

#	Division	Budget Issue	Recommendation	Agency Response
1	PLPCO	<p>Current performance measures for PLPCO attempt to capture external customer service and timeliness. However, one of the metrics has not been reported consistently, which indicates it is not a measure the office is using to gauge its success.. In 2009, the Legislative Auditor General released 'A Performance Audit of the Public Lands Policy Coordinating Office' which recommended that the Office improve performance measures and that the office base measures on a strategic plan. The 2024 Strategic Plan for the Department of Natural Resources includes goals for the Public Lands Policy Coordinating Office which could offer potential metrics that relate to the Office's mission.</p>	<p>The Office should work with the Governor's Office and the Legislature to improve line item performance measures based on the 2024 strategic plan that demonstrate the Office's value to the state and provide accountability.</p>	<p>The Office supports this recommendation and has provided feedback for suggested measures.</p>
2	PLPCO	<p>Prior to FY 2022, the Public Lands Policy Coordinating Office was a part of the Governor's Office. Neither the Department of Natural Resources nor the Governor's Office was able to produce an internal audit report that involved PLPCO. UCA 63I-5-201, which describes internal audit programs for state agencies, requires DNR to "conduct various types of auditing procedures as determined by the agency head or governor."</p>	<p>Include PLPCO in the regularly occurring internal audits conducted by the Department of Natural Resources.</p>	<p>PLPCO is willing and interested in requesting an internal audit by the Department of Natural Resources (DNR) and being part of the rotation for the regularly occurring audits.</p>
3	PLPCO	<p>Until FY 2023, the Office has employed a Finance Manager at .75 FTE. PLPCO has been employing assistance from the Department of Natural Resources Finance manager since that position has been vacant. In addition to the Department finance manager already having full-time responsibilities, PLPCO's budget shows room for improvement in the areas of performance measurement and reporting. The office also has lapsed between \$131,700-\$982,400 from FY 2019-2023, which indicates they have room in their budget to hire this essential position.</p> <p>A full-time finance manager should oversee pass-through funding contracts, ensure performance measures are useful and reported annually, oversee budget adjustments to avoid lapsing balances, adherence to statutory requirements, and provide necessary administrative support to the office. A finance manager who is separate from the Office's operations and contract negotiations also plays an important role in budget controls.</p>	<p>The Office should reallocate funding within the existing operating and capital budget to hire a full-time finance manager.</p>	<p>Before PLPCO was part of DNR, the Governor's Office did all the accounting and budgeting for our line item. A past PLPCO director needed some additional help and hired a part-time Finance Manager to work ¾-time. PLPCO was integrated into DNR (July 2022) to gain some efficiencies and enhance internal coordination. One potential source of savings identified by PLPCO in conjunction with GOPB was having the DNR Administration help with finances. Furthermore, the DNR Administration felt they had the necessary people who were willing to help do the accounting and budgeting for PLPCO's line item.</p> <p>Last fiscal year, PLPCO's Finance Manager retired. Since his retirement, the DNR Administration has fully taken over accounting and budgeting for PLPCO. With the DNR Administration's help, we have made some substantial changes starting this fiscal year to help us better account for and track our expenses.</p> <p>The LFA indicated we may have funding in our budget to hire a new finance manager since we have lapsed funds between 2019-2023. However, the FY24 closing contained no lapsed funds. It is PLPCO's opinion that hiring a new full-time Finance Manager is unnecessary for the size of our office and budget. We propose that we instead hire a full-time finance technician (or something similar) who can perform accounting and budget duties under the guidance of DNR Administration accountants, as well as office manager tasks.</p>

#	Division	Budget Issue	Recommendation	Agency Response
4	PLPCO	The Office's entire budget is contained in a line item without further refinements of expenditure. This makes it difficult to understand how the office has expended funds for ongoing projects over time and to what extent funding supports the office directly.	To increase transparency and improve reporting, the Legislature should create appropriation units in the PLPCO line item that reflect the programs administered and pass through funding supported.	<p>We feel having additional appropriation units may not be necessary, but we would not object to implementing more. In conjunction with the DNR Finance Director, who is now overseeing our budget and accounting, we have made several accounting changes to track our costs better, which we started on July 1, 2024 (FY25). These changes will facilitate budget tracking for the LFA and legislature when requested, or even by the LFA themselves if they query the database.</p> <p>We have separated the units into the following functional areas: PLPCO Administration, PLPCO Attorneys, GIS Program, AG Attorneys, and Planning</p> <p>In addition, we have set up other accounting codes to track work on:</p> <p>RS2477 Roads, Monuments, Travel Management Plans, and Endangered Species Act.</p> <p>More codes can be generated for tracking other tasks we may be assigned in the future. Finally, we are tracking all one-time funding expenses with codes for projects from special appropriations (Monroe Mountain, Provo Canyon, Grand Staircase, etc.). We appreciate the help the DNR Administration has given us to strengthen our accounting procedures. We do feel like the recent changes will satisfy this recommendation moving forward and will result in increased transparency and better information availability.</p>
5	PLPCO	UCA 63L-11-201 Describes the executive director who reports to the Governor. It is confusing at best and problematic at worst to have two executive directors in the same department, both of which report to the Governor. Lack of clear organizational structure leads to inefficiencies, turnover, and provides questions about who sets the direction for the office or who has authority to enforce policies and procedures.	The Legislature should open a bill file which clarifies that the director of the Public Lands Policy Office reports to the executive director of the Department of Natural Resources. Note: requires statute change/bill file to be opened.	We do not oppose a bill file on the change of the Director's title. Given the nature of our work, coordinating across multiple agencies and numerous levels of government, there is a need for the Director to have direct communication with and access to the Governor. Therefore, we recommend that the Director of PLPCO's title be changed to Senior Advisor to the Governor on Public Lands. This change was agreed to by the Governor's Office, DNR Executive Director, and PLPCO Director last legislative session.
6	Trust Lands	The Surface business group is split between two appropriation units for staff and a separate line item for projects. This program would be better accounted for in a single appropriation unit for the staff within the operations line item. The GIS section does not have its own unit, yet it's larger than five other programs which are uniquely accounted for. The GIS program also provides a large role in making SITLA's information public.	The Legislature should create the following appropriation unit within the operations line item: GIS. The Legislature should combine the following appropriation units: Director + Board, Grazing and Forestry + Surface.	SITLA supports this recommendation. Aligning appropriation units to operations would help with efficiency and clarity in the appropriation process.

#	Division	Budget Issue	Recommendation	Agency Response
7	Trust Lands	UCA 53C-1-201(3)(f)(i)-(ii) detail that SITLA is not subject to the requirements of the budgetary procedures act governing fees, with the exception of the 13 fees listed in that section (see SITLA Fee Amounts over time.) However, the statute does not indicate which programs these generalized fee titles apply to (i.e. energy and minerals versus surface, etc.) Currently in Fee Prep, all fees are assigned to a single appropriation unit (Administration) instead of where the revenues are generated from (i.e., Surface, Energy and Minerals, etc.) The data entered in fee prep also does not include information about how each fee is calculated.	For clarity and consistency, the Legislature should standardize that SITLA's fee schedule is either fully subject to or fully exempt from the budgetary procedures act. Note: requires statute change/bill file to be opened.	SITLA is neutral on this recommendation.
8	Trust Lands	The School and Institutional Trust Lands Administration is the revenue generating arms of the larger system to raise funds for the state's beneficiaries. The complete group includes the School and Institutional Trust Fund Office (SITFO), the Land Trusts Protection and Advocacy Office, and the School Learning and Nurturing Development Trust Program (LAND). These four different entities report to three different subcommittees (Natural Resources, Agriculture, and Environmental Quality, Public Education, and Executive Office and Criminal Justice.) To provide consistent direction and understand the full picture of revenue generation and distribution to Utah's beneficiaries the Legislature should consider having these three entities report to a single appropriations committee.	The Executive Appropriations Committee should consider having all parts of the Land Trust report to a single oversight committee.	SITLA supports this recommendation. Consistency on oversight committees for the broader trust system could be helpful.
9	Trust Lands	While SITLA's mission is to maximize revenues for the beneficiaries, before revenue goes to the beneficiaries it is invested by SITFO. From a statewide perspective, to actually maximize revenues both SITLA and SITFO need to be optimizing performance of their portfolios. SITFO currently does not have any line item metrics with which to provide accountability and measure performance.	The Legislature should establish performance measures for SITFO based on industry standards.	SITLA is neutral on this recommendation since it is a recommendation for a separate agency.
10	Outdoor Recreation	Our review of the statute identified two areas that need updating. UCA 79-7-301(2) directs that "Departmental operating and administrative expenses for the administration of the boating account of the division shall be charged against that account." It is unclear what constitutes "departmental" expenses. This statute could potentially be in conflict with the statute governing the Boating Account (73-18-22), which restricts the use of funds from the Boating Account solely to the Division of Outdoor Recreation. We also found out that the Utah Children's Outdoor Recreation and Education Fund (79-8-304) has never had any funding in it and is not needed by the division. We recommend the Legislature reconcile the two sections of code and consider eliminating the Utah Children's Outdoor Recreation and Education Fund.	We recommend the Legislature review and reconcile the statutes governing the use of the Boating Account and consider eliminating the Utah Children's Outdoor Recreation and Education Fund.	DOR supports these recommendations. Please include the content from H.B. 120 (2024 General Session), especially the part that repeals a section of the code requiring the Legislature to appropriate money to the Division of State Parks for boating account expenses (repealer of 79-4-401). (DOR let Parks' leadership know we would be asking for this to be included.)
11	Outdoor Recreation	The current fee calculations do not account for all the costs as required by statute.	We recommend the division review and revise its current methodology for calculating the costs to administer each fee and provide a report with recommendations by September 27, 2024.	DOR agrees with this recommendation and will review and revise as needed.

#	Division	Budget Issue	Recommendation	Agency Response
12	Outdoor Recreation	The current budget structure of the division does not meet the needs of the division.	We recommend the Legislature approve the following restructure recommended by the division: Operations Line Item Directors Office, Boating, Law Enforcement, OHV, Outdoor Services, Outdoor Shop Capital Line Item Boating Access Grants, Land and Water Conservation, Outdoor Infrastructure, Off-highway Vehicle Grants, Recreational Trails Program, Outdoor Capital	DOR agrees with this recommendation.
13	Outdoor Recreation	The division’s operations line item includes \$518,200 from the General Fund, which is used for the division administration. Since the directors oversee all division activities, their compensation could mirror the funding mix of the line item.	We recommend that the Legislature replace the General Fund with restricted funds in proportion to the funding mix of the line item, allowing the General Fund to be used for other legislative priorities.	DOR reviewed the use of our General Fund dollars and the activities/duties that are not supported by any of our Restricted Accounts. These positions/duties connect to a variety of programs, including those connected to programs that are general outdoor recreation (i.e, not specific to Boating fund uses, Off-Highway Vehicles fund uses, or expendable funds uses).The total of these General Funds use is \$429,270.
14	Outdoor Recreation	According to 41-22-8, the maximum registration fees for off-highway vehicles (OHV) are: •Off-highway vehicle: \$35 •Snowmobile: \$26 •Street-legal all-terrain vehicle: \$72 These amounts represent the maximum limits set by statute, so the specific fees should be detailed in the fee bill. However, the current fee schedule only lists two charges: “Statewide OHV Registration Fee \$72” and “State-issued Permit to Non-resident OHV \$30.” The listed “Statewide OHV Registration Fee” does not match the maximum fee limits set by the statute.	We recommend that the division include the specific registration fees for each type of off-highway vehicle as outlined in statute 41-22-8 in their fee proposal for the 2025 General Session. The proposed fees should not exceed the amounts specified in the statute.	DOR agrees with this recommendation and will review and revise as needed.
15	State Parks	Our review of the statute identified several areas that need updating. There are outdated references to the now-discontinued parks board and some sections that refer to functions no longer in practice, such as riverway enhancement grants (UCA 79-4-802). Additionally, there is a potential error regarding the use of Boating Account (UCA 79-4-401). There is also a typographical error that also needs to be addressed in UCA 79-4-1203(1)(a)(iii)(A).	We recommend that the Legislature eliminate outdated sections referring to the parks board, discontinue the Riverway enhancement grants, remove the provisions allowing State Parks to access Boating Account funds, and correct any typographical errors.	The Division of State Parks (State Parks) not only agrees with the recommendation, we appreciate the LFA’s support.
16	State Parks	After the Winter Olympics of 2022, the Division of Parks and Recreation issued a revenue bond for the Soldier Hollow Golf Course for \$20.2 million with an annual payment of \$1.0 million from the Park Fees Restricted Account. The bond was fully paid off in 2024 and the \$1.0 million is no longer needed.	We recommend the Legislature reduce the division’s base budget by \$1,010,800 ongoing from the Park Fees Restricted Account, starting in FY 2025.	State Parks agrees with the recommendation.

#	Division	Budget Issue	Recommendation	Agency Response
17	State Parks	Parks Operations' line item currently doesn't provide details on the budget of the different types of state parks, such as the state golf courses, the museums, the recreation parks.	We recommend the Legislature restructure the division's operations line item to include the following appropriation units: Executive Management, Support Services, This Is The Place, Golf Courses, Recreational Parks, Heritage Parks.	State Parks agrees with the recommendation.
18	State Parks	UCA 63J-1-504(3)(b) stipulates that an agency may not "create, change, or collect any fee unless the fee has been established according to the procedures and requirements of this section." We have observed that the division is charging fees that are higher than those approved by the Legislature in H.B. 8 (2024 General Session). For example, the following list shows the authorized amount compared to the amount charged online: a. Group Camping i. Maximum Fee Allowed in HB 8: \$400 ii. Actual Fee Charged for Wallsburg (Deer Creek): \$500 b. Group Site Day-Use i. Maximum Fee Allowed: \$250 ii. Actual Fee Charged for Wallsburg Group Pavilion (Deer Creek): \$400 c. Cottages i. Maximum Fee Allowed: \$200 ii. Actual Charged for three locations: \$250-500 d. Golf i. Maximum Fee Allowed: \$82 ii. Actual Charged at Wasatch/Soldier Hollow: \$85	We recommend that the division issue refunds to all park visitors who were overcharged in FY 2024 and FY 2025. By September 25, 2024, the division should also submit a detailed report outlining the overcharged fees and the refunded amounts. Additionally, we recommend the Legislature review and potentially increase some park fees, based on a comprehensive price comparisons and recommendations from the division.	State Parks believes the Legislature intended to significantly increase fees for out-of-state visitors, doubling or tripling each fee, and that the omission of out-of-state golf fees from the fee schedule was an oversight. Regarding the other fees mentioned, it is understood that the facility charges align with the approved amounts in the fee schedule. Any appearance of higher fees likely results from the inclusion of additional services, entrance fees, amenities, and/or taxes in the final total, to simplify the visitor's experience by avoiding the breakdown of each individual fee.
19	State Parks	One of Parks fees is titled: "Annual Repository Agreement, Annual Agreement Fee, Fee Collection, Return Checks, and Duplicate Document (per storage unit)."	We recommend the Legislature change the name of the fee to "Repository and Annual Agreement Fee."	State Parks agrees with the recommendation.
20	State Parks	The division is also charging fees that are not approved by the Legislature in H.B. 8 (2024 General Session). Examples include: a. Extra Vehicle, Peak: \$20 b. Golf Spectator Fee: \$14	We recommend that the division issue refunds to all park visitors who were charged for the unapproved fees in FY 2024 and FY 2025. By September 25, 2024, the division should also submit a detailed report outlining the unapproved fees and the refunded amounts. Additionally, we recommend the Legislature review and potentially approve the additional park fees, based on a comprehensive price comparisons and recommendations from the division.	State Parks believes the fees charged were approved by the Legislature. For example here is how the following fees fit within the approved fee schedule: a. Extra Vehicle, Peak: \$20 = Fee schedule: Camping Fees \$60.00 b. Golf Spectator Fee: \$14 = Fee schedule: Greens Fees, 9 Holes \$25.00
21	State Parks	The division has not provided its calculations for the cost of each fee, as required by statute.	We recommend the division provide the calculations for the cost of each fee by September 27, 2024.	State Parks uses a cost accounting system that allows us to fairly easily report the revenue earned and the expense incurred per each fee. We will complete the fee review before September 27, 2024.

#	Division	Budget Issue	Recommendation	Agency Response
22	State Parks	<p>There is a vast discrepancy between the fees authorized by the Legislature for boating slips and storage and what the division is charging. Given the high demand for these services, with waiting lists numbering in the hundreds and spanning many years, the division is forgoing substantial revenue generation. The current fee schedule approved in H.B. 8 allows the division to charge \$7 per foot per day for boat mooring for residents and \$14 per foot per day for nonresidents. However, the division’s actual fees are 35 to 70 times lower than these authorized rates. For example, at Bear Lake State Park, the fee for a Long-Term Boat Rental Slip for a 22-foot boat is \$800 per season (May 1 - October 31), which equates to \$4 per day. This is 35 times less than the authorized \$154 per day (\$7 per foot x 22 feet) for residents. In addition, the division has decided not to apply the newly approved nonresident fee of \$14 per foot per day, which could bring the division \$308 per day for the same size of boat. Instead, they are charging \$7 per foot per day for nonresidents, which is almost 70 times lower than the authorized rate. Similarly, the authorized Boat and RV Storage fee is \$200 per day, but Bear Lake Park charges only \$5 per night and \$25 per week (which is \$3.6 per night) for storage in the Short-Term Unsecure Area. For the Long-Term Secure Area, the fees are \$375 for six months in the season (which averages to \$2 per night) and \$250 for six months off-season (averaging \$1 per night).</p>	<p>We recommend the division provide a comprehensive price comparison and a proposal for boating slips and storage.</p>	<p>State Parks will draft a proposal to simplify the boating slip fee and storage fee.</p>
23	State Parks	<p>The Parks' website contains outdated and inaccurate information. Since this is the main resource for park visitors to make decisions, it is essential that the information is correct. For example, East Canyon’s webpage lists yurt rates as \$100 Monday through Thursday and \$130 Friday through Sunday/holidays, but the reservation site shows rates of \$120 for weekdays and \$150 for weekends. And the website lists Palisade Cabins at \$125, while a link with pictures of the cabins display rates ranging from \$80 to \$100.</p>	<p>We recommend that the division ensure all information on their website is accurate and reviewed regularly.</p>	<p>State Parks agrees and conducts monthly reviews of our website and the website content.</p>
24	State Parks	<p>Park managers often use available parking spaces to determine how many boats can be allowed at a boating park on busy days. However, since water levels at reservoirs fluctuate both annually and within the year, they should instead establish guidelines for the maximum number of boats based on the current water levels. This would help park managers ensure greater safety and satisfaction for visitors.</p>	<p>We recommend the division establish guidelines for the maximum boats allowed at each boating park based on the water levels.</p>	<p>State Parks has long talked about boating safety and the carrying capacities of our lakes and reservoirs. We will continue to review carrying capacities at our boating parks.</p>
25	State Parks	<p>The division may have a disconnect between its definition of success and how it measures it. They define success as the level of natural resource management, visitor satisfaction, attendance, economic impact, and educational value of the parks. However, they measure success primarily through financial indicators, such as gate revenue, total revenue, park expenditures, completion of renovation projects, and donation revenue.</p>	<p>We recommend that the division align its performance metrics with its defined objectives and propose by September 27, 2024 additional measures that capture other objectives, such as visitor satisfaction and natural resource management.</p>	<p>State Parks agrees and is excited to hear the LFA is not solely focused on financial indicators. We will incorporate other measures, such as visitor feedback into our report to the Legislature.</p>