

**Report on Performance-Based Budgeting Pilot Program
for the Division of Wildlife Resources**

Table of Contents

A. Executive Summary 1

B. Overview 2

C. Excerpts from the Pilot Budget..... 4
Public Services
Law Enforcement

D. What Worked Well?..... 8

E. What Can be Improved?..... 9

F. Lessons Learned 11
Performance budgeting has important benefits
States are increasingly using performance budgeting
Performance budgeting is not an instant cure
Challenges of implementing performance budgeting
Suggestions for successful implementation

G. Checklist of Predictors for Success..... 14

H. Recommendations..... 15
Develop a process to be initiated in the FY 2004 cycle
Suggested timeline

Appendix A, Sample Format

A. Executive Summary

The purpose of this report is to follow up on the pilot “Performance Informed Budget” that was requested by the Legislative Process Committee and presented to the to the Natural Resources Appropriations Subcommittee in the 2001 General Session. This report will also discuss lessons learned and provide recommendations for the future.

Performance-Based Budgeting (PBB) is sometimes also referred to as “Results-Based Budgeting.” The Legislative Process Committee opted to refer to the concept as “Performance-Influenced Budgeting.” By whatever name, performance budgeting links appropriations to outcomes through the use of performance information in budget decision-making and the inclusion of performance indicators in the budget document. It does not replace the political process of making difficult resource allocation decisions.

The pilot PBB for the Division of Wildlife Resources worked well because the division already had a strategic plan in place. During the budget hearings in the 2000 General Session, the pilot budget improved the discussion of the budget subcommittee and improved program evaluation.

Performance budgeting is still an emerging discipline. Certain improvements can be made as all sides to budget preparation gain more expertise. In the future it is hoped there will be better linkage of budget recommendations to outcome measures, more performance targets, and more time to focus on outcomes.

This data should provide legislative decision-makers with information to better evaluate budget proposals and better enable them to ask key questions about agency programs’ effectiveness. It should help focus the budget discussions on performance and results.

It is the recommendation of the Office of the Legislative Fiscal Analyst that all state agencies, including the judiciary, develop a performance-based budgeting process to be initiated in the FY 2004 budget cycle. As part of this process, key performance measures will be established through a cooperative effort by the agencies, the Governor’s Office of Planning and Budget, and the Office of the Legislative Fiscal Analyst. The measures that are developed should provide the Legislature with a functional, systematic approach for determining effective use of appropriated funds.

B. Overview

Legislative Process Committee request

During the 2000 General Session, the Legislative Process Committee requested that the Fiscal Analyst's Office prepare a "pilot" Performance-Based Budget (PBB) for the Division of Wildlife Resources. The purpose was to gauge whether performance measures would provide committee members better information--thus improving committee hearings--in the short amount of time available, and to see if PBB should be implemented statewide.

Senate Bill 3 (1999 General Session)

This was not the first time performance measures have been used for budgetary purposes. Legislative intent language in Senate Bill 3 (1999 General Session) instructed the Office of the Legislative Fiscal Analyst to develop a performance budget for one or more agencies in the Department of Human Services. The Fiscal Analyst, with concurrence of the department, chose the Division of Child and Family Services (DCFS) as the subject agency for this assignment. DCFS has considerable experience in reporting various types of performance measures as a result of the David C. court settlement and child welfare reform legislation. The Fiscal Analyst and the department developed several performance measures and reported to the Legislative Process Committee in November 1999. These performance measures have become part of budget deliberations in the Health and Human Services Appropriations Subcommittee.

House Bill 71 (2000 General Session)

House Bill 71 (2000 General Session) required the Office of the Legislative Auditor General to monitor all new programs and agencies, provide each new program with a list of best practices--including performance measures--and later follow up with a survey requesting a self-evaluation. The Auditor's Office has created a "Best Practices for Good Management" manual and has begun to implement the program.

Pilot PBB presented to Process Committee

The pilot budget for the Division of Wildlife Resources was written by the Fiscal Analyst's Office in cooperation with the division. It was shown to the Legislative Process Committee in October 2000. The Process Committee, by motion, made several recommendations to the Executive Appropriations Committee, including:

- That the budget of the Division of Wildlife Resources be presented at the next session in a Performance-Based Budget format.
- That the Legislature refer to this type of budget as "Performance Informed Budget" rather than "Performance Based Budget."

Pilot PBB presented to Natural Resources Appropriations Subcommittee

The pilot budget was given to the Natural Resources Appropriations Subcommittee in the 2001 General Session. The Division of Wildlife

Resources spent considerable time researching prior-year data and calculating unit cost information regarding many of the performance measures.

Activity-Based Costing

An important part of the pilot budget was the use of Activity Based Costing (ABC). ABC essentially means figuring out how much it costs to deliver a single unit of service. For example, what is the total cost to plant one fish in Utah? ABC can help legislators see whether services are being delivered efficiently, compared both to other agencies and to outside providers.

The purpose of this report is to follow up on the “Performance Informed Budget” that was presented to the Natural Resources Appropriations Subcommittee, discuss lessons learned, and provide recommendations for the future.

C. Excerpts from Pilot Budget

Shown below are excerpts from two programs that were presented in the pilot budget.

3.1 Public Services

Recommendation

The Analyst recommends a total budget of \$4,831,500. Personal Services comprise 45 percent of the recommended budget.

	2000 Actual	2001 Estimated	2002 Analyst	Est/Analyst Difference
Financing				
Federal Funds	89,600	132,600	128,500	(4,100)
GFR - Wildlife Resources	4,234,200	4,748,800	4,703,000	(45,800)
Total	<u>\$4,323,800</u>	<u>\$4,881,400</u>	<u>\$4,831,500</u>	<u>(\$49,900)</u>
Expenditures				
Personal Services	1,986,900	2,223,500	2,157,300	(66,200)
In-State Travel	16,400	18,300	18,300	
Out of State Travel	6,500	6,400	6,400	
Current Expense	1,902,600	2,017,400	2,033,700	16,300
DP Current Expense	392,800	590,800	590,800	
DP Capital Outlay	18,600			
Capital Outlay		25,000	25,000	
Total	<u>\$4,323,800</u>	<u>\$4,881,400</u>	<u>\$4,831,500</u>	<u>(\$49,900)</u>
FTE/Other				
Total FTE	50	50	50	

Purpose

The Public Services program provides support services for the division. All financial activities are managed through the Fiscal Management program. This includes Federal Aid programs, revenue collection and budgeting, and contracts and agreements. The Licensing area of Public Services issues and reconciles all hunting and fishing licenses with the regions and retail outlets.

Performance Measures

1. **Number of applications for available limited entry hunting permits (bucks and bulls) and average total cost to issue a permit (excludes general season deer permits).**

Year	1997	1998	1999	2000
# of Permits Available	4,130	3,890	4,425	4,646
Total # of applicants	48,551	55,498	69,685	75,445
Applicants per Permit	11.8	14.3	15.8	16.2
Cost Per Applicant	\$5.89	\$5.86	\$5.52	\$4.76

Assessment: This performance measure indicates how well the division is advertising its special, non-traditional hunting opportunities. It also indicates the public's interest in these opportunities. Some growth in the numbers can be attributed to natural population growth. Nevertheless, public awareness of these hunting opportunities appears to be increasing. While the number of permits available is increasing, the number of applicants per permit is increasing more rapidly. This drives down the cost per applicant, but it also means a higher percentage of applicants are not getting permits.

2. Total Number of Licenses/Permits Processed and cost per License/Permit (excludes draw permits)

Year	1997	1998	1999	2000 YTD	2000 Deer
Hunting Licenses (Excluding draw hunts)	224,713	225,573	231,104	102,921	97,124
Fishing Licenses	517,617	534,715	546,459	520,844	N/A
Total Licenses/Permits (Includes Habitat Auth.)	1,119,962	1,141,747	1,159,897	996,450	97,124
Issuance Cost Per License/Permit	\$1.20	\$1.31	\$1.27	\$1.35	\$3.43

Note: License data is collected on a calendar year basis. Costs include documents, labor, outside data input, and agent commissions. Deer permits include cost of contractor to perform the draw, but DWR staff costs are in the other license costs.

Assessment: This measure indicates the number of citizens accessing division services, and the efficiency with which this program is delivering licenses. In 2000, the division began selling general season deer permits through a contractual draw. These permits, tabulated in the "2000 deer" column, are not included in the "2000 YTD" column. The number of licenses/permits processed has increased gradually each year. The Analyst expects "2000 YTD" numbers to equal 1999 numbers by year-end close. The number of licenses/permits processed in 2001, however, will decline by approximately 380,000 due to elimination of the Habitat Authorization (S.B. 248).

Actual issuance cost per license is slightly higher than shown. Accounting systems used prior to FY2000 did not track indirect costs, nor did they include the costs of employees "borrowed" from other programs during peak sales times. Cost per license under the draw contract is more than the division's internal costs. The Analyst recommends the division discuss reasons for going to a draw contract.

3.2 Law Enforcement

Recommendation

The Analyst recommends a total budget of \$6,133,900. The recommendation includes \$6,900 transferred from the Department of Administrative Services for ongoing 800 MHz operating costs. Personal Services comprise 81 percent of the recommended budget.

	2000	2001	2002	Est/Analyst
	Actual	Estimated	Analyst	Difference
Financing				
General Fund	442,400	279,400	280,700	1,300
Federal Funds	274,200	332,100	327,200	(4,900)
Dedicated Credits Revenue	44,100			
GFR - Wildlife Resources	5,225,300	5,653,700	5,526,000	(127,700)
Beginning Nonlapsing	132,500			
Total	\$6,118,500	\$6,265,200	\$6,133,900	(\$131,300)
Expenditures				
Personal Services	4,766,300	5,086,500	4,944,200	(142,300)
In-State Travel	38,800	37,100	37,100	
Out of State Travel	10,400	10,900	10,900	
Current Expense	1,211,100	1,111,300	1,122,300	11,000
DP Current Expense	22,100	14,400	14,400	
Capital Outlay	68,200	5,000	5,000	
Other Charges/Pass Thru	1,600			
Total	\$6,118,500	\$6,265,200	\$6,133,900	(\$131,300)
FTE/Other				
Total FTE	83	83	83	

Purpose

The primary responsibility of this section is to favorably control human interaction with wildlife resources by enforcing state wildlife laws and, through voluntary compliance, seeking protection of resources and orderly use of resources. Officers in the law enforcement section have all the powers of law enforcement officers throughout the state. Law Enforcement employs approximately 80 officers.

Hunter Education teaches safe handling of firearms, respect for wildlife, furbearer education, and ethical hunting practices. Using federal Pittman-Robertson Act funds, the division operates the Lee Kay Center in Salt Lake County and the Cache Valley Center in Logan. \$1 from each hunting license sold goes to fund Hunter Education.

Performance Measures

1. **Number of contacts, cost per contact, and percent of contacts that did not result in a violation.**

Year	1996	1997	1998	1999
Contacts	217,087	175,197	160,571	164,115
Cost per contact	\$23.57	\$30.93	\$33.06	\$33.89
Citations	4,747	4,888	4,208	4,227
Contacts without a violation	97.8%	97.2%	97.4%	97.4%

Note: Division Conservation Officers are directed to spend up to 20 percent of their time on other duties such as depredation and landowner assistance, thereby inflating the cost per contact.

Assessment: The number of public contacts has declined, most markedly in 1997 and 1998, to the point that 1999 contact numbers were 24 percent lower than in 1996. As the apparent ratio of citations to contacts is 1:38, this decline in contacts had precipitated a sharp decline in citations by 1998, perhaps indicating an increase in undetected violations. The division has provided two reasons for the reduction in contact numbers. First, budgetary constraints have prevented them from filling four vacant positions. Second, a greater emphasis on investigations, as incidents of poaching increase, has diverted manpower from maintaining the previous level of public contacts. The Analyst recommends these reasons be discussed in further detail. Perhaps an additional indicator to measure in the future would be the number of reported crimes.

2. Number of students completing hunter safety courses, and total average cost per student

Year	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000 Est
Students	13,728	14,026	14,253	13,556	12,643	12,000
Cost per student	\$27.05	\$26.27	\$16.53	\$18.24	\$20.90	\$22.38

Note: Calendar Year 2000 numbers are still coming in from instructors.

Assessment: In 1998 the number of students began to decline, and since fixed costs basically remained the same, the cost per student began to increase. The Analyst believes the reduction is due to a declining interest in hunting among urban youth.

D. What Worked Well?

Strategic Plan already in place. The Division of Wildlife Resources already had a strategic plan in place, which laid the foundation for performance budgeting. It was the strategic plan and its associated goals that helped determine the end outcomes chosen for the budget process. Literature on PBB suggests that it is conceivable but not probable that performance-based budgeting can be achieved in the absence of an agency vision and strategic plan. Utah Tomorrow provides a good start, but in the case of Wildlife Resources, was not specific enough to the agency to use as a backbone for performance budgeting.

Improved discussion. The presence of performance measures in the budget recommendation helped focus discussion on the issues surrounding the measures. For example, the performance measure on license issuance costs highlighted the fact that selling deer licenses on a “draw” basis through a contractor was significantly more expensive than processing licenses in-house. The division fielded several questions from legislators regarding their decision to go to a draw. This measure also highlighted the fact that revenues have declined since the decision was made to cap deer license sales at 97,000/year.

The performance measures did not preclude committee members from asking questions or making comments of particular importance to them. The measures did, however, appear to keep the discussion focused on the larger issues (outcomes). The measures did not tell committee members everything they needed to know to make decisions, but they did make a contribution to the budget debate.

Good executive branch involvement. The division and the Governor’s Office of Planning and Budgeting (GOPB) participated in the process of developing measures, although time constraints prohibited GOPB from reviewing the outcome measures directly with the agency before submitting the budget to the Fiscal Analyst’s Office. If PBB is to be successful, it must become an integral part of the Governor’s budget process, not just the Legislature’s.

Suggested need for program changes. While no appropriation changes were made based on outcome measures, some program changes were suggested. For example, in discussing the reasons for the declining number of students completing hunter safety courses, it was suggested that changing the nature of the courses might accommodate more students. One committee member submitted an Interim Study Request to see if certain course requirements could be changed without sacrificing quality.

E. What Can be Improved?

Even in states that have been using outcome measures for several years, the tenets of performance budgeting are still under development. Performance budgeting is very much a work in progress. The following items should improve over time as the appropriations subcommittee becomes more accustomed to using outcome measures:

Better linkage of budget recommendations to outcome measures.

Several factors explain why the use of outcome measures did not have more impact on the appropriation. First, it was a new process, and it was only used in one committee hearing. Committee members were understandably not comfortable suggesting appropriation changes based on a few measures. Performance indicators do not tell legislators everything they need to know to make decisions. Second, the budget process is by nature political, and a performance measuring system is not going to replace the art of politics with the science of numbers. Third, few (if any) states have figured out how to actually make appropriations based largely on performance information. Texas is considered one of the most advanced states in performance budgeting, and legislators there consider performance measures one of many factors in their budget deliberations. Texas has the statutory option to use incentives and disincentives with agencies, but to date, incentives have been used only sparingly and disincentives haven't been used at all.

No performance targets were set. Again, this is because of the newness of the process. Putting together an effective performance system takes time and patience. The first priority was to establish some baseline numbers. Once these have been established, and all branches of government have developed some proficiency with performance budgeting, the Legislature may want to devise some performance goals for agencies.

Time was short. The time allotted for the hearing was too short to delve into the performance measures. The subcommittee was not able to meet after the elections in the 2000 interim, so all of the performance measures were new to committee members. It is apparent that interim committee meetings will be the best place to discuss performance in depth.

More focus on outcomes vs. outputs. Some outcomes are difficult to measure, and sometimes the relationship between expenditures and outcomes is especially difficult to measure. This was the case, for example, in developing performance measures for the division's administration. While one may have a clear opinion whether an

administrator is doing a good job, it is difficult to develop a set of quantifiable measures. Two independent surveys conducted by Utah State University were used. One gauged the satisfaction of various segments of the population, the other gauged the internal satisfaction of division employees. These surveys were good instruments, but they are expensive and are currently performed every five years.

Format can be improved. Presentation of the data should be done in such a way as to allow for easier interpretation of data. Once PBB is adopted statewide, standard formats should be developed in both the legislative and executive branch budget offices. A suggested format for legislative budget presentations is shown in Appendix A.

F. Lessons Learned

The following conclusions are based on experience with the pilot performance budget and experiences in other states using performance budgeting.

Performance budgeting has important benefits

Performance-based budgeting forges the link between planned activities and outcomes. The budget can be considered the plan that really matters because funding decisions are where plans live or die. Performance budgeting provides indicators that help legislators evaluate the programs they are being asked to fund.

Performance budgeting establishes accountability. It establishes a link for accountability of executive branch managers who agree to achieve stated results in return for continued funding or other incentives. It also makes government more accountable to citizens.

Performance information helps policymakers put a monetary value on programs. This allows them to ask if the end outcome is worth the full cost.

States are increasingly using performance indicators

The national trend is clear: state budget processes are using more and more outcomes along with or in place of outputs. It is a work in progress, but expectations are high that it will contribute to accountable and responsive government. Almost all states are using some kind of performance budgeting process. In Utah, almost all appropriations committees are using performance indicators to some degree.

Performance budgeting should not be seen as an instant cure for budgeting dilemmas

The budget process is largely political, and will always remain so. Performance budgeting should not be expected to be a mechanistic, rational system that will replace the political process of making choices. It should, however, make a valuable contribution to the budget debate.

Performance indicators are one of many factors considered in decision-making. Even in Texas, where performance budgeting is advanced, there is room to grow in terms of actually making appropriations based to some extent on performance information.

Performance budgeting cannot reveal the value of various outcomes, such as whether it is better to spend money on health or social services. But it can provide important clues as to the likely effects of proposed budget allocations. This in turn suggests the extent of need for budgetary changes.

Challenges of implementing performance budgeting

It is not clear how to respond to poor performance. Poor performance should not induce a reflexive response to cut funding. Poor performance is a flag that signals the need for more investigation.

One of the first hurdles of performance budgeting may well be definitions and terms, such as what is really meant by “performance-based” budgeting. According to the Rules Committee, it should be “performance-influenced” budgeting because the appropriation will not be based on performance alone. Another term that is frequently used is “results-based” budgeting. It should be clear to agencies what the Legislature means by these terms and other terms such as outcome, output, and input.

The relationships between expenditures and outcomes are seldom understood in detail. Many problems to which agencies are directed are multi-agency in nature, or at least partially influenced by factors outside an agency’s control. In undertaking performance budgeting, it will be necessary to identify obstacles and redundancies.

To undertake performance budgeting is to undertake extra costs. Time is needed to develop indicators and templates, train agency personnel, improve data tracking systems, and prepare budget staff to receive and analyze them. Usually these costs appear to fall more heavily on the budget office than the individual agencies. Most agencies already have a planning coordinator.

Florida and Texas are perhaps the two most advanced states in using performance information in budgeting. Central budget staff in both states has grown greatly since implementing PBB. In Texas, the Legislative Budget Bureau, which has 140 staff, tracks agency performance developments and prepares the legislative budget and the appropriations bill, which includes performance targets. In Florida, the Office of Program Policy Analysis and Governmental Accountability (OPPAGA) has 90 staff. It conducts performance audits and policy reviews of state programs and provides technical review of agency performance-based budget proposals.

Indicators take time to perfect. Over time, the quality of indicators will improve. However, constant changing of indicators sacrifices the ability to compare data across several years. There is a trade-off between continuity and improving the quality of indicators. Legislators will not trust indicators that vary from year to year.

Outcome-based measures are much harder to define and track than outputs or efficiency measures. For example, it is easier to count the number of fish released into the wild than to determine whether

anglers are having better fishing experiences.

Agencies will probably be concerned about attention being paid to a small number of indicators, since doing so may result in an overemphasis on a small number of highly selective indicators and could lead to increased chance of punitive use by legislators. On the other hand, increased visibility of outcome measures increases agencies' motivation to achieve targets.

Agency personnel tend to see performance monitoring as a requirement rather than as a useful tool in preparing and justifying their budgets. In Florida, however, agencies report that it has actually led legislators to be more responsive to their budget requests.

**Suggestions for
successful
implementation**

Implementation of a governing-for-results system in state government must involve the executive, judicial, and legislative branches. Without buy-in from the executive and judicial branches, agencies will not invest the time and energy required to submit quality performance measures. All three branches must recognize and reinforce the process.

Central budget offices do not have the time or staff to develop and track every performance measure. Agencies' staff should develop significant outcome indicators based on their strategic plans. The Legislature should then review and approve the indicators.

It is essential that the legislative and executive branch budget offices provide a standard format to ensure all information requirements are met and to facilitate comparisons. A suggested format for legislative budget presentations is shown in Appendix A.

A strategic plan for each agency works as the foundation for performance budgeting. Utah Tomorrow provides a starting point, but agency-specific plans are better suited for budgetary purposes.

Successfully implementing useful performance reporting and management requires a multi-year time frame. In fact, some outcomes may occur over years, even decades, rather than during the next budget year.

The number of performance indicators presented to the Legislature should be kept small and outcome-based.

A few critical Activity-Based Costing (ABC) measures will help the Legislature gauge efficiency and to weigh costs versus quality.

G. Checklist of Predictors for Successful Performance Budgeting¹

- Statewide strategic planning is undertaken.
- Goals and strategies are clear, easily defined and communicated.
- Functional experts assist in linking cause and effect between spending and outcomes.
- Accountability is clear.
- Systems are designed to recognize achievement of performance objectives.
- Fewer indicators rather than more are used.
- Agency heads are enthusiastic about the process.
- Governing for results “feels” right and is thought superior to traditional methods.
- Training of state personnel is provided.
- There is alignment of legislative committees with performance budget categories.
- Auditors should be assigned to validate tracking data and its handling and reporting.
- Citizen input is made easy.
- Agencies coordinate across departments where mutual objectives are apparent.

¹ From State Approaches to Governing-for-Results and Accountability, December 2000 (Urban Institute).

H. Recommendations

1. It is the recommendation of the Office of the Legislative Fiscal Analyst that all state agencies, including the judiciary, develop a performance based budgeting process to be initiated in the FY 2004 budget cycle. As part of this process, key performance measures will be established through a cooperative effort by the agencies, the Governor's Office of Planning and Budget, and the Office of the Legislative Fiscal Analyst. The measures that are developed should provide the Legislature with a functional, systematic approach for determining effective use of appropriated funds. Where appropriate, this process should reflect the objectives of Utah Tomorrow.

- Agencies should begin the process by justifying their FY 2003 budget requests at least partially based on the outcomes sought.
- Agencies should begin to develop ways to estimate outcomes that can be expected from various budget levels.
- While outcome measures will receive major emphasis in determining successes or failures of programs, other measures, such as input, output and efficiency measures, should not be ignored.
- The Legislative Fiscal Analyst should review goals and measures to ensure consistency with current legislative policy. However, periodically, the Legislative Auditor General's staff should provide an objective review and validation of the process and its measures.
- All parties should exercise care in crafting performance measures to avoid misdirected efforts.
- Performance goals and measures should originate in the Executive Branch and be approved by the Legislature.
- Performance data should be validated by the Legislative Auditor's Office.
- The number of measures before the Legislature should be kept small. There is not enough time during the session for proper evaluation of a large number of indicators. Additional performance data can be made available upon request.
- After executive, judicial and legislative branches have agreed upon performance measures, the executive branch should

monitor and report the data. Results should be included in the annual budget submissions. Legislative review of performance data should be a major part of legislative budget hearings. The Legislative Fiscal Analyst's budget presentations will be formatted for easy reference to the performance data.

- No direct linkage of funding to performance achievement should be expected. Direct linkage may raise expectations in executive agencies and could reduce legislative powers to allocate and reallocate resources. However, as the project evolves, there may be specific programs that will be conducive to direct linkage.

2. Implementation of Performance Based Budgeting should be phased in over several years. Most states take three to five years to bring all state agencies "on board." In Utah, most agencies are adept at reporting process measures such as input, output, and quality. A valuable PBB system should give participants time to craft and perfect outcome measures. The following is a suggested timeline for implementation.

Year 1: 2001 (FY 2003 Budget Cycle):

- Inventory state departments on level of performance reporting capability, especially in the area of outcome measures.
- Establish an executive branch process to oversee development of agencies' performance measures. The Legislature should be involved in the approval of measures that agencies will report with their budgets. This approval could take place during interim appropriation subcommittee meetings.

Year 2: 2002 (FY 2004 Budget Cycle):

- Based on results from the inventory and progress with the executive branch process, expand the PBB program to all state agencies.
- Re-design Governor's budget process and documents to show key performance measures (especially outcomes or results) along with agencies' proposed funding levels. Where appropriate, requested budget increases should show expected impacts on performance data. If such a request is funded, subsequent years' performance reports should report on those claimed improvements.
- Fiscal Analysts' budget presentations will focus budget discussions on agency performance and results.

Year 3: 2003 (FY 2005 Budget Cycle):

- Evaluate effectiveness of PBB and its impact on the budget process.
- Survey legislators and agency staff on their impressions and usefulness of the PBB system.
- Based on results of trial efforts, surveys and evaluations, draft legislation to make PBB statutory.

Appendix A

Performance Based Budgeting Sample Format

3.0 Programs: Division of Wildlife Resources

3.1 Wildlife Section

Recommendation

The Analyst recommends a total budget of \$6,778,400. Personal Services comprise 49 percent of the recommended budget.

	2000	2001	2002	Est/Analyst
Financing	Actual	Estimated	Analyst	Difference
General Fund	1,096,500	1,046,200	1,034,500	(11,700)
Federal Funds	1,919,100	2,499,800	2,464,200	(35,600)
Dedicated Credits Revenue	5,000	19,800	19,600	(200)
GFR - Wildlife Resources	2,529,000	2,987,400	2,960,100	(27,300)
Beginning Nonlapsing	468,400	651,400	300,000	(351,400)
Closing Nonlapsing	(651,400)	(300,000)		300,000
Total	\$5,366,600	\$6,904,600	\$6,778,400	(\$126,200)
Expenditures				
Personal Services	3,351,200	3,457,500	3,335,900	(121,600)
In-State Travel	38,200	46,700	46,700	
Out of State Travel	21,300	17,200	17,200	
Current Expense	1,394,200	2,260,000	2,306,800	46,800
DP Current Expense	48,800	23,500	23,500	
Capital Outlay	10,700	10,300	10,300	
Other Charges/Pass Thru	502,200	1,089,400	1,038,000	(51,400)
Total	\$5,366,600	\$6,904,600	\$6,778,400	(\$126,200)
FTE/Other				
Total FTE	71	71	71	

Program Description

The wildlife section is responsible for the terrestrial wildlife management programs. It manages and conserves manages and conserves over 350 species of wildlife. The section also addresses the needs of sportsmen, private landowners, and the general public through falconry, Dedicated Hunter, Cooperative Wildlife Management units, and depredation management programs.

Outcome Measure 1

Percent of harvestable species meeting statewide management plan objectives, which includes ideal population levels.

Total Outcome	Projected	Actual	% of Ann. Projection Attained
Deer Herds	15%	15%	100%
Elk Herds	35%	41%	117%

**Variance
Explanation /
Assessment**

The division has spent considerable time and effort developing management plans for deer and elk herds. While certain factors outside the division's control can greatly impact herds (e.g. weather, development in critical habitat areas), the division's actions are not without effect. Biological studies, acquisition of conservation easements, and predator control--all division functions--impact herd size. Recent indicators suggest that positive improvements have been made in deer and elk herds. In particular, the former has recently improved following years of decline.

**Four-Year
Historical
Summary**

<u>Year</u>	1997	1998	1999	2000
# of Deer Herds	33	33	33	33
% Meeting Objective	0%	3%	12%	15%
# of Elk Herds	29	29	29	29
% Meeting Objective	45%	34%	34%	41%

Note: Deer herds are modeled from harvest data for population estimates, and elk have physical counts taken.

Other agencies or programs impacting the outcomes:

The Department of Agriculture and Food regulates private elk and deer ranches. Outbreak of a disease from one of these ranches could devastate wild deer and elk. The Division of Forestry, Fire and State Lands prevents losses due to fire. Land management agencies such as SITLA, BLM, and Forest Service also impact herd objectives through their policies.

**Outcome
Measure 2**

Total depredation expenditures from big game, cougar, and bear.

	Projected	Actual	% of Ann. Projection Attained
Total Outcome	\$800,000	\$884,300	91%

**Variance
Explanation /
Assessment**

Depredation expenditures have declined for several years, due primarily to mild winters. However, it may also be an indication that the division is effectively taking steps (installing fences and giving landowner tags in lieu of depredation payments) to reduce wildlife damage to private landowners. The harsh winter of 1993 resulted in depredation payments of approximately \$2.5 million. It should be expected that eventually a similarly harsh winter will arrive.

**Four-Year
Historical
Summary**

<u>Year</u>	1997	1998	1999	2000
Big Game Cash Payments	\$267,546	\$227,097	\$165,620	\$203,214
Fencing Material/Effort	\$202,637	\$272,351	\$236,880	\$113,786
Cougar/Bear Payments	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$100,000
Other Division Labor Costs	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	\$467,284
<u>Total</u>	\$570,183	\$599,448	\$502,500	\$884,284

Note: Prior to 2000, division labor was not tracked as a program expenditure; thus the increase in the 2000 total.

Other agencies or programs impacting the outcomes:
None.