.2)	0
e. Total FTEs March 31, 2009 (line b minus line c, plus/minus line d)	8
f. Change from Initial 2008-09 Target (line a minus line e)	1

G. Monthly Projections: All Funds Workforce; General Fund State Operations/Local/Capital

	APR	MAY	JUN	JUL	AUG	SEP	OCT	NOV	DEC	JAN	FEB	MAR	TOTAL
A. Workforce - All Funds													
Est FTEs Month-end	9	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8
B. State Operations													
Personal Service													
1st PP	14280	14850	28400	32120	32120	32120	32120	32120	16900	16900	16900	16900	270510
2nd PP	14280	26400	28400	34200	32120	32120	32120	32120	16900	16900	16900	16900	284140
3rd PP (if applies)	14280	0	0	0	0	0	0	16900	0	0	0	0	31180
Subtotal PS	42840	41250	56800	66320	64240	64240	64240	81140	33800	33800	33800	33800	585830
NPS	65400	42000	64000	98000	41000	42000	42000	82500	52200	22500	66000	26500	663600
Total Disbursements -- State Ops	108240	83250	120800	164320	105240	106240	163640	86000	56300	99800	60300	95300	1249430
C. Local Assistance													
Program x	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Program y	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Program z	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
All other local assistance	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total Disbursements - Local	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D. Capital Projects													
Program/project aa	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Program/project bb	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Program/project cc	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
All other Capital Projects	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total Disbursements -Capital	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

(double-click to enter table)

H. Assumptions Underlying the Proposed Plan

It is assumed that the Commission will continue to receive an adjustment for fringe benefit rate applicable to offset the effect of the relative disproportionate share of agency payroll expenses that are seasonal. It is assumed that STP return rates will average 4.5%. Increases in fuel costs are predicted at 10% and savings estimates are conservative. It is assumed that state program reimbursements and special fund appropriations are reduced but will not be eliminated entirely.

I. Management of Risks Inherent in the Plan

The plan assumes revenue from boat registration fees remains static (registration fees have varied less than 2% in any year from the five year average). A significant and sustained reduction in lake use due to a further weakening economic climate would reduce revenue below estimates and require further corrections.

There is a risk that external events (significant water quality events, high pollution counts, beach closings etc.) could drive up program costs.

J. Additional Savings Opportunities for 2008-09

Electronic business process integration could save money in the out-years but requires additional investments in the current year.

The State FMS project, when complete, will reduce costs for separate accounting programs the agency must support.

The agency could reduce re-occurring telephone line access charges for PaySR by making this a web-based system.

The agency could reduce expenses for reports if the agency had web-based remote access to OSC accounting reports.

PaySR reform would free-up available staff resources.

Raising limits for state contract approval and reducing by elimination the excessive paper work associated with contract pre-audit would have two-sided savings for agencies and OSC. The Commission spends a significant amount supporting the contract approval process for services it finds otherwise efficient to procure on a contractual basis.

K. Potential Future Savings Opportunities/Operational Improvements (indicate if statutory change is required)

None identified.