

FLORIDA FISH AND WILDLIFE CONSERVATION COMMISSION

Final



LONG RANGE PROGRAM PLAN

FY 2009-2010 THROUGH 2013-2014

SUBMITTED - SEPTEMBER 30, 2008

Rodney Barreto - Chairman

Brian S. Yabonski - Vice-Chairman

Richard A. "Dick" Corbett

Dwight Stephenson

Kenneth W. Wright

Ronald M. Bergeron

Kathy Barco

LONG RANGE PROGRAM PLAN FOR FY 2009-10 THROUGH 2013-2014
TABLE OF CONTENTS

Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission

<u>LRPP COMPONENTS</u>	<u>Page #</u>
AGENCY MISSION	N/A
GOALS, OBJECTIVE, OUTCOMES AND PROJECTION TABLE	1
LINKAGE TO GOVERNORS PRIORITIES	3
TRENDS AND CONDITIONS STATEMENT	4
PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND STANDARDS LRPP – EXHBIT II:	
EXECUTIVE DIRECTION AND ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES	22
FISH, WILDLIFE, AND BOATING LAW ENFORCMENT	23
HUNTING AND GAME MANAGEMENT	24
HABITAT AND SPECIES CONSERVATION	25
FRESHWATER FISHERIES MANAGEMENT	26
MARINE FISHERIES MANAGEMENT	27
FISH AND WILDLIFE RESEARCH INSTITUTE	28
ASSESSMENT OF PERFORMANCE FOR APPROVED PERFORMANCE MEASURES EXHBIT III:	
EXECUTIVE DIRECTION AND ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES	29
FISH, WILDLIFE, AND BOATING LAW ENFORCMENT	30
HUNTING AND GAME MANAGEMENT	53
HABITAT AND SPECIES CONSERVATION	58
FRESHWATER FISHERIES MANAGEMENT	59
MARINE FISHERIES MANAGEMENT	60
FISH AND WILDLIFE RESEARCH INSTITUTE	62
PERFORMANCE MEASURES VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY – LRPP EXHBIT IV:	
EXECUTIVE DIRECTION AND ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES	63
FISH, WILDLIFE, AND BOATING LAW ENFORCMENT	74
HUNTING AND GAME MANAGEMENT	112
HABITAT AND SPECIES CONSERVATION	118
FRESHWATER FISHERIES MANAGEMENT	132
MARINE FISHERIES MANAGEMENT	135
FISH AND WILDLIFE RESEARCH INSTITUTE	142

LONG RANGE PROGRAM PLAN FOR FY 2009-10 THROUGH 2013-2014
TABLE OF CONTENTS

PG 2
CONTINUED

ASSOCIATED ACTIVITIES CONTRIBUTING TO PERFORMANCE MEASURES – LRPP
EXHIBIT V:

EXECUTIVE DIRECTION AND ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES	151
FISH, WILDLIFE, AND BOATING LAW ENFORCEMENT	154
HUNTING AND GAME MANAGEMENT	157
HABITAT AND SPECIES CONSERVATION	158
FRESHWATER FISHERIES MANAGEMENT	159
MARINE FISHERIES MANAGEMENT	160
FISH AND WILDLIFE RESEARCH INSTITUTE	161
AGENCY-LEVEL UNIT COST SUMMARY	162
GLOSSARY OF TERMS AND ACRONYMS	165

Mission Statement

Managing fish and wildlife resources for their long-term well-being and the benefit of people.

FLORIDA FISH AND WILDLIFE CONSERVATION COMMISSION
Goals and Objectives
(In Priority Order)

GOAL: TO PROVIDE FOR HEALTHY RESOURCES AND SATISFIED CUSTOMERS.

OBJECTIVE 1A: TO PROVIDE FOR INCREASING OR STABLE FISH AND WILDLIFE POPULATIONS.

OUTCOME 1A: Percent of critical habitat (hot spots) protected through land acquisition, lease or management contract.

Baseline/ Year	FY 2009-10	FY 2010-11	FY 2011-12	FY2012-13	FY2013-14
38%	39%	39%	39%	40%	40%

OUTCOME 1B: Percent of wildlife species that are increasing or stable.

Baseline/ Year	FY 2009-10	FY 2010-11	FY 2011-12	FY2012-13	FY2013-14
48.7	48.7	48.7	48.7	48.7	48.7

OUTCOME 1C: Percent of marine fishery stocks that are increasing or stable.

Baseline/ Year	FY 2009-10	FY 2010-11	FY 2011-12	FY2012-13	FY2013-14
80%	80%	80%	80%	80%	80%

OUTCOME 1D: Number of public contacts by law enforcement.

Baseline/ Year	FY 2009-10	FY 2010-11	FY 2011-12	FY2012-13	FY2013-14
973,920	1,012,876	1,032,488	1,052,105	1,072,095	1,093,322

OUTCOME 1E: Percent of research projects that provide management recommendations or support management decisions.

Baseline/ Year	FY 2009-10	FY 2010-11	FY 2011-12	FY2012-13	FY2013-14
100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

OBJECTIVE 2A: TO INCREASE THE NUMBER OF CUSTOMERS AND CONTINUE TO PROVIDE CUSTOMER SATISFACTION.

FLORIDA FISH AND WILDLIFE CONSERVATION COMMISSION
Goals and Objectives
(In Priority Order)

OUTCOME 2A: Percent change in licenses and permits issued.

Baseline/ Year	FY 2009-10	FY 2010-11	FY 2011-12	FY2012-13	FY2013-14
-0.1%	0.5%	0.4%	0.4%	0.3%	0.3%

OUTCOME 2B: Percent change in the number of information and education materials provided to citizens.

Baseline/ Year	FY 2009-10	FY 2010-11	FY 2011-12	FY2012-13	FY2013-14
0%	2%	2%	2%	2%	2%

OUTCOME 2C Percent of satisfied hunters

Baseline/ Year	FY 2009-10	FY 2010-11	FY 2011-12	FY2012-13	FY2013-14
80%	80%	80%	80%	80%	80%

OUTCOME 2D Percent of satisfied freshwater anglers

Baseline/ Year	FY 2009-10	FY 2010-11	FY 2011-12	FY2012-13	FY2013-14
75%	75%	75%	75%	75%	75%

FLORIDA FISH AND WILDLIFE CONSERVATION COMMISSION
Linkage to Governor's 6 Priorities

(List each of your agency goals under the appropriate priority below.)

#1 – Protecting Our Communities

#2 – Strengthening Florida's Families

#3 – Keeping Florida's Economy Vibrant

#4 – Success For Every Student

#5 – Keeping Floridians Healthy

#6 – Protecting Florida's Natural Resources

To provide healthy resources and satisfied customers.

TRENDS AND CONDITIONS STATEMENT

a. Agency Primary Responsibilities – Based On Statute

The Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission (FWC) shall exercise the regulatory and executive powers of the state with respect to wild animal life and exercise regulatory and executive powers of the state with respect to marine life. The agency's primary responsibilities are based on the following statutes and Constitutional authority: Chapters 379 and 327, Florida Statutes and Article 4, Section 9 and Article 10, Section 16, Florida Constitution.

b. What Led the Agency to Select Its Priorities?

In August 2002, the FWC conducted on-line surveys of stakeholders and the general Florida citizenry seeking input on the current condition of and desired future direction for the FWC. These surveys asked a range of questions designed to determine the FWC's strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats; current level of service; desired future state and other areas of interest.

The FWC compiled the survey results, and held a meeting of stakeholders to confirm the survey findings and provide more detailed understanding through solicitation of further comments. These comments were gathered by providing all stakeholder attendees a laptop computer for use during the meeting to enter their comments.

Results of all stakeholder and citizen input were compiled and analyzed by FWC staff into "areas of concern". These areas of concern became the focus of redefining FWC's priorities (See Attachment A).

c. How the Agency Will Generally Address the Priorities Over A Five-Year Period

Based upon the stakeholder areas of concern, FWC revamped its goals and strategies into a new Agency Strategic Plan (ASP) containing a mission, vision, agency goal, elements of success, guiding principles, values, competencies, strategies and priority issues. In 2006, FWC revised the ASP to streamline it and make it easier to understand. The overall direction of the agency did not change in this revision. (see Attachment B).

When FWC began developing plans for implementing the Strategic Plan, we realized we were not optimally organized to deliver on the Plan. We concluded we were merged as a result of the 1998 constitutional change, but not integrated; we could not adequately address habitat, use conflict and exotic and imperiled species issues our stakeholders identified; and we were not as efficient or effective as needed.

The solution is to align like functions, flatten the organization, and provide better support to our mainline programs better. This resulted in a proposed restructuring of the agency designed to better deliver on the Plan and provide "more bang for the buck", so that savings can be invested back into the agency.

The restructuring primarily (1) integrated biological functions to better focus on the habitat, user conflict and species issues identified by stakeholders, while maintaining our core focuses on fishing and hunting; and (2) better organized support functions into Offices that serve to support the Programs.

The 2004 Legislature approved the restructure and it was signed by the Governor.

The new structure has six (6) divisions: Habitat and Species, Research (the Fish and Wildlife Research Institute), Law Enforcement, Marine Fisheries, Freshwater Fisheries and Hunting & Game Management.

In support of these Programs are the following thirteen (13) Offices: Finance and Budget, Policy and Stakeholder Coordination, Legal, Human Resources, Licensing and Permitting, Recreation Services, Information Technology, Data Portal, Community Relations, Legislative Affairs, Strategy and Planning, Inspector General, and Regional Operations.

Each division and office has a detailed Strategic Plan for its operations for the next five years, and an operational plan that specifies specific actions to be taken in any given fiscal year. These documents are available upon request.

A description of each Division and Office follows:

Habitat and Species Management

This division is responsible for habitat and species conservation efforts. These efforts include lake restoration, land acquisition, aquatic plant control, management of state lands and development of recreational uses on these lands, non-game species, imperiled species recovery, and exotic species management.

Law Enforcement

The responsibilities of Law Enforcement will remain unchanged in the proposed new structure.

Fish and Wildlife Research Institute

All FWC research on marine, freshwater fish and wildlife will be conducted or contracted through this Program.

Marine Fisheries Management

This division is responsible for marine fisheries management (rule development, liaison with federal fishery councils), angler outreach and artificial reefs.

Freshwater Fisheries Management

This division manages freshwater lake and river fish populations, operates fish management areas, urban fishing projects, aquatic outreach and fish culture and stocking,

Hunting and Game Management

Game Management manages waterfowl, alligators, turkeys, deer and small game species. It is responsible for hunter safety and ranges, and hunting regulations and publications.

Finance and Budget

This Office is responsible for financial operations, revenue, budget development and facilities management.

Community Relations

Community Relations coordinates FWC media relations, development and production of publications, public relations and message creation.

Policy and Stakeholder Coordination

External Relations coordinates FWC stakeholder relations, development of partnerships, rule-development processes and development of agency positions.

Licensing & Permitting

All FWC licensing and permitting functions is coordinated by this office. It will also issue recreational and commercial licenses.

Executive Director

This Office contains internal support functions such as legal, inspector general, planning, information technology, legislative and human relations.

Legal

The Legal Office provides for all legal services to the Commission and its divisions and offices. Legal services include representation in litigation, preparation of legal opinions,

development and review of contracts and other legal instruments, drafting and review of legislation and rules, and general legal counseling relating to FWC operations.

Human Resources

The Human Resources Office provides service and support to agency employees and management in the areas of personnel laws and rules, training coordination, diversity division, retirement benefits, collective bargaining, discipline administration, workers' compensation, unemployment compensation and non-transactional processes for classification and pay recruitment and selection, attendance and leave and payroll.

Recreation Services

The Recreation Services Office provides recreation planning and design services for FWC-managed areas; coordinate implementation of wildlife viewing structures, trails and other recreation enhancements; provide technical assistance to local governmental and other agencies to develop wildlife viewing sites and divisions; and to develop interpretive products and divisions that increase awareness of recreation opportunities on FWC-managed properties and understanding of how the FWC manages these natural areas to sustain the wildlife and recreation opportunities that depend on them.

Information Technology

The purpose and function of the Information Technology Office is to coordinate the planning, budgeting, acquisition, development, implementation, use, and management of information technology for FWC; provide technical support and guidance to programs and offices to assist them to meet their goals and priorities; provide executive direction, administrative services, planning, organizing, directing, developing policy, cost recovery, IT staff training, and coordination for IT activities across the agency; plan for, implement, and operate network security, servers, network infrastructure (LAN, WAN, MAN), Email services, desktop, and helpdesk services; develop, acquire, implement, and maintain computer software applications using in-house or out-sourced resources; develop, maintain, and enhance the FWC Internet and intranet websites, and; coordinate the FWC's records retention and destruction procedures for the agency. The purpose and function of data portal is to provide a "one-stop-shopping" environment for data and information needed by agency employees and the public to make sound decisions regarding fish and wildlife conservation. Data portal section is intended to solve the problem of "too much information" by making data and information readily available in a customizable, personalized format using a web browser connected to the intranet or internet. Basic functions being incorporated into the data portal include dissemination of agency news, document and work flow management, employee access to human resource and fiscal information, FWC issue team collaboration, search and query tools for natural resource data and information, transactional capability for tasks such as entering data or applying for permits, and delivery of geographic information system (GIS) products and services. The section also is responsible for the agency's data management functions, including developing data standards, data warehousing and integration, and search and retrieval of data and information.

Legislative Affairs

The Legislative Affairs Office is responsible for the development and coordination of State and Federal legislative activities for the Commission; lobbies for the passage of the agency's legislative package and provides information on other legislation that is considered by the Florida Legislature and Congress; works in conjunction with the Director of Finance and Budget to lobby for passage of the agency's budget requests; assists legislators and Commission constituents; endeavors to establish a positive rapport with legislators and their staff, other governmental staff, lobbyists, and citizen groups involved with legislative activities of the agency.

Strategy & Planning

The purpose and function of the Strategy and Planning Office is to coordinate the development, monitoring and evaluation of the implementation of the Agency Strategic Plan and Program and Office plans; to coordinate revision of these plans; to monitor and evaluate coordination and teamwork among and within Programs and Offices; to develop planning processes and procedures; and to provide process mapping and meeting facilitation assistance to the programs and offices. This Office often employs consultants and facilitators to conduct its work.

Inspector General

The Inspector General Office provides a central point for coordination of and responsibility for activities that promote accountability, integrity, and efficiency in government. The IG accomplishes these goals through internal audits, investigations, and management reviews. Additionally, the OIG conducts investigations brought under the agency's Ombudsman Program and investigates complaints that fall under the state's whistleblower statute.

Regional Operations

The purpose and function of the Regional Operations Office is to keep the agency's mission, policies and service consistent across the state; facilitate the coordination and implementation of agency programs at the regional and local level through effective communication and leadership; conduct public workshops and survey conservation groups and landowners, and appropriate public officials and agencies to solicit input on proposed regulation changes; and integrate agency operations, engage stakeholders, and execute projects and decision-making at the lowest practicable level.

d. The Justification Of Revised Or Proposed New Programs And / Or Services

Not Applicable. No revisions, or new programs or services are proposed.

e. Justification of Final Projection For Each Outcome And Include An Impact Statement Relating To Demand And Fiscal Implications

- **Justification Of Final Projection for each Outcome**

Outcome 1 A: Percent of critical habitat (hot spots) protected through land acquisition, lease or management contract

This outcome focuses on conserving critical fish and wildlife habitat. FWC's primary means of doing so are Florida Forever Florida. Based on anticipated funding levels, we project an ability to increase protected habitat by 1% over the next five years.

Outcome 1 B: Percent of wildlife species that are increasing or stable

In general, there is an inverse relationship between human and wildlife population trends. As Florida's human population continues to increase, we tend to see a concomitant decrease in wildlife populations. This is due primarily to habitat loss or degradation both in Florida and, for migratory species such as songbirds, in Latin America, also.

As a result, we project that with anticipated funding levels FWC can "hold the line" over the next five years and not allow additional species to suffer population declines.

Outcome 1 C: Percent of marine fishery stocks that are increasing or stable

The situation with marine fisheries is similar to that of wildlife. A number of marine fish species are declining due to over fishing, primarily in federal waters. We, along with our federal and other state partners, expect to hold the line over the next five years.

Outcome 1 D: Number of public contacts by law enforcement

Past experience shows that this number will fluctuate based on a number of factors outside the control of FWC that include: vacancies, natural disasters, weather, resource use by the public, and more recently, demands for homeland security directed patrols. All of these factors impact the ability of officers to make direct public contacts. Given the difficulty of predicting all these factors, we project contacts to increase only slightly.

Outcome 1 E: Percent of research projects that provide management recommendations or support management actions

We expect to continue ensuring all research projects provide recommendations to or otherwise support management actions.

Outcome 2 A: Percent change in licenses and permits issued

We expect license sales to fluctuate slightly over the next few years, primarily due to increasing interest in saltwater fishing and rising fuel costs.

Outcome 2 B: Percent change in the number of information and education materials provided to citizens

FWC will continue to move towards providing more material on-line as opposed to printing the material.

We expect an increase in the number of informational materials to be offset by a reduction in educational materials.

Outcome 2 C: Percent of satisfied hunters

We expect satisfaction of hunters to remain at current levels for the next five years.

Outcome 2 D: Percent of satisfied freshwater anglers

We expect satisfaction of freshwater anglers to remain at current levels for the next five years.

f. List Of Potential Policy Changes Affecting The Agency Budget Request or Governor's Recommended Budget

1. Establishing Penalties for Seagrass Damage

This proposal would create a noncriminal infraction for damaging seagrasses due to careless operation of a boat that results in seagrass scarring and vessel grounding in saltwater aquatic preserves. Increased fines are also established for repeat offenders. This proposal was part of the FWC's legislative package that passed during the 2008 Session; however, the bill, HB 7059, was vetoed for an issue unrelated to this proposal.

2. Confiscation and Disposition of Illegally taken Wildlife, Freshwater Fish and Saltwater Fish

This proposal would clarify and provide consistency in the confiscation and disposition of evidence in saltwater fish, freshwater fish, and wildlife cases. It specifies how such evidence should be photographed so that the photograph may be used as evidence in court, rather than the fish or wildlife. This proposal was part of FWC's legislative package that passed during the 2008 Session, however, the bill, HB 7059, was vetoed for an issue unrelated to this proposal.

3. Boating Safety Education

This proposal would modify Florida’s mandatory boating safety education law for anyone operating a motorboat powered by 10 horsepower or more in Florida. It would establish a ten-year phase-in period for every vessel operator to pass a basic boating safety course. An exemption would be authorized for those operating a vessel within the first 30 days of purchase, if they have the bill of sale. An exemption from the \$2 fee, which is already established in law, would be authorized for governmental employees who are required to take the course as a condition of employment.

4. Personal Flotation Devices

This proposal would change the age of persons required to wear a life jacket/personal flotation device (PFD) on a vessel less than 26 feet from under 6 years of age to under 13 years of age. The proposal would parallel the recreational federal regulations and create a safer boating experience for children.

5. Vessel Management – Status Report

This issue will seek legislative solutions to issues relating to vessel management and statutory cleanup of certain parts of Chapter 327 F. S. Vessel management issues include: local government authority to further regulate vessels, anchoring/mooring restrictions, and identifying vessel ownership.

6. Boating Safety/Illegal Transportation of Excessive Fuel on the Water

The Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission (FWC) and its federal, county and local marine law enforcement partners have observed a uniquely hazardous condition within the State of Florida. Specifically, there is a significant increase in the number of vessels transporting excessive amounts of fuel which dramatically jeopardizes the safety of citizens and visitors on Florida’s waterways. As a leading law enforcement agency in the maritime domain with statutory authority and responsibility to protect state resources and the public, FWC is recommending legislation that will mitigate this risk. Vessels transporting excessive fuel represent an extremely volatile explosive threat to the lives and safety of citizens in and around them, and the discharge of containers represent a threat to precious natural resources. Although current law s. 316.80, F.S., prohibits illegal transport of fuel over the highways, and s. 330.440, F.S. prohibits aircraft from carrying fuel in unapproved containers, there is currently no state (or federal) statute that prevents this from happening on the water. This proposal prohibits the transporting of large amounts of fuel on the water.

7. Boating Under the Influence

This proposal will amend Florida Statutes to make appropriate Boating under the Influence (BUI) violations/penalties consistent with laws related to driving under the influence. Specifically, the blood alcohol level would be lowered from 0.20 or more to 0.15 or more to trigger enhanced penalties when charged with a BUI.

8. Spiny Lobster Trap Certificate Program

This legislative proposal would reduce the time from three to two years that spiny lobster trap certificates for which the annual certificate fee is not paid shall be considered abandoned and revert to the FWC. This will help reduce the number of traps allowed, but it is estimated that

less than 1500 certificates will be reverted each year. A large majority of the fishers who would be affected are likely not actively participating in the spiny lobster fishery. This issue was recommended by the Lobster Advisory Board.

9. Repeal Shoreline Exemption

This issue repeals the shoreline exemption authorized for Florida residents to fish from the saltwater shoreline or a structure fixed to the land. Those issued a Medicaid card, and who have proof of identification, would retain the exemption. This issue is offered so that Florida's anglers, who fish in federal waters or who fish for anadromous species, will be exempt from the federal saltwater fishing registration requirement that will go into effect January 2009.

10. Alligator Agent Issues

This proposal would allow agents to work with any trapper or farmer; allow agents to possess, process, or sell hides and meat; eliminate the prohibition of issuing a trapper, farmer or agent license to anyone who has been convicted of violating alligator statutes/rules; and clarify confusing language that allows alligator farmers to possess and process alligator hides and meat for sale.

11. State Bird

This proposal would change the designation of Florida's state bird from the Northern mockingbird to one that better represents the uniqueness of Florida. The proposed new bird will be chosen by Florida's 4th – 8th graders in an on-line election, November 4, Election Day. Their selection will be submitted to the 2009 Legislature for consideration.

12. Invasive Plant Management Issues

This proposal completes the 2008 Legislature's transfer of the Bureau of Invasive Plant Management (Bureau) from the Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) to the Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission (FWC). It provides a Type Two transfer of the Bureau from DEP to FWC, establishes the Invasive Plant Control Trust Fund within FWC, clarifies that the Board of Trustees of the Internal Improvement Trust Fund - Governor and Cabinet – (BOT) may delegate to FWC the authority to take final agency action on sovereign submerged lands for aquatic plant management activities, and establishes judicial and administrative remedies for violations of the aquatic plant management permitting program.

13. Chapter 379 Glitch Issues

This issue proposes clean-up or "glitch" changes to Chapter 379, F.S. Chapter 379 was created in the 2008 Session by combining Chapter 370, F.S., saltwater fisheries, and Chapter 372, F.S., wildlife and freshwater fisheries. None of the changes are substantive; rather, they correct mistakes that were made in combining the two former chapters. Also proposed is repealing certain sections of Chapter 379 that are no longer needed in statute, as the requirements fall under the constitutional authority of the Commission and have been promulgated in Commission rules.

g. List Of Changes, Which Would Require Legislative Action, Including The Elimination Of Programs, Services And / Or Activities

Same as question f. above.

h. List of all task forces studies, etc., in progress

Public Boat Ramps and Piers Study

FWC, in partnership with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and Lee County, is conducting a boating access facilities inventory and economic study. The study will clarify the economic value of boating regionally and will include an inventory of boat ramps, marinas, dry-storage for boats, docks, etc. The study will be completed in three work stages: Phase I includes inventory of boating access facilities, Phase II is the Global Information System (GIS) component which will generate GIS data layers of field data and development of a web host, and Phase III is the economic study of all data including development of a site suitability analysis, cost study of new infrastructure, estimation of present and projected supply and demand, time horizons, etc. A pilot project in Lee County was initiated to fool-proof the state-wide project. The economic studies will estimate the present and projected demand for boating facilities, quantify the economic impact of recreational boating to Florida, and estimate capital cost of new or improved facilities.

**Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission
Advisory Committees**

Advisory Committee Name and Composition	Authorization (statutory or managerial initiative)	Purpose and Activities
Stone Crab Advisory Board	Managerial Initiative F.A.C. 68B-13	To advise the Commission on management strategies for the stone crab fishery.
Artificial Reef Advisory Board	Managerial Initiative	To provide advice and recommendations to the Commission on goals and objectives for the state's artificial reef program, including strategic and operational planning.
Blue Crab Advisory Board	Managerial Initiative	To provide advice and recommendations to the Commission on management of Florida's blue crab fishery by focusing on the promotion of a healthy and profitable industry through management and regulation.
Marine Life Workgroup	Managerial Initiative	To provide advice and recommendations to the Commission on the biological and management needs of Florida's marine life industry.
Management Advisory Groups (conservation / land management planning)	259.032, F.S.	To engage stakeholders and the public in the drafting of ten-year Conceptual Management Plans for each FWC-managed areas, which include wildlife management areas, wildlife environmental areas, and mitigation parks.

Boating Advisory Council	327.803, F.S.	To make recommendations to the Commission and Department of Community Affairs regarding issues affecting the boating community, including boating and diving safety education, boating-related facilities, including marinas and boat testing facilities, boat usage, boat access, and working waterfronts.
Harmful Algal Bloom Task Force	379.2271, F.S. & continued as managerial initiative	To determine research, monitoring, control and mitigation strategies for red tide and other harmful algal blooms in Florida waters. Provides its recommendations to the Fish and Wildlife Research Institute.
Marine Stock Enhancement Advisory Board	Managerial Initiative	To determine research priorities for stocking marine fisheries species and provide recommendations to the Fish and Wildlife Research Institute.
Wildlife Magazine Advisory Committee	379.2342, F.S.	To provide advice and guidance to the Commission regarding the development, publication and sale of the Florida Wildlife magazine.
Spiny Lobster Trap Certificate Technical Advisory and Appeals Board	379.3671, F.S.	To advise the Department of Natural Resources on disputes and problems related to allocation of spiny lobster trap certificates and the implementation of the (then) new trap certificate/effort management program for the commercial trap fishery.

Attachment A

Stakeholder Executive Summary

This document summarized the lengthy stakeholder survey document. Direct quotes are in *italics*. All other items are combined, edited for clarity, or represent a summary point.

Qualitative analysis is very different from traditional quantitative techniques. It involves far more than counting the occurrences of an item. As you read through this summary, be conscious that it represents a compilation of the data into themes of our choosing. We use themes as placeholders or “buckets” to capture the flavor of a group of seemingly unrelated ideas.

Several key themes are prevalent in the stakeholder survey:

1. Emerging Stakeholder Tension

There are tensions between all your user groups and clear strategies for addressing the tensions must be identified and prioritized. Each group insisting on increased FWC focus and programmatic energies. Additionally, the non-use group is requesting that habitat be set aside and that the species not be consumed in many areas.

2. Leadership

New stakeholders are emerging and requesting FWC focus on and provide the leadership around Habitat and Water in Florida. Strategically, this offers many challenges to FWC. It implies new skills, new focus of energies, and an active role in coordination. This implies new roles for the existing SLT members, particularly as it relates in more interagency coordination, MOU's and broader perspectives of the agencies role in Florida.

3. New Customers

The traditional customer base is tiny and declining as a percent of the population, is not united in its requests to FWC, and it is not active in supporting the FWC. This will increasingly put the agency in an advocacy role that is not understood by the vast majority of Floridians. Careful consideration needs to be given to working with the traditional fresh water anglers and hunting groups to increase their active support, reduce the internal tensions within the groups (bow hunting versus dog hunting), and explain the need for them to begin actively addressing the demographic shift threatening their recreational pursuits. It must be made clear that FWC is not the advocate for any one group over any other and not a marketing agency for any one type of user.

4. Placing the Resource First

The resource comes first with nearly all your groups (93% according to our poll). Those self-focused on single issues that serve only themselves must be helped to create a broader perspective. Assisting stakeholders in understanding the big picture as it

relates to your mission and their long-term best interests will be a key role for the FWC leadership.

5. Evolution in Funding

User-based funding is a mixed blessing. It is perceived as driving the department to pursue directions and choices that might be counter to the needs of the habitat and species. Additionally, it is tied to a stable or declining user base. The growth areas in the in users are boaters, saltwater anglers, recreational (non-hunting and fishing) users. In many ways, the traditional groups have a lesser impact on the habitat than the new users, requiring fewer infrastructures to access the habitat. It is largely the perception of consumptive uses that will need to be addressed. ,

6. Revolution in Funding

Broader funding mechanisms are needed that are equitable, applied to all users and applied to non-user beneficiaries. Stakeholders were clear in their statements that increased fees, dedicated to specific ends were OK. Additionally, they felt it was unfair to exempt any user group from fees (seniors, non-powered boats, recreational users, saltwater shore anglers, etc...)

7. Mouthpiece of the Resource and Species

Education of Floridians and visitors about the state-of-the-resource will be an increasingly important role. All stakeholders felt that extensive communication with the Public about the resource was essential. They recommended partnerships as the primary way for FWC to address this role.

8. Partner 'til we Drop

The decisions facing Florida are too big to go it alone. Partnerships are the key to solving the really big problems. This does not imply that partnerships cannot be used on a smaller scale to attack local and regional problems. In fact, the short-term successes are likely to happen in bite-sized chunks. This will require a complete re-assessment of how we currently are structured to operate, how we view our day-to-day jobs, and inter-operate with others.

9. Stick to science as a basis for decision-making.

It is clear from the stakeholder and employee surveys that departure from science-based decisions had damaged the credibility of FWC with both groups. Make our science good enough that we are prepared to make the big calls and can justify all decisions with neutral science.

10. Proactive Research

Build the research database that enables proactive actions that can be implemented on behalf of the habitat and species in FloThis is related to several of the above items. Leadership, scientific decision-making, education, and other themes all leverage on having the data, information, knowledge and, ultimately, wisdom to do the right thing for the habitat and species under out care or influence.

11. Re-think Law Enforcement

Law enforcement is the way that each group ensures the other groups are doing their part. The law enforcement mechanism is increasingly called upon to ensure compliance. If a group is experiencing a decline or diminishment of their specific use of the resource, they want to ensure that others are not still reaping benefit. Law enforcement implications must be paramount in all execution. Additionally, FWC must discuss that “more” is not the most likely answer. The most likely answer is different. Assisting all stakeholders in understanding the real constraints will be critical. Having a mission critical focus for law enforcement will be essential. They must focus their energies on those areas that have the greatest impact and benefit. Additionally, FWC must be seen as championing stricter penalties.

12. The Role of the Commission

The Commission is not seen as balanced in representation or focus. It is seen as overtaxed and increasingly focused on marine issues. Stakeholders do not feel that the Commission has time to fully listen to them, given the current agenda. It will become increasingly important to create pre-Commission processes that allow for stakeholders to become involved in proactive solutions, well in advance of any immediate need for rule-making. We suggest a long-term planning process with stakeholders to identify the emerging issues where rule making will be required and suggested rules. Additionally, we suggest a pre-Commission process be established for including all stakeholder input into a position paper that can be used as a briefing document for the Commission. This would be a more immediate process that would address the gathering of scientific and socio-economic input, before the rule-making process.

13. Big Picture Thinking

Landscape level planning, data collection, and research is required of FWC, particularly when looking at the big picture issues on the horizon, partnership interactions, and answering the emerging questions that face Florida habitat and species.

14. New Roles

There are new roles FWC must take on. The existing lines of business are not effectively addressing the expectations of customers or the role of protecting the resource. FWC advocates for key strategies, goals will need to be identified, and their roles defined.

15. Serving Florida and its Visitors

Change the way we interact with customers to better address their real needs, not our view of their needs. Bringing FWC into the Third Millennium in its understanding of customer support, help desks, community involvement, and responsiveness will be critical to how we are viewed and are directly related to State efforts in this arena. This will be one of the key influencers on the monetary and stakeholder support we need to execute the strategy.

Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission Strategic Plan January 2007

This plan contains the key strategies that will guide the FWC over the long term and sets forth the behaviors that are essential to successfully achieving our mission. We have taken this long-term view to better ensure the conservation of Florida's fish and wildlife resources.

We are expanding the role of management to place greater emphasis on management through leadership, education and influence. Under this approach, people do what is best for fish and wildlife of their own volition, rather than by the threat of regulatory or enforcement actions.

Regarding the work itself, we want to move from reacting to situations to being more proactive. This entails identifying and working on emerging issues before they overtake us. We are intent on moving from single focus planning where one division or office works on an issue to planning that brings all relevant disciplines of the agency to bear in a coordinated way. We want to keep our eye on the bigger landscape.

Our Vision

Powered by science-based leadership, we will create a sustainable and healthy future for Florida's fish, wildlife, water and habitat resources.

FWC envisions a future where the people who live in or visit Florida care for and contribute to the stability of our fish and wildlife resources and the quality of our environment. FWC will be the recognized leader in the science and management of Florida's fish and wildlife. Residents and visitors will fully support and fund efforts to maintain the resources that provide recreational opportunities for fishing, hunting, wildlife viewing and boating.

Our Mission

To manage fish and wildlife resources for their long-term well-being and the benefit of people.

Our mission is a concise statement of what we do to achieve this vision. This statement captures the concept that humans are an integral part of the equation and that balancing competing public interests, concerns, and uses of natural resources is at the heart of our mission.

Our Goal

To provide healthy resources for safe, satisfied customers.

This is the end result we hope to accomplish through our mission.

Agency Strategies

In this section we describe the strategies we will employ to accomplish our mission. Divisions and offices have plans that specifically address implementation of these strategies. These strategies are not in priority order.

1. Develop proactive, integrated research that anticipates emerging issues and ensures positive resource outcomes.
2. Develop leading-edge resource management programs.
3. Develop proactive, preventative enforcement programs that enable FWC to avoid potential and emerging problems.
4. Develop fish and wildlife recreation opportunities and programs that foster resource stewardship.
5. Improve our resource leadership position by clearly communicating where we are headed, why it is important, and how we plan to get there.
6. Increase stakeholder involvement and interaction on emerging issues to proactively reduce resource conflicts.
7. Initiate partnerships as a means of addressing the big resource issues facing Florida.
8. Integrate human dimensions insights into management planning and decision making.
9. Integrate our activities to better achieve sustainable populations of species, protect critical habitat and high quality environmental resources.
10. Foster and develop the multi-disciplinary expertise of the FWC needed to ensure strategic, integrated solutions that address and solve resource problems.
11. Build a collaborative workforce built on professionalism, with the skills and resources needed to maximize effectiveness.

Agency Code of Conduct

As we implement this plan, we will do so in a manner consistent with the value we place on respect for the individual and recognition of what teamwork, genuinely employed, can accomplish.

Lead and Make Informed Decisions

FWC leadership is about: creating a vision, aligning agency resources to accomplish the vision, and empowering people to do the work. We will work with our employees, customers and stakeholders to set the vision for Florida's fish and wildlife future, align the resources and empower people to make this vision a reality.

These, in no order of priority, are our guides.

1. Balance the needs of citizens with the needs of the resource, putting the resource first in our decisions and actions.
2. Make resource decisions based on the best available science with a balance of enforcement and management practicality.
3. Make consistent, thoughtful and timely decisions that keep pace with the needs of the resource.
4. Seek first to influence others rather than regulate them.
Develop collaborative approaches to address conservation needs.
5. Be proactive in our actions, anticipating emerging issues and getting out in front of them.
6. Adopt a landscape or big picture approach that uses interdisciplinary teams to address complex resource-management issues.
7. Effectively involve citizens and staff who are closest to an issue in the decision-making process.
8. Use teamwork and collaboration to integrate our work effort.
9. Communicate well up and down the organization, across the organization, and externally with others.

Provide Excellent Service

Providing the best possible service to the public and one another is essential to gathering the support we need to achieve our mission. These, in no order of priority, are our guides.

10. Provide consistent, high-quality service to citizens.
11. Be collaborative and respectful in interactions with fellow employees.
12. Seek input from and listen to citizens; understand and try to meet their needs.
13. Proactively engage stakeholders and management partners in planning and decision-making; strive to continuously inform affected parties of plans and actions.
14. Work with all parties on issues in a fair and balanced way; create forums for dialogue and seek the middle ground. Focus on conflict resolution and collaboration.
15. Partner with others.
16. Communicate the reasons for our actions and state a consistent FWC point of view (speak with one voice).
17. Continually improve agency processes, operations and cost-effectiveness.

Measurement

We will measure progress on implementing this plan using an agency-level scorecard. This scorecard is under development and includes specific and measurable objectives for judging how well we're doing on the end results of our actions.

S:\OED\PLANNING\Agency Strategic Plan\Strategic Plan\Revisions
2006\FinalstrategicplanShortVs.doc

LRPP Exhibit II - Performance Measures and Standards

Department: Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission	Department No.: 77
---	--------------------

Program: Executive Direction and Administrative Services	Code: 77100000
Service/Budget Entity: Office of Executive Direction and Administrative Support Services	Code: 77100700

NOTE: Approved primary service outcomes must be listed first.

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2008-09 (Words)	Approved Prior Year Standard FY 2007-08 (Numbers)	Prior Year Actual FY 2007-08 (Numbers)	Approved Standards for FY 2008-09 (Numbers)	Requested FY 2009-10 Standard (Numbers)
Compliance with recreational and commercial licensing rules and law	99%	99%	99%	99%
Percent change in licensed anglers	1.00%	-2.05%	1.00%	1.00%
Percent change in the number of licensed hunters	-2.00%	0.16%	-2.00%	-0.50%
Number of recreational licenses and permit issued	2,300,000	2,327,555	2,300,000	2,300,000
Number of wildlife and freshwater fishing commercial licenses and permits issued	84,405	125,124	84,405	135,000
Number of commercial and other marine fishing license processed	2,049,835	2,686,373	2,049,835	2,100,000
Number of rural counties counseled regarding use of nature-based recreation as an economic development tool	28	22	28	28
Number of people reached with fish and wildlife messages	4,327,601	6,190,601	4,327,601	4,500,000
Economic impact of fishing, hunting and wildlife viewing(dollars/jobs)	\$10.1 Billion / 105,636	\$11.6 Billion / 119,904	\$10.1 Billion / 105,636	\$10.1 Billion / 105,636
Number of people reached with conservation messages	3,188,500	3,245,697	3,188,500	2,800,000
Florida Wildlife Magazine - annual distribution	50,000	100,000	50,000	90,000
Administrative costs as a percent of total agency costs	6.39%	7.00%	6.39%	6.39%
Administrative positions as a percent of total agency positions	8.58%	8.58%	8.58%	8.58%
Administrative costs per division	1,238,089	1,361,588	1,238,089	1,238,089
Administrative positions per division	14.5 FTE	14.7 FTE	14.5 FTE	14.5 FTE

LRPP Exhibit II - Performance Measures and Standards

Department: Fish & Wildlife Conservation Commission	Department No.:
---	-----------------

Program: Law Enforcement	Code: 77200000
Service/Budget Entity: Fish, Wildlife, and Boating Law Enforcement	Code: 77200100

NOTE: Approved primary service outcomes must be listed first.

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2008-09 (Words)	Approved Prior Year Standard FY 2007-08 (Numbers)	Prior Year Actual FY 2007-08 (Numbers)	Approved Standards for FY 2008-09 (Numbers)	Requested FY 2009-10 Standard (Numbers)
Compliance with specified commission rules and state law	81.4%	87%	81.4%	81.4%
Response time to emergency calls	43 minutes	55 minutes	43 minutes	43 minutes
Number of recreational boating injuries	450	378	450	450
Number of warnings, arrests, and convictions	127,692	114,228	127,692	127,692
Number of vessels checked	320,345	227,858	320,345	320,345
Aircraft down time	<5.1 day/month/aircraft	<4.8 day/month/aircraft	<5.1 day/month/aircraft	<5.1 day/month/aircraft
Communications equipment down time	<2.5 day/year/radio	<2.1 day/year/radio	<2.5 day/year/radio	<2.5 day/year/radio
Total number of hours spent in preventative patrol and investigations	930,391	966,045	930,391	930,391
Number of vessel safety inspections	320,345	227,858	320,345	320,345
Total number of boating accidents investigated	1,292	670	1,292	1,292
Number of patrol hours	861,026	817,861	861,026	861,026
Number of investigative hours	69,365	148,184	69,365	69,365
Number of officers and recruits trained	737	734	737	737
Number of enforcement flight hours	4,821	3,337	4,821	4,821
Number of boats repaired	351	939	351	351
Number of equipment repairs	3,282	6,396	3,282	3,282
Number of data-related information requests fulfilled	156	84	156	156
Number of regulatory zones properly permitted	50	69	50	50
Number of boating safety education cards issued	20,000	23,168	20,000	20,000

LRPP Exhibit II - Performance Measures and Standards

Department: Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission	Department No.: 77000000
---	--------------------------

Program: Wildlife	Code: 77350000
Service/Budget Entity: Habitat and Species Conservation	Code: 77350200

NOTE: Approved primary service outcomes must be listed first.

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2008-09 (Words)	Approved Prior Year Standard FY 2007-08 (Numbers)	Prior Year Actual FY 2007-08 (Numbers)	Approved Standards for FY 2008-09 (Numbers)	Requested FY 2009-10 Standard (Numbers)
Percent of critical habitat (hot spots) protected through land acquisition, lease or management contract	44.0%	45.1%	44.0%	44.0%
Percent of wildlife species whose biological status is stable or improving	48.7%	49.60%	48.7%	48.7%
Number of acres managed for wildlife	5,539,815	5,737,012	5,539,815	5,737,012
Number of written technical assists provided	204	299	204	204
Number of survey and monitoring projects	195	184	195	185
Acres of fish and wildlife habitat purchased	2,800	3,326.58	2,800	2,800
Number of recovery plan actions implemented	44	46	44	44
Number of water acres where habitat rehabilitation projects have been completed	69,592	87,836	69,592	10,000
Percent of Florida's water bodies in which hydrilla, water hyacinth and water lettuce are under maintenance control	97.0%	This standard is determined from data collected during an annual survey of 1.25 million acres of public water bodies (spring through fall). The earliest this standard can be determined is late December.	95.0%	95.0%
Request for New Measure:				
Number of native fish and wildlife speices with stable or increasing populations	327	362	327	327
number of exotic species with management plans written	6	6	6	6

LRPP Exhibit II - Performance Measures and Standards

Department: Fish & Wildlife Conservation Commission	Department No.: 77
---	--------------------

Program: Marine Fisheries	Code: 77500000
Service/Budget Entity: Marine Fisheries Management	Code: 77500200

NOTE: Approved primary service outcomes must be listed first.

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2008-09 (Words)	Approved Prior Year Standard FY 2007-08 (Numbers)	Prior Year Actual FY 2007-08 (Numbers)	Approved Standards for FY 2008-09 (Numbers)	Requested FY 2009-10 Standard (Numbers)
Percent of fisheries stocks that are increasing or stable	80%	95%	80%	80%
Number of fishery management plans reviewed and analysis completed	15	15	15	15
Number of educational and outreach contacts	350,000	328,623	350,000	350,000
Number of artificial reefs created and/or monitored	160	117	175	175
Number of marine fishery services contacts	179,650	416,443	179,650	179,650

LRPP Exhibit II - Performance Measures and Standards

Department: FISH AND WILDLIFE CONSERVATION COMMISSION	Department No.: 77
---	--------------------

Program: Research	Code: 77650000
Service/Budget Entity: Fish and Wildlife Research Institute	Code: 77650200

NOTE: Approved primary service outcomes must be listed first.

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2008-09 (Words)	Approved Prior Year Standard FY 2007-08 (Numbers)	Prior Year Actual FY 2007-08 (Numbers)	Approved Standards for FY 2008-09 (Numbers)	Requested FY 2009-10 Standard (Numbers)
Number of fisheries assessment and data summaries conducted	149,602	161,572	149,602	149,602
Number of technical and analytical GIS remote sensing requests completed and GIS oil spill training assistance provided	1,470	760	1,470	200,758
Number of requests for status of endangered and threatened species and wildlife completed	99,522	100,330	99,522	99,522
Number of red tide and aquatic health assessments completed	200,947	385,009	200,947	200,947
Number of manatees rehabilitated	52	59	52	52
Number of requests for assessments of seagrass, salt marsh, mangrove, coral, aquatic, and upland habitat	28,207	29,002	28,207	28,207

LRPP Exhibit III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT

Department: Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission
Program: Executive Direction and Administrative Services
Service/Budget Entity: Office of Executive Direction and Administrative Support Services / 77100700
Measure: Number of rural counties counseled regarding use of nature-based recreation as an economic development tool

Action:

- Performance Assessment of Outcome Measure Revision of Measure
 Performance Assessment of Output Measure Deletion of Measure
 Adjustment of GAA Performance Standards

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
28	22	-6	-21%

Factors Accounting for the Difference:

Internal Factors (check all that apply):

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Personnel Factors | <input type="checkbox"/> Staff Capacity |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Competing Priorities | <input type="checkbox"/> Level of Training |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Previous Estimate Incorrect | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other (Identify) |

Explanation: A revision of this measure is requested because the original conditions do not apply.

External Factors (check all that apply):

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Resources Unavailable | <input type="checkbox"/> Technological Problems |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Legal/Legislative Change | <input type="checkbox"/> Natural Disaster |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Target Population Change | <input type="checkbox"/> Other (Identify) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> This Program/Service Cannot Fix The Problem | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Current Laws Are Working Against The Agency Mission | |

Explanation: The original measure was established when the legislature allocated specific, one-time funds to the FWC for the purpose of promoting nature-based tourism in rural counties. The funds have not been reallocated and the re-organization of the FWC in 2004 limits the agency's ability to meet this measure.

Management Efforts to Address Differences/Problems (check all that apply):

- | | |
|------------------------------------|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Training | <input type="checkbox"/> Technology |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Personnel | <input type="checkbox"/> Other (Identify) |

Recommendations:

LRPP Exhibit III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT

Department: Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission
Program: Law Enforcement
Service/Budget Entity: Fish, Wildlife, and Boating Law Enforcement
Measure: Aircraft Down Time

Action:

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Performance Assessment of <u>Outcome</u> Measure | <input type="checkbox"/> Revision of Measure |
| X Performance Assessment of <u>Output</u> Measure | <input type="checkbox"/> Deletion of Measure |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Adjustment of GAA Performance Standards | |

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
<5.1 day/month/aircraft	<4.8 day/month/aircraft	.3	- 5.8%

Factors Accounting for the Difference:

Internal Factors (check all that apply):

- | | |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Personnel Factors | <input type="checkbox"/> Staff Capacity |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Competing Priorities | <input type="checkbox"/> Level of Training |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Previous Estimate Incorrect | X Other (Identify) |

Explanation:

Standard Achieved. The ultimate desired results of this standard would be zero days of aircraft down time. The Division has a fleet of newer aircraft. As a result, less maintenance is required which provides a lower downtime per aircraft.

External Factors (check all that apply):

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Resources Unavailable | <input type="checkbox"/> Technological Problems |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Legal/Legislative Change | <input type="checkbox"/> Natural Disaster |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Target Population Change | <input type="checkbox"/> Other (Identify) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> This Program/Service Cannot Fix The Problem | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Current Laws Are Working Against The Agency Mission | |

Explanation:

N/A

Management Efforts to Address Differences/Problems (check all that apply):

- | | |
|------------------------------------|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Training | <input type="checkbox"/> Technology |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Personnel | <input type="checkbox"/> Other (Identify) |

Recommendations:

N/A

LRPP Exhibit III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT

Department: Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission
 Program: Law Enforcement
 Service/Budget Entity: Fish, Wildlife, and Boating Law Enforcement
 Measure: Communications Equipment Down Time

Action:

- Performance Assessment of Outcome Measure
- Revision of Measure
- X Performance Assessment of Output Measure
- Deletion of Measure
- Adjustment of GAA Performance Standards

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
<2.5 day/year/radio	<2.1 day/year/radio	.4	- 16%

Factors Accounting for the Difference:

Internal Factors (check all that apply):

- Personnel Factors
- Competing Priorities
- Previous Estimate Incorrect
- Staff Capacity
- Level of Training
- X Other (Identify)

Explanation:

Standard Achieved. The ultimate desired results of this standard would be zero days of communications equipment down time. Division communications equipment is newer, contributing to less down time.

External Factors (check all that apply):

- Resources Unavailable
- Legal/Legislative Change
- Target Population Change
- This Program/Service Cannot Fix The Problem
- Current Laws Are Working Against The Agency Mission
- Technological Problems
- Natural Disaster
- Other (Identify)

Explanation:

N/A

Management Efforts to Address Differences/Problems (check all that apply):

- Training
- Personnel
- Technology
- Other (Identify)

Recommendations:

N/A

LRPP Exhibit III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT

Department: Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission
 Program: Law Enforcement
 Service/Budget Entity: Fish, Wildlife, and Boating Law Enforcement
 Measure: Compliance With Specified Commission Rules and State Law

Action:

- Performance Assessment of Outcome Measure Revision of Measure
- Performance Assessment of Output Measure Deletion of Measure
- Adjustment of GAA Performance Standards

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
81.40%	87%	5.6	6.8%

Factors Accounting for the Difference:

Internal Factors (check all that apply):

- Personnel Factors Staff Capacity
- Competing Priorities Level of Training
- Previous Estimate Incorrect Other (Identify)

Explanation:

Standard Achieved. Compliance rates are influenced by many variables and are expected to fluctuate. Such factors include, weather conditions, geographic conditions, officer presence, and voluntary compliance with laws/rules.

External Factors (check all that apply):

- Resources Unavailable Technological Problems
- Legal/Legislative Change Natural Disaster
- Target Population Change Other (Identify)
- This Program/Service Cannot Fix The Problem
- Current Laws Are Working Against The Agency Mission

Explanation:

Standard Achieved. Compliance rates are influenced by many variables and are expected to fluctuate. Such factors include, weather conditions, geographic conditions, officer presence, and voluntary compliance with laws/rules.

Management Efforts to Address Differences/Problems (check all that apply):

- Training Technology
- Personnel Other (Identify)

Recommendations:

N/A

LRPP Exhibit III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT

Department: Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission
Program: Law Enforcement
Service/Budget Entity: Fish, Wildlife, and Boating Law Enforcement
Measure: Number of Boating Safety Education Cards Issued

Action:

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Performance Assessment of <u>Outcome</u> Measure | <input type="checkbox"/> Revision of Measure |
| X Performance Assessment of <u>Output</u> Measure | <input type="checkbox"/> Deletion of Measure |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Adjustment of GAA Performance Standards | |

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
20,000	23,168	3,168	16%

Factors Accounting for the Difference:

Internal Factors (check all that apply):

- | | |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Personnel Factors | <input type="checkbox"/> Staff Capacity |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Competing Priorities | <input type="checkbox"/> Level of Training |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Previous Estimate Incorrect | X Other (Identify) |

Explanation:

Standard Achieved. The increase in actual performance can be attributed to more students completing boating safety education courses for this reporting period.

External Factors (check all that apply):

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Resources Unavailable | <input type="checkbox"/> Technological Problems |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Legal/Legislative Change | <input type="checkbox"/> Natural Disaster |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Target Population Change | <input type="checkbox"/> Other (Identify) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> This Program/Service Cannot Fix The Problem | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Current Laws Are Working Against The Agency Mission | |

Explanation:

N/A

Management Efforts to Address Differences/Problems (check all that apply):

- | | |
|------------------------------------|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Training | <input type="checkbox"/> Technology |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Personnel | <input type="checkbox"/> Other (Identify) |

Recommendations:

N/A

LRPP Exhibit III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT

Department: Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission
 Program: Law Enforcement
 Service/Budget Entity: Fish, Wildlife, and Boating Law Enforcement
 Measure: Number of Boats Repaired

Action:

- Performance Assessment of Outcome Measure Revision of Measure
 X Performance Assessment of Output Measure Deletion of Measure
 Adjustment of GAA Performance Standards

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
351	939	588	167%

Factors Accounting for the Difference:

Internal Factors (check all that apply):

- Personnel Factors Staff Capacity
 Competing Priorities Level of Training
 Previous Estimate Incorrect X Other (Identify)

Explanation:

Standard Achieved. This increase is attributed to the cost savings regions experience when using FWC Shop Services. The actual performance results for this measure may continue to increase, but we recommend data be collected for at least 5 years to establish a new baseline for this measure.

External Factors (check all that apply):

- Resources Unavailable Technological Problems
 Legal/Legislative Change Natural Disaster
 Target Population Change Other (Identify)
 This Program/Service Cannot Fix The Problem
 Current Laws Are Working Against The Agency Mission

Explanation:

N/A

Management Efforts to Address Differences/Problems (check all that apply):

- Training Technology
 Personnel Other (Identify)

Recommendations:

N/A

LRPP Exhibit III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT

Department: Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission
Program: Law Enforcement
Service/Budget Entity: Fish, Wildlife, and Boating Law Enforcement
Measure: Number of Data-Related Information Requests Fulfilled

Action:

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Performance Assessment of <u>Outcome</u> Measure | <input type="checkbox"/> Revision of Measure |
| X Performance Assessment of <u>Output</u> Measure | <input type="checkbox"/> Deletion of Measure |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Adjustment of GAA Performance Standards | |

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
156	84	72	- 46%

Factors Accounting for the Difference:

Internal Factors (check all that apply):

- | | |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Personnel Factors | <input type="checkbox"/> Staff Capacity |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Competing Priorities | <input type="checkbox"/> Level of Training |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Previous Estimate Incorrect | X Other (Identify) |

Explanation:

The change in actual performance for this measure is attributed to improvements in data systems which allow individuals to run reports or obtain information themselves.

External Factors (check all that apply):

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Resources Unavailable | <input type="checkbox"/> Technological Problems |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Legal/Legislative Change | <input type="checkbox"/> Natural Disaster |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Target Population Change | <input type="checkbox"/> Other (Identify) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> This Program/Service Cannot Fix The Problem | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Current Laws Are Working Against The Agency Mission | |

Explanation:

N/A

Management Efforts to Address Differences/Problems (check all that apply):

- | | |
|------------------------------------|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Training | <input type="checkbox"/> Technology |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Personnel | <input type="checkbox"/> Other (Identify) |

Recommendations:

N/A

LRPP Exhibit III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT

Department: Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission
Program: Law Enforcement
Service/Budget Entity: Fish, Wildlife, and Boating Law Enforcement
Measure: Number of Equipment Repairs

Action:

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Performance Assessment of <u>Outcome</u> Measure | <input type="checkbox"/> Revision of Measure |
| X Performance Assessment of <u>Output</u> Measure | <input type="checkbox"/> Deletion of Measure |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Adjustment of GAA Performance Standards | |

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
3,282	6,396	3,114	95%

Factors Accounting for the Difference:

Internal Factors (check all that apply):

- | | |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Personnel Factors | <input type="checkbox"/> Staff Capacity |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Competing Priorities | <input type="checkbox"/> Level of Training |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Previous Estimate Incorrect | X Other (Identify) |

Explanation:

Standard Achieved. Repair numbers are high for this reporting period due to the need to reprogram every radio in the state to comply with the first round of the Nationwide Frequency Exchange negotiated by the Federal Communications Commission and Sprint-Nextel.

External Factors (check all that apply):

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Resources Unavailable | <input type="checkbox"/> Technological Problems |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Legal/Legislative Change | <input type="checkbox"/> Natural Disaster |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Target Population Change | <input type="checkbox"/> Other (Identify) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> This Program/Service Cannot Fix The Problem | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Current Laws Are Working Against The Agency Mission | |

Explanation:

N/A

Management Efforts to Address Differences/Problems (check all that apply):

- | | |
|------------------------------------|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Training | <input type="checkbox"/> Technology |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Personnel | <input type="checkbox"/> Other (Identify) |

Recommendations:

N/A

LRPP Exhibit III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT

Department: Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission
Program: Law Enforcement
Service/Budget Entity: Fish, Wildlife, and Boating Law Enforcement
Measure: Number of Investigative Hours

Action:

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Performance Assessment of <u>Outcome</u> Measure | <input type="checkbox"/> Revision of Measure |
| X Performance Assessment of <u>Output</u> Measure | <input type="checkbox"/> Deletion of Measure |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Adjustment of GAA Performance Standards | |

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
69,365	148,184	78,819	113%

Factors Accounting for the Difference:

Internal Factors (check all that apply):

- | | |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Personnel Factors | <input type="checkbox"/> Staff Capacity |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Competing Priorities | <input type="checkbox"/> Level of Training |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Previous Estimate Incorrect | X Other (Identify) |

Explanation:

Standard Achieved. Internal reorganization occurring FY 2003-04 allocated 10 additional FTEs to Investigations since the conception of this standard. At the time the standard was created, data was retrieved from Time Direct; the last three years' data has been retrieved from our internal Activity Net database. We recommend data be collected for at least 5 years to establish a baseline for this measure.

External Factors (check all that apply):

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Resources Unavailable | <input type="checkbox"/> Technological Problems |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Legal/Legislative Change | <input type="checkbox"/> Natural Disaster |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Target Population Change | <input type="checkbox"/> Other (Identify) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> This Program/Service Cannot Fix The Problem | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Current Laws Are Working Against The Agency Mission | |

Explanation:

N/A

Management Efforts to Address Differences/Problems (check all that apply):

- | | |
|------------------------------------|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Training | <input type="checkbox"/> Technology |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Personnel | <input type="checkbox"/> Other (Identify) |

Recommendations:

N/A

Office of Policy and Budget – July 2006

LRPP Exhibit III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT

Department: Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission
Program: Law Enforcement
Service/Budget Entity: Fish, Wildlife, and Boating Law Enforcement
Measure: Number of Patrol Hours

Action:

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Performance Assessment of <u>Outcome</u> Measure | <input type="checkbox"/> Revision of Measure |
| X Performance Assessment of <u>Output</u> Measure | <input type="checkbox"/> Deletion of Measure |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Adjustment of GAA Performance Standards | |

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
861,026	817,861	43,165	- 5%

Factors Accounting for the Difference:

Internal Factors (check all that apply):

- | | |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Personnel Factors | X Staff Capacity |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Competing Priorities | <input type="checkbox"/> Level of Training |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Previous Estimate Incorrect | X Other (Identify) |

Explanation:

The Division had approximately 50 sworn vacancies for much of this reporting period. These vacancies, coupled with higher fuel costs negatively impacted our ability to achieve the standard for this measure.

External Factors (check all that apply):

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Resources Unavailable | <input type="checkbox"/> Technological Problems |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Legal/Legislative Change | <input type="checkbox"/> Natural Disaster |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Target Population Change | <input type="checkbox"/> Other (Identify) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> This Program/Service Cannot Fix The Problem | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Current Laws Are Working Against The Agency Mission | |

Explanation:

N/A

Management Efforts to Address Differences/Problems (check all that apply):

- | | |
|------------------------------------|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Training | <input type="checkbox"/> Technology |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Personnel | <input type="checkbox"/> Other (Identify) |

Recommendations:

N/A

LRPP Exhibit III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT

Department: Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission
Program: Law Enforcement
Service/Budget Entity: Fish, Wildlife, and Boating Law Enforcement
Measure: Number of Recreational Boating Injuries

Action:

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Performance Assessment of <u>Outcome</u> Measure | <input type="checkbox"/> Revision of Measure |
| X Performance Assessment of <u>Output</u> Measure | <input type="checkbox"/> Deletion of Measure |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Adjustment of GAA Performance Standards | |

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
450	378	72	- 16%

Factors Accounting for the Difference:

Internal Factors (check all that apply):

- | | |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Personnel Factors | <input type="checkbox"/> Staff Capacity |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Competing Priorities | <input type="checkbox"/> Level of Training |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Previous Estimate Incorrect | X Other (Identify) |

Explanation:

Standard achieved. Ultimately, the desired standard and achieved results for this measure would be zero. This standard is expected to fluctuate each year. It is difficult to identify specific activities that would guarantee consistent statistics in this standard. The numbers of recreational boating injuries that occur are directly linked to the number of boating accidents that occur each year. Many external factors, which are outside the control of the Division, contribute to the number of boating accidents. It is our goal to continue to emphasize boating safety and public education, combined with an enforcement presence, to effect a reduction in the number of boating accidents, injuries, and fatalities.

External Factors (check all that apply):

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Resources Unavailable | <input type="checkbox"/> Technological Problems |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Legal/Legislative Change | <input type="checkbox"/> Natural Disaster |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Target Population Change | <input type="checkbox"/> Other (Identify) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> This Program/Service Cannot Fix The Problem | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Current Laws Are Working Against The Agency Mission | |

Explanation:

N/A

Management Efforts to Address Differences/Problems (check all that apply):

Training

Technology

Personnel

Other (Identify)

Recommendations:

N/A

LRPP Exhibit III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT

Department: Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission
Program: Law Enforcement
Service/Budget Entity: Fish, Wildlife, and Boating Law Enforcement
Measure: Number of Vessel Safety Inspections

Action:

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Performance Assessment of <u>Outcome</u> Measure | <input type="checkbox"/> Revision of Measure |
| X Performance Assessment of <u>Output</u> Measure | <input type="checkbox"/> Deletion of Measure |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Adjustment of GAA Performance Standards | |

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
320,345	227,858	92,487	- 28%

Factors Accounting for the Difference:

Internal Factors (check all that apply):

- | | |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Personnel Factors | X Staff Capacity |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Competing Priorities | <input type="checkbox"/> Level of Training |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Previous Estimate Incorrect | X Other (Identify) |

Explanation:

The Division had approximately 50 sworn vacancies for much of this reporting period. These vacancies, coupled with higher fuel costs negatively impacted our ability to achieve the standard for this measure.

External Factors (check all that apply):

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Resources Unavailable | <input type="checkbox"/> Technological Problems |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Legal/Legislative Change | <input type="checkbox"/> Natural Disaster |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Target Population Change | <input type="checkbox"/> Other (Identify) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> This Program/Service Cannot Fix The Problem | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Current Laws Are Working Against The Agency Mission | |

Explanation:

Management Efforts to Address Differences/Problems (check all that apply):

- | | |
|------------------------------------|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Training | <input type="checkbox"/> Technology |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Personnel | <input type="checkbox"/> Other (Identify) |

Recommendations:

N/A

LRPP Exhibit III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT

Department: Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission
Program: Law Enforcement
Service/Budget Entity: Fish, Wildlife, and Boating Law Enforcement
Measure: Number of Vessels Checked

Action:

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Performance Assessment of <u>Outcome</u> Measure | <input type="checkbox"/> Revision of Measure |
| X Performance Assessment of <u>Output</u> Measure | <input type="checkbox"/> Deletion of Measure |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Adjustment of GAA Performance Standards | |

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
320,345	227,858	92,487	- 28%

Factors Accounting for the Difference:

Internal Factors (check all that apply):

- | | |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Personnel Factors | X Staff Capacity |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Competing Priorities | <input type="checkbox"/> Level of Training |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Previous Estimate Incorrect | X Other (Identify) |

Explanation:

The Division had approximately 50 sworn vacancies for much of this reporting period. These vacancies, coupled with higher fuel costs negatively impacted our ability to achieve the standard for this measure.

External Factors (check all that apply):

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Resources Unavailable | <input type="checkbox"/> Technological Problems |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Legal/Legislative Change | <input type="checkbox"/> Natural Disaster |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Target Population Change | <input type="checkbox"/> Other (Identify) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> This Program/Service Cannot Fix The Problem | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Current Laws Are Working Against The Agency Mission | |

Explanation:

Management Efforts to Address Differences/Problems (check all that apply):

- | | |
|------------------------------------|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Training | <input type="checkbox"/> Technology |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Personnel | <input type="checkbox"/> Other (Identify) |

Recommendations:

N/A

LRPP Exhibit III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT

Department: Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission
Program: Law Enforcement
Service/Budget Entity: Fish, Wildlife, and Boating Law Enforcement
Measure: Number of Warnings, Arrests, and Convictions

Action:

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Performance Assessment of <u>Outcome</u> Measure | <input type="checkbox"/> Revision of Measure |
| X Performance Assessment of <u>Output</u> Measure | <input type="checkbox"/> Deletion of Measure |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Adjustment of GAA Performance Standards | |

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
127,692	114,228	13,464	-11%

Factors Accounting for the Difference:

Internal Factors (check all that apply):

- | | |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Personnel Factors | X Staff Capacity |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Competing Priorities | <input type="checkbox"/> Level of Training |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Previous Estimate Incorrect | X Other (Identify) |

Explanation:

The Division had approximately 50 sworn vacancies for much of this reporting period. These vacancies, coupled with higher fuel costs negatively impacted our ability to achieve the standard for this measure.

External Factors (check all that apply):

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Resources Unavailable | <input type="checkbox"/> Technological Problems |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Legal/Legislative Change | <input type="checkbox"/> Natural Disaster |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Target Population Change | <input type="checkbox"/> Other (Identify) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> This Program/Service Cannot Fix The Problem | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Current Laws Are Working Against The Agency Mission | |

Explanation:

Management Efforts to Address Differences/Problems (check all that apply):

- | | |
|------------------------------------|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Training | <input type="checkbox"/> Technology |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Personnel | <input type="checkbox"/> Other (Identify) |

Recommendations:

N/A

LRPP Exhibit III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT

Department: Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission
 Program: Law Enforcement
 Service/Budget Entity: Fish, Wildlife, and Boating Law Enforcement
 Measure: Response Time to Emergency Calls

Action:

- Performance Assessment of Outcome Measure
- Revision of Measure
- X Performance Assessment of Output Measure
- Deletion of Measure
- Adjustment of GAA Performance Standards

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
43 minutes	55 minutes	12	27%

Factors Accounting for the Difference:

Internal Factors (check all that apply):

- Personnel Factors
- Staff Capacity
- Competing Priorities
- Level of Training
- X Previous Estimate Incorrect
- Other (Identify)

Explanation:

At the conception of the approved standard, data for this measure was incomplete. On 11 April 2004, CAD became available statewide and provides a more accurate picture of response time. Response time is impacted by many variables which include geographic conditions, weather, equipment availability, officer availability, and traffic conditions. This figure reflects an average response time for the entire state. We recommend data be collected for at least 5 years to establish a baseline for this measure.

External Factors (check all that apply):

- Resources Unavailable
- Technological Problems
- Legal/Legislative Change
- Natural Disaster
- Target Population Change
- Other (Identify)
- This Program/Service Cannot Fix The Problem
- Current Laws Are Working Against The Agency Mission

Explanation:

N/A

Management Efforts to Address Differences/Problems (check all that apply):

- Training
- Technology

Personnel

Other (Identify)

Recommendations:

N/A

LRPP Exhibit III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT

Department: Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission
Program: Law Enforcement
Service/Budget Entity: Fish, Wildlife, and Boating Law Enforcement
Measure: Total Number of Hours Spent in Preventative Patrol and Investigations

Action:

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Performance Assessment of <u>Outcome</u> Measure | <input type="checkbox"/> Revision of Measure |
| X Performance Assessment of <u>Output</u> Measure | <input type="checkbox"/> Deletion of Measure |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Adjustment of GAA Performance Standards | |

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
930,391	966,045	35,654	3.8%

Factors Accounting for the Difference:

Internal Factors (check all that apply):

- | | |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Personnel Factors | <input type="checkbox"/> Staff Capacity |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Competing Priorities | <input type="checkbox"/> Level of Training |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Previous Estimate Incorrect | X Other (Identify) |

Explanation:

Standard Achieved.

External Factors (check all that apply):

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Resources Unavailable | <input type="checkbox"/> Technological Problems |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Legal/Legislative Change | <input type="checkbox"/> Natural Disaster |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Target Population Change | <input type="checkbox"/> Other (Identify) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> This Program/Service Cannot Fix The Problem | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Current Laws Are Working Against The Agency Mission | |

Explanation:

N/A

Management Efforts to Address Differences/Problems (check all that apply):

- | | |
|------------------------------------|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Training | <input type="checkbox"/> Technology |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Personnel | <input type="checkbox"/> Other (Identify) |

Recommendations:

N/A

LRPP Exhibit III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT

Department: Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission

Program: Wildlife

Service/Budget Entity: Hunting and Game Management

Measure: Number of Recreational Sites

Action:

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Performance Assessment of <u>Outcome</u> Measure | <input type="checkbox"/> Revision of Measure |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Performance Assessment of <u>Output</u> Measure | <input type="checkbox"/> Deletion of Measure |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Adjustment of GAA Performance Standards | |

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
144	153	9	6.3

Factors Accounting for the Difference:

Internal Factors (check all that apply):

- | | |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Personnel Factors | <input type="checkbox"/> Staff Capacity |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Competing Priorities | <input type="checkbox"/> Level of Training |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Previous Estimate Incorrect | <input type="checkbox"/> Other (Identify) |

Explanation:

External Factors (check all that apply):

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Resources Unavailable | <input type="checkbox"/> Technological Problems |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Legal/Legislative Change | <input type="checkbox"/> Natural Disaster |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Target Population Change | <input type="checkbox"/> Other (Identify) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> This Program/Service Cannot Fix The Problem | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Current Laws Are Working Against The Agency Mission | |

Explanation:

Management Efforts to Address Differences/Problems (check all that apply):

- | | |
|------------------------------------|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Training | <input type="checkbox"/> Technology |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Personnel | <input type="checkbox"/> Other (Identify) |

Recommendations:

Office of Policy and Budget – July 2008

LRPP Exhibit III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT

Department: Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission

Program: Wildlife

Service/Budget Entity: Hunting and Game Management

Measure: Number of hunting accidents

Action:

- | | |
|--|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Performance Assessment of <u>Outcome</u> Measure | <input type="checkbox"/> Revision of Measure |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Performance Assessment of <u>Output</u> Measure | <input type="checkbox"/> Deletion of Measure |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Adjustment of GAA Performance Standards | |

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
10	13	3	30%

Factors Accounting for the Difference:

Internal Factors (check all that apply):

- | | |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Personnel Factors | <input type="checkbox"/> Staff Capacity |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Competing Priorities | <input type="checkbox"/> Level of Training |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Previous Estimate Incorrect | <input type="checkbox"/> Other (Identify) |

Explanation:

External Factors (check all that apply):

- | | |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Resources Unavailable | <input type="checkbox"/> Technological Problems |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Legal/Legislative Change | <input type="checkbox"/> Natural Disaster |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Target Population Change | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other (Identify) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> This Program/Service Cannot Fix The Problem | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Current Laws Are Working Against The Agency Mission | |

Explanation: There are hunters in Florida every year that do not follow proper safety rules and add to the statistics. By obeying basic rules of safety stressed in Florida's Hunter Safety Course, none of these incidents would have occurred.

Management Efforts to Address Differences/Problems (check all that apply):

- | | |
|------------------------------------|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Training | <input type="checkbox"/> Technology |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Personnel | <input type="checkbox"/> Other (Identify) |

Recommendations:

LRPP Exhibit III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT

Department: Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission

Program: Wildlife

Service/Budget Entity: Hunting and Game Management

Measure: Percent of Satisfied Hunters

Action:

- | | |
|--|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Performance Assessment of <u>Outcome</u> Measure | <input type="checkbox"/> Revision of Measure |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Performance Assessment of <u>Output</u> Measure | <input type="checkbox"/> Deletion of Measure |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Adjustment of GAA Performance Standards | |

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
80.0%	83.1%	3.1%	3.9%

Factors Accounting for the Difference:

Internal Factors (check all that apply):

- | | |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Personnel Factors | <input type="checkbox"/> Staff Capacity |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Competing Priorities | <input type="checkbox"/> Level of Training |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Previous Estimate Incorrect | <input type="checkbox"/> Other (Identify) |

Explanation:

External Factors (check all that apply):

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Resources Unavailable | <input type="checkbox"/> Technological Problems |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Legal/Legislative Change | <input type="checkbox"/> Natural Disaster |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Target Population Change | <input type="checkbox"/> Other (Identify) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> This Program/Service Cannot Fix The Problem | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Current Laws Are Working Against The Agency Mission | |

Explanation:

Management Efforts to Address Differences/Problems (check all that apply):

- | | |
|------------------------------------|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Training | <input type="checkbox"/> Technology |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Personnel | <input type="checkbox"/> Other (Identify) |

Recommendations:

LRPP Exhibit III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT

Department: Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission

Program: Wildlife

Service/Budget Entity: Hunting and Game Management

Measure: Number of students graduating from hunter education courses

Action:

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Performance Assessment of <u>Outcome</u> Measure | <input type="checkbox"/> Revision of Measure |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Performance Assessment of <u>Output</u> Measure | <input type="checkbox"/> Deletion of Measure |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Adjustment of GAA Performance Standards | |

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
10,000	10,587	587	5.9%

Factors Accounting for the Difference:

Internal Factors (check all that apply):

- | | |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Personnel Factors | <input type="checkbox"/> Staff Capacity |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Competing Priorities | <input type="checkbox"/> Level of Training |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Previous Estimate Incorrect | <input type="checkbox"/> Other (Identify) |

Explanation:

External Factors (check all that apply):

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Resources Unavailable | <input type="checkbox"/> Technological Problems |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Legal/Legislative Change | <input type="checkbox"/> Natural Disaster |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Target Population Change | <input type="checkbox"/> Other (Identify) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> This Program/Service Cannot Fix The Problem | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Current Laws Are Working Against The Agency Mission | |

Explanation:

Management Efforts to Address Differences/Problems (check all that apply):

- | | |
|------------------------------------|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Training | <input type="checkbox"/> Technology |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Personnel | <input type="checkbox"/> Other (Identify) |

Recommendations:

LRPP Exhibit III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT

Department: Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission

Program: Wildlife

Service/Budget Entity: Hunting and Game Management

Measure: Number of Hunters Served

Action:

- | | |
|--|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Performance Assessment of <u>Outcome</u> Measure | <input type="checkbox"/> Revision of Measure |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Performance Assessment of <u>Output</u> Measure | <input type="checkbox"/> Deletion of Measure |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Adjustment of GAA Performance Standards | |

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
150,000	166,669	16,669	11.1%

Factors Accounting for the Difference:

Internal Factors (check all that apply):

- | | |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Personnel Factors | <input type="checkbox"/> Staff Capacity |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Competing Priorities | <input type="checkbox"/> Level of Training |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Previous Estimate Incorrect | <input type="checkbox"/> Other (Identify) |

Explanation:

External Factors (check all that apply):

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Resources Unavailable | <input type="checkbox"/> Technological Problems |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Legal/Legislative Change | <input type="checkbox"/> Natural Disaster |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Target Population Change | <input type="checkbox"/> Other (Identify) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> This Program/Service Cannot Fix The Problem | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Current Laws Are Working Against The Agency Mission | |

Explanation:

Management Efforts to Address Differences/Problems (check all that apply):

- | | |
|------------------------------------|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Training | <input type="checkbox"/> Technology |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Personnel | <input type="checkbox"/> Other (Identify) |

Recommendations:

LRPP Exhibit III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT

Department: Fish & Wildlife Conservation Commission

Program: Habitat and Species Conservation

Service/Budget Entity: Habitat and Species Conservation

Measure: Number of Surveying and Monitoring Projects

Action:

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Performance Assessment of <u>Outcome</u> Measure | <input type="checkbox"/> Revision of Measure |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Performance Assessment of <u>Output</u> Measure | <input type="checkbox"/> Deletion of Measure |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Adjustment of GAA Performance Standards | |

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
195	184	-11	-6%

Factors Accounting for the Difference:

Internal Factors (check all that apply):

- | | |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Personnel Factors | <input type="checkbox"/> Staff Capacity |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Competing Priorities | <input type="checkbox"/> Level of Training |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Previous Estimate Incorrect | <input type="checkbox"/> Other (Identify) |

Explanation:

The decrease in the number of surveying and monitoring projects is a result of our eliminating projects that weren't providing useful data and projects being completed.

External Factors (check all that apply):

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Resources Unavailable | <input type="checkbox"/> Technological Problems |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Legal/Legislative Change | <input type="checkbox"/> Natural Disaster |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Target Population Change | <input type="checkbox"/> Other (Identify) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> This Program/Service Cannot Fix The Problem | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Current Laws Are Working Against The Agency Mission | |

Explanation:

Management Efforts to Address Differences/Problems (check all that apply):

- | | |
|------------------------------------|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Training | <input type="checkbox"/> Technology |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Personnel | <input type="checkbox"/> Other (Identify) |

Recommendations:

LRPP Exhibit III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT

Department: FL Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission

Program: Freshwater Fisheries

Service/Budget Entity: Freshwater Fisheries Management

Measure: Number of Fish Stocked

Action:

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Performance Assessment of <u>Outcome</u> Measure | <input type="checkbox"/> Revision of Measure |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Performance Assessment of <u>Output</u> Measure | <input type="checkbox"/> Deletion of Measure |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Adjustment of GAA Performance Standards | |

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
3,600,000	2,352,275	-1,247,725	-35%

Factors Accounting for the Difference:

Internal Factors (check all that apply):

- | | |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Personnel Factors | <input type="checkbox"/> Staff Capacity |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Competing Priorities | <input type="checkbox"/> Level of Training |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Previous Estimate Incorrect | <input type="checkbox"/> Other (Identify) |

Explanation:

External Factors (check all that apply):

- | | |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Resources Unavailable | <input type="checkbox"/> Technological Problems |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Legal/Legislative Change | <input type="checkbox"/> Natural Disaster |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Target Population Change | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other (Identify) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> This Program/Service Cannot Fix The Problem | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Current Laws Are Working Against The Agency Mission | |

Explanation: During FY 07-08, 2,352,275 were stocked. Drought conditions throughout Florida over the past two years made conditions in multiple waterbodies unsuitable for stocking. This resulted in a reduction in the number of fish requested from the hatcheries.

Management Efforts to Address Differences/Problems (check all that apply):

- | | |
|------------------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Training | <input type="checkbox"/> Technology |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Personnel | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other (Identify) |

Recommendations:

As environmental conditions improve, requests for fish should increase.

LRPP Exhibit III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT

Department: Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission
Program: Marine Fisheries
Service/Budget Entity: Marine Fisheries Management
Measure: Number of artificial reefs created and or monitored

Action:

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Performance Assessment of <u>Outcome</u> Measure | <input type="checkbox"/> Revision of Measure |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Performance Assessment of <u>Output</u> Measure | <input type="checkbox"/> Deletion of Measure |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Adjustment of GAA Performance Standards | |

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
175	117	-58	-33.1%

Factors Accounting for the Difference:

Internal Factors (check all that apply):

- | | |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Personnel Factors | <input type="checkbox"/> Staff Capacity |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Competing Priorities | <input type="checkbox"/> Level of Training |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Previous Estimate Incorrect | <input type="checkbox"/> Other (Identify) |

Explanation:

Exchanged single large reef construction project with scores of small patch reefs proposed for four other reef projects using same funds to build a smaller number of large reefs which were not completed until after the end of the fiscal year (in August 2008) in a grant extension and therefore could not be counted for FY 2007-08.

External Factors (check all that apply):

- | | |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Resources Unavailable | <input type="checkbox"/> Technological Problems |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Legal/Legislative Change | <input type="checkbox"/> Natural Disaster |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Target Population Change | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other (Identify) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> This Program/Service Cannot Fix The Problem | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Current Laws Are Working Against The Agency Mission | |

Explanation:

Original proposed University of FL project to build dozens of patch reefs was pushed back two years due to insufficient monitoring data obtained from baseline monitoring of evaluation reefs currently in place (too few or no grouper noted on 40 patch reefs system)-monitoring has to be extended on these reefs another 2 years and more funds procured to place the proposed additional reefs in the water all at once.

Management Efforts to Address Differences/Problems (check all that apply):

- | | |
|------------------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Training | <input type="checkbox"/> Technology |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Personnel | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other (Identify) |

Recommendations:

Avoid cancellation/delay of planned reef project funds and allocation of funds for replacement projects that may reflect changes in target numbers of reefs built in the fiscal year (i.e. many small reefs replaced by fewer larger reefs).

LRPP Exhibit III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT

Department: Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission
Program: Division of Marine Fisheries Management
Service/Budget Entity: Marine Fisheries Services/ 77500200
Measure: Number of educational and outreach contacts

Action:

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Performance Assessment of <u>Outcome</u> Measure | <input type="checkbox"/> Revision of Measure |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Performance Assessment of <u>Output</u> Measure | <input type="checkbox"/> Deletion of Measure |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Adjustment of GAA Performance Standards | |

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
350,000	328,623	-21,377	-6.1%

Factors Accounting for the Difference:

Internal Factors (check all that apply):

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Personnel Factors | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Staff Capacity |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Competing Priorities | <input type="checkbox"/> Level of Training |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Previous Estimate Incorrect | <input type="checkbox"/> Other (Identify) |

Explanation:

There was a high turn-over of staff (four left for promotional opportunities or to attend graduate school) in the second half of this year, which resulted in fewer public contacts.

External Factors (check all that apply):

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Resources Unavailable | <input type="checkbox"/> Technological Problems |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Legal/Legislative Change | <input type="checkbox"/> Natural Disaster |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Target Population Change | <input type="checkbox"/> Other (Identify) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> This Program/Service Cannot Fix The Problem | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Current Laws Are Working Against The Agency Mission | |

Explanation:

The Jacksonville Florida Sportsman Show was cancelled.

Management Efforts to Address Differences/Problems (check all that apply):

- | | |
|------------------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Training | <input type="checkbox"/> Technology |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Personnel | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other (Identify) |

Recommendations:

We're in the process of reviewing applications in order to fill the vacant positions.

LRPP Exhibit III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT

Department: Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission

Program: Research

Service/Budget Entity: Fish and Wildlife Research Institute

Measure: Number of habitat impact assessments and GIS requests

Action:

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Performance Assessment of <u>Outcome</u> Measure | <input type="checkbox"/> Revision of Measure |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Performance Assessment of <u>Output</u> Measure | <input type="checkbox"/> Deletion of Measure |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Adjustment of GAA Performance Standards | |

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
1470	760	-710	-48.3

Factors Accounting for the Difference:

Internal Factors (check all that apply):

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Personnel Factors | <input type="checkbox"/> Staff Capacity |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Competing Priorities | <input type="checkbox"/> Level of Training |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Previous Estimate Incorrect | <input type="checkbox"/> Other (Identify) |

Explanation: We received fewer requests than anticipated.

External Factors (check all that apply):

- | | |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Resources Unavailable | <input type="checkbox"/> Technological Problems |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Legal/Legislative Change | <input type="checkbox"/> Natural Disaster |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Target Population Change | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other (Identify) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> This Program/Service Cannot Fix The Problem | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Current Laws Are Working Against The Agency Mission | |

Explanation: Users were reluctant to complete online forms to obtain the data and should not be necessary to receive public information.

Management Efforts to Address Differences/Problems (check all that apply):

- | | |
|------------------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Training | <input type="checkbox"/> Technology |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Personnel | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other (Identify) |

Recommendations: We will no longer count user-initiated data and map downloads that are handled entirely by the user. The main reason for this is that it is very difficult to get accurate counts of data downloads. Another reason is that many users let us know that they didn't want to fill out online forms to get the data. They felt this was an unnecessary step and not something we should demand in order for them to get public information.

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Fish & Wildlife Conservation Commission

Program: Executive Direction and Administrative Services

Service/Budget Entity: Office of Executive Direction and Administrative Services/77100700

Measure: Number of rural counties counseled regarding use of nature-based recreation as an economic development tool

Action (check one):

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure.
- Backup for performance measure.

Data Sources and Methodology: Requesting a revision of measure title.

***Current:* Number of rural counties counseled regarding use of nature-based recreation as an economic development tool**

***Requested:* 1) Number of multi-year hunting and fishing licenses.
2) Number of rural counties counseled regarding use of nature-based recreation as an economic development tool**

Validity:

Reliability:

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission

Program: Executive Direction and Administrative Services

Service/Budget Entity: Office of Executive Direction and Administrative Support Services

Measure: Number of commercial and other marine fishing license processed

Action (check one):

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure.
- Backup for performance measure

Data Sources and Methodology:

FWC has developed and implemented the FWC Commercial Saltwater License system (CSL). The database includes the Commercial Saltwater Licensing and Trap Tag applications. The licensing and trap tag data is now housed on a Client/Server Oracle database management system hosted at the STO Shared Resource Center.

Information about the customer and the type of L&P purchased is captured at the time of each L&P sell and stored in a central database. This information is then retrieved and summarized for statistical reporting.

Validity:

The measure of number of L&P issued reflects workload of processing licenses and permits. Validity is assured since there is a direct relationship between the data and the measure.

Reliability:

99%

Office of Policy and Budget – June, 2008

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission

Program: Executive Direction and Administrative Services

Service/Budget Entity: Office of Executive Direction and Administrative Support Services

Measure: Number of wildlife and freshwater fishing commercial licenses and permits issued

Action (check one):

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure
- Backup for performance measure

Data Sources and Methodology:

FWC has developed and implemented systems to process wildlife and freshwater fishing commercial licenses and permits. Information about the customer and the type of L&P purchased is captured at the time of each L&P sell and stored in a central database. This information is then retrieved and summarized for statistical reporting.

Validity:

The measure of number of L&P issued reflects workload of processing licenses and permits. Validity is assured since there is a direct relationship between the data and the measure.

Reliability:

99%

Office of Policy and Budget – June, 2008

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission

Program: Executive Direction and Administrative Services

Service/Budget Entity: Office of Executive Direction and Administrative Support Services

Measure: Number of wildlife and freshwater fishing commercial licenses and permits issued

Action (check one):

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure
- Backup for performance measure

Data Sources and Methodology:

FWC has developed and implemented systems process to wildlife and freshwater fishing commercial licenses and permits. Information about the customer and the type of L&P purchased is captured at the time of each L&P sell and stored in database. This information is then retrieved and summarized for statistical reporting.

Validity:

The measure of number of L&P issued reflects workload of processing licenses and permits. Validity is assured since there is a direct relationship between the data and the measure.

Reliability:

99%

Office of Policy and Budget – June, 2008

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Fish & Wildlife Conservation Commission

Program: Executive Direction and Administrative Services

Service/Budget Entity: Office of Executive Direction and Administrative Support Services/77100700

Measure: Administrative cost per division

Action (check one):

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure.
- Backup for performance measure not previously approved or for which validity, reliability and/or methodology information has not been provided.

Data Sources and Methodology:

This Program maintains SAMAS and People First data on agency expenditures and by budget entity.

Previously the measure was the ratio of expenditures and FTE's in the Office of Executive Direction and Administrative Support Services to the expenditure and FTE's of the entire agency. The data source had to be revised due to the reorganization. The Community Relation Office, Recreational Services Office and the Licensing and Permitting Office expenditures and FTE's had to be subtracted out of the Office of Executive Direction and Administrative Support Services budget entity to improve the validity and reliability of the performance measure.

Validity:

Reliability:

Office of Policy and Budget – June, 2004

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Fish & Wildlife Conservation Commission

Program: Executive Direction and Administrative Services

Service/Budget Entity: Office of Executive Direction and Administrative Support Services/77100700

Measure: Administrative costs as a percent of total agency cost

Action (check one):

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure.
- Backup for performance measure

Data Sources and Methodology:

This Program maintains SAMAS and People First data on agency expenditures and by budget entity.

Previously the measure was the ratio of expenditures and FTE's in the Office of Executive Direction and Administrative Support Services to the expenditure and FTE's of the entire agency. The data source had to be revised due to the reorganization. The Community Relation Office, Recreational Services Office and the Licensing and Permitting Office expenditures and FTE's had to be subtracted out of the Office of Executive Direction and Administrative Support Services budget entity to improve the validity and reliability of the performance measure.

Validity:

Reliability:

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Fish & Wildlife Conservation Commission

Program: Executive Direction and Administrative Services

Service/Budget Entity: Office of Executive Direction and Administrative Support Services/77100700

Measure: Administrative positions per division

Action (check one):

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure
- Backup for performance measure

Data Sources and Methodology:

This Program maintains SAMAS and People First data on agency expenditures and by budget entity.

Previously the measure was the ratio of expenditures and FTE's in the Office of Executive Direction and Administrative Support Services to the expenditure and FTE's of the entire agency. The data source had to be revised due to the reorganization. The Community Relation Office, Recreational Services Office and the Licensing and Permitting Office expenditures and FTE's had to be subtracted out of the Office of Executive Direction and Administrative Support Services budget entity to improve the validity and reliability of the performance measure.

Validity:

Reliability:

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Fish & Wildlife Conservation Commission

Program: Executive Direction and Administrative Services

Service/Budget Entity: Office of Executive Direction and Administrative Support Services/77100700

Measure: Administrative position as a percent of total agency positions

Action (check one):

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure
- Backup for performance measure

Data Sources and Methodology:

This Program maintains SAMAS and People First data on agency expenditures and by budget entity.

Previously the measure was the ratio of expenditures and FTE's in the Office of Executive Direction and Administrative Support Services to the expenditure and FTE's of the entire agency. The data source had to be revised due to the reorganization. The Community Relation Office, Recreational Services Office and the Licensing and Permitting Office expenditures and FTE's had to be subtracted out of the Office of Executive Direction and Administrative Support Services budget entity to improve the validity and reliability of the performance measure.

Validity:

Reliability:

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission

Program: Executive Direction and Administrative Services

Service/Budget Entity: Office of Executive Direction and Administrative Support Services

Measure: Percent change in licensed anglers

Action (check one):

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure.
- Backup for performance measure

Data Sources and Methodology:

Annually FWC must certify to the Federal Fish and Wildlife Department the number of paid licensed anglers and hunters. This information is standard for all State and tracked on the Federal Fish and Wildlife Department's website for all States. For consistency and comparability FWC is now using the Federal Fish and Wildlife Department certified numbers as the source of data for this measure. The original source of the Federal Fish and Wildlife Department certified numbers is the Total License System (TLS) used to sell all recreational fishing and hunting L&P since November, 2003.

Validity:

The measure of percent change in L&P issued reflects a trend over time in sales of licenses and permits. This measure may then be used to predict revenues and workload. Validity is assured since there is a direct relationship between the data and the measure.

Reliability:

99%

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission

Program: Executive Direction and Administrative Services

Service/Budget Entity: Office of Executive Direction and Administrative Support Services

Measure: Percent change in the number of licensed hunters

Action (check one):

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure
- Backup for performance measure

Data Sources and Methodology:

Annually FWC must certify to the Federal Fish and Wildlife Department the number of paid licensed anglers and hunters. This information is standard for all State and tracked on the Federal Fish and Wildlife Department's website for all States. For consistency and comparability FWC is now using the Federal Fish and Wildlife Department certified numbers as the source of data for this measure. The original source of the Federal Fish and Wildlife Department certified numbers is the Total License System (TLS) used to sell all recreational fishing and hunting L&P since November, 2003.

Validity:

The measure of percent change in L&P issued reflects a trend over time in sales of licenses and permits. This measure may then be used to predict revenues and workload. Validity is assured since there is a direct relationship between the data and the measure.

Reliability:

99%

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY

Department: Fish & Wildlife Conservation Commission

Program: Executive Direction and Administrative Services

Service/Budget Entity: Office of Executive Direction and Administrative Services/77100700

Measure: Economic Impact of Fishing, Hunting and Wildlife Viewing (dollars/jobs)

Action (check one):

- Requesting Revision to Approved Measure
- Change in Data Sources or Measurement Methodologies
- Requesting New Measure
- Backup for Performance Outcome and Output Measure

Data Sources and Methodology: U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service (USFWS) Survey on Fishing, Hunting and Wildlife-Associated Outdoor Recreation, 2006. Data are updated to year 2006 using U.S. Dept. of Commerce Consumer Price Index and FWC license sales statistics. USFWS survey data are published and available. We then adjust economic output based upon Consumer Price Index through simple multiplication. The number of jobs is not adjusted. Calculate the adjustment indicated in #2.

Validity: USFWS survey is the only source of data and therefore most valid. Annual adjustments are the only valid way to bring the data up to date.

Reliability: USFWS survey is the only source of data and therefore most valid. Annual adjustments are the only valid way to bring the data up to date.

Office of Policy and Budget – June, 2008

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission

Program: Law Enforcement

Service/Budget Entity: Fish, Wildlife, and Boating Law Enforcement

Measure: Number of Boats Repaired

Action (check one):

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure.
- Backup for performance measure.

Data Sources and Methodology:

Officers prepare a Marine Maintenance Work Request form and send it through Shopnet. The Shopnet system sends it to the appropriate FWC shop or field mechanic. If the work request is sent to the shop, the shop supervisor will assign a Marine Maintenance Repair Order (RO) and assign the job to a marine mechanic. Once the work is completed the RO is returned to the supervisor. The supervisor checks the work closes out the RO and advises the Regional office to pick up the equipment and then a copy of the RO is sent back to the Region with the equipment. If the work request is sent to a field mechanic, the mechanic will schedule the work. Once completed the field mechanic advises the region of the completion of the work and a copy of the RO go to the Regional office for reference.

Validity:

The Marine Maintenance Work Request and the Marine Maintenance Repair Order have been used for many years to obtain the necessary data needed to operate the maintenance facilities.

Reliability:

All RO's are checked by the Storekeeper when parts are charged out; then by the shop supervisor when closed out.

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission

Program: Law Enforcement

Service/Budget Entity: Fish, Wildlife, and Boating Law Enforcement

Measure: Number of Data-Related Information Requests Fulfilled

Action (check one):

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure.
- Backup for performance measure.

Data Sources and Methodology:

Data Management receives requests for information related to arrests, numbers of arrests, and other various enforcement related statistics on a semi-regular basis. This information is retrieved and forwarded to the requesting party. If the request is received by phone, a call back number is taken and the information is given with a return call. If a request is received by fax or letter, it is returned in the same manner. With this procedure, verification of the identity of persons requesting information is kept in a file of public information requests. If there is a request for information that is questionable, a response is approved through proper chain-of-command.

Validity:

Several methods for responding to requests for public information have been used over the years and changes have evolved, but all changes use the Public Records guide for Law Enforcement as a reference.

Reliability:

Information for a record search or data-related report uses the ArrestNet or ActivityNet database as a search tool. ArrestNet is a database that all arrest citations are entered into, but it also merged all arrest record entries from the two prior agencies that comprise the existing Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission. ActivityNet is a database that all officer activity is entered into, keeping up with officer hours, counts, etc.

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission

Program: Law Enforcement

Service/Budget Entity: Fish, Wildlife, and Boating Law Enforcement

Measure: Number of Equipment Repairs

Action (check one):

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure.
- Backup for performance measure.

Data Sources and Methodology:

Officers, Dispatchers and/or their supervisors and administrative help submit a Radio Technology Work Request (RTWR) form (FWC-DLE form # 667) when any of the officers electronic equipment needs repair. We have migrated to a computer based repair request and database. We no longer submit these forms manually. Radio Engineers manage their repairs and scheduling electronically. Radio Engineers contact the officer to set a time and place for repairs. Each step in the process is date and time stamped in the database. After the repair is completed, the Radio Engineer selects equipment type and corrective action(s) from pull-down menus. They briefly describe repair particulars in a free form narrative section. In the three years we have been electronically using the on-line RTWR process, we've developed many improvements to assure regularity and uniformity in both reporting and tracking, while maintaining the integrity of the older data.

Validity:

Some variation of the RTWR form have been used for 10 years by the Radio Technology Group, resulting in fine tuning an established process that is routinely checked for accuracy and completeness.

Reliability:

As needed and no less than bi-monthly, supervisory review and analysis of the data is performed. This data is used to compile reports and other correspondence with regards to Radio Technology activities. Follow up calls to the field officers is performed to spot-check the accuracy of the information.

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission

Program: Law Enforcement

Service/Budget Entity: Fish, Wildlife, and Boating Law Enforcement

Measure: Number of Investigative Hours

Action (check one):

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure.
- Backup for performance measure.

Data Sources and Methodology:

Officers document investigation hours on an activity report. The report is then submitted to their respective supervisors. The supervisor then reviews the reports and submits them for input into the Activity Net database. Reports are generated by the type of hours that the officer enters.

Validity:

The documents used to compile this data are an appropriate method for this and other measures in the program area. The Activity Net data has been proven to be effective and accurate.

Reliability:

All officers must submit the activity report of their hours and specific activities. These reports are checked by at least two levels of supervision, and checked for accuracy and consistency.

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission

Program: Law Enforcement

Service/Budget Entity: Fish, Wildlife, and Boating Law Enforcement

Measure: Number of Officers and Recruits Trained

Action (check one):

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure.
- Backup for performance measure.

Data Sources and Methodology:

Officers: To comply with Chapter 943.135, Florida Statutes, training's Administrative Assistant II entered into FDLE'S Automated Training Management System (ATMS) on the Mandatory Retraining Report (CJSTC-74) a minimum of 40 hours of continuing training every four years per officer. Regional Training Officers (Lieutenants) record this training by two methods. The first method is by use of an attendance roster. The roster required the student name, signature and social security number and must be signed by the instructor. The second method is to write the score achieved by the student on the score sheet or test. These two methods are used to prove that FWC officers have received mandatory re-training as required by FDLE, CJSTC.

Validity:

Officers: The signed attendance roster or score sheet has been used by the Training Section for years to certify attendance of each officer and is kept in the officer's training file. These rosters and/or score sheets are attached to the CJSTC form 74 as back up documents and the CJSTC form 74 is audited by FDLE.

Reliability:

Officers: The rosters and score sheets are reviewed by a supervisor and used to verify officers attendance for each block of training. These rosters and/or score sheets are used to certify that information submitted on the Mandatory Retraining Report (CJSTC-74) to FDLE is accurate.

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission

Program: Law Enforcement

Service/Budget Entity: Fish, Wildlife, and Boating Law Enforcement

Measure: Number of Patrol Hours

Action (check one):

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure.
- Backup for performance measure.

Data Sources and Methodology:

Officers document patrol hours on an activity report. The report is then submitted to their respective supervisors. The supervisor then reviews the reports and submits them for input into the Activity Net database. Reports are generated by the type of hours that the officer enters.

Validity:

The documents used to compile this data are an appropriate method for this and other measures in the program area. The Activity Net data has been proven to be effective and accurate.

Reliability:

All officers must submit the activity report of their hours and specific activities. These reports are checked by at least two levels of supervision, and checked for accuracy and consistency.

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission

Program: Law Enforcement

Service/Budget Entity: Fish, Wildlife, and Boating Law Enforcement

Measure: Number of Recreational Boating Injuries

Action (check one):

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure.
- Backup for performance measure.

Data Sources and Methodology:

Officers document these accidents using the Florida Boating Accident report. Reports completed by Commission officers are submitted to their supervisor for review, who sends them to the Regional Office where they are again reviewed. The reports are then sent to Tallahassee Headquarters where they are again reviewed by the boating safety staff and the data is entered by agency OPS personnel. The Boating and Waterways Section compiles the data into reports using computer software programs. Reports generated from this database supply data for this and other measures. The reports are sampled by the boating safety lieutenant against hard copies of the reports for accuracy and completeness.

Validity:

The document used to compile this data is an appropriate method for this and other measures.

Reliability:

This data may be relied upon because state law requires that accidents be reported. Sworn law enforcement officers complete accident reports in most cases. They are checked by at least two levels of supervision for accuracy and completeness. The boating safety lieutenant detects discrepancies on the accident reports prior to entry. The lieutenant will then return the incomplete or incorrect report to the regional captain or the appropriate law enforcement agency. After the boating accident reports are entered, they are sampled by comparing them with the hard copies of the reports for accuracy and completeness.

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission

Program: Law Enforcement

Service/Budget Entity: Fish, Wildlife, and Boating Law Enforcement

Measure: Number of Regulatory Zones Properly Permitted

Action (check one):

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure.
- Backup for performance measure.

Data Sources and Methodology:

The Boating & Waterways Section receives waterway marker permit applications from state and local governmental entities. Pending adherence to Federal and State requirements, permits are issued for the marking of boating safety zones, grassbed restoration areas, manatee zone (both state and local) as well as various informational markers on a temporary and permanent basis. Information includes, but is not limited to: location (lat/long), entity contact, ordinance/rule creating zone and permit number, description/type of zone.

Validity:

The provisions of 68D.23 FAC as well as 327.46 FS prescribe the procedures by which the Division permits and regulates the placement of markers in, on and over the waters of this state and shores thereof.

This chapter also provides for the design, construction, characteristics and coloring of all markers placed in, on and over the waters of this state and the shores thereof by adopting by reference the United States Aids to Navigation systems, Part 62 of Title 33 of the Code of Federal Regulations.

Reliability:

The data is confirmed prior to permits being issued. Data is input and maintained within a database controlled by the Boating and Waterways Section. Waterway markers not within this database are considered illegal.

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission

Program: Law Enforcement

Service/Budget Entity: Fish, Wildlife, and Boating Law Enforcement

Measure: Number of Vessel Safety Inspections

Action (check one):

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure.
- Backup for performance measure.

Data Sources and Methodology:

Officers document their water patrol vessel inspections on their Activity Report. This report is submitted to their supervisor for review, who then sends them to the Regional Office where they are again reviewed. The reports are sent to Tallahassee Headquarters where they are entered by agency OPS personnel. Field Services compiles the data in the reports using computer software programs. Reports generated from this database supplies the data for this and other measures. The reports are sampled by the Data Quality Control specialist against hard copies of the reports for accuracy and completeness.

Validity:

The document used to compile this data is an appropriate method for this and other measures.

Reliability:

This data may be relied upon because officers are required by policy to submit the Activity Reports. The reports are checked by at least two levels of supervision for accuracy and completeness. It is not uncommon for a supervisor to physically verify activities that one of his subordinates submits. Officers have been disciplined for submission of false or inaccurate Activity Reports. The data entry operator detects discrepancies on the Activity Reports prior to entry. The data entry operator identifies incomplete or incorrect reports and gives them to the Field Services Lieutenant. The Lieutenant will then return the incomplete or incorrect report to the Regional Captain. After the activity reports are entered, they are sampled by comparing them with the hard copies of the reports for accuracy and completeness.

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission

Program: Law Enforcement

Service/Budget Entity: Fish, Wildlife, and Boating Law Enforcement

Measure: Number of Vessels Checked

Action (check one):

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure.
- Backup for performance measure.

Data Sources and Methodology:

Officers document their activities on their Activity Report. This report is submitted to their supervisor for review, who then sends them to the Regional Office where they are again reviewed. The reports are then sent to Tallahassee Headquarters where they are data entered by agency OPS personnel. Field Services then compiles the data in the reports using computer software programs. Reports generated from this database supply the data for this and other measures. The reports are sampled by the Data Quality Control specialist against hard copies of the reports for accuracy and completeness. Currently there is not a field on the activity report to document vessels checked. There is one for vessel safety inspections. The Division's interpretation of this measure is identical to the measure "Number of Vessel Safety Inspections" and the data is captured in the same manner. With the advent of the new computer aided dispatch (CAD) system, officers will also tell the radio dispatcher their activities as they complete them. These activities will then be saved into the regional CAD server. The criminal analyst will compile each regions data and produce statewide statistical reports.

Validity:

The document used to compile this data is an appropriate method for this and other measures. The CAD data is directly entered as the officer completes each task and will allow the agency to document when a vessel check was completed.

Reliability:

This data may be relied upon because officers are required by policy to submit Activity Reports. Therefore, the issue becomes the quality of the information contained in the reports. They are checked by at least two levels of supervision for accuracy and completeness. It is not uncommon for a supervisor to

physically verify activities that one of his subordinates submits. Officers have been disciplined for submission of false or inaccurate Activity Reports. The data entry operator detects discrepancies on the Activity Reports prior to entry. The data entry operator identifies incomplete or incorrect reports and gives them to the Field Services Lieutenant. The Lieutenant will then return the incomplete or incorrect report to the Regional Captain. After the activity reports are entered, they are sampled by comparing them with the hard copies of the reports for accuracy and completeness. Because the CAD data is entered as it occurs, it is a very reliable method to capture the information.

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission

Program: Law Enforcement

Service/Budget Entity: Fish, Wildlife, and Boating Law Enforcement

Measure: Response Time to Emergency Calls

Action (check one):

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure.
- Backup for performance measure.

Data Sources and Methodology:

As calls are received by the radio dispatch center, they are logged and dispatched to the first available officer. The officer will then notify dispatch as soon as he or she arrives on scene. With the advent of the new computer aided dispatch (CAD) system, officers tell the radio dispatcher their activities as they complete them. These activities are saved into the regional CAD server. The criminal analyst compiles each regions data and produces statewide statistical reports.

Validity:

CAD data is directly entered as the officer completes each task and allows the agency to document response times in a much more effective and accurate manner.

Reliability:

CAD data is directly entered as the officer completes each task and allows the agency to document response times in a much more effective and accurate manner.

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission

Program: Law Enforcement

Service/Budget Entity: Fish, Wildlife, and Boating Law Enforcement

Measure: Aircraft Down Time

Action (check one):

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure.
- Backup for performance measure.

Data Sources and Methodology:

Pilots document the number of down days for maintenance on their monthly cost summary report. These forms are completed by the pilot and submitted to Headquarters monthly along with their individual daily flight logs. The Staff Lieutenant compiles a report and gives it to the Chief Pilot for review. The Aviation Administrator reviews aircraft down time monthly in an effort to identify trends and remedies for increasing aircraft availability.

Validity:

The monthly reports used to collect this data have been used for years by the aircraft section, resulting in a stable database that is routinely checked for accuracy and completeness.

Reliability:

Two levels of supervision review the monthly reports used to collect this data. This data is used to compile reports and other correspondence with regards to aircraft section activities.

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission

Program: Law Enforcement

Service/Budget Entity: Fish, Wildlife, and Boating Law Enforcement

Measure: Communications Equipment Down Time

Action (check one):

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure.
- Backup for performance measure.

Data Sources and Methodology:

Officers, Dispatchers and/or their supervisors and administrative help submit a Radio Technology Work Request (RTWR) form (FWC-DLE form # 667) when any of the officers electronic equipment needs repair. We have migrated to a computer based repair request and database. We no longer submit these forms manually. Radio Engineers manage their repairs and scheduling electronically. Radio Engineers contact the officer to set a time and place for repairs. Each step in the process is date and time stamped in the database. After the repair is completed, the Radio Engineer selects equipment type and corrective action(s) from pull-down menus. They briefly describe repair particulars in a free form narrative section. In the three years we have been electronically using the on-line RTWR process, we've developed many improvements to assure regularity and uniformity in both reporting and tracking, while maintaining the integrity of the older data.

Validity:

Some variation of the RTWR form have been used for 10 years by the Radio Technology Group, resulting in fine tuning an established process that is routinely checked for accuracy and completeness.

Reliability:

As needed and no less than bi-monthly, supervisory review and analysis of the data is performed. This data is used to compile reports and other correspondence with regards to Radio Technology activities. Follow up calls to the field officers is performed to spot-check the accuracy of the information.

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission

Program: Law Enforcement

Service/Budget Entity: Fish, Wildlife, and Boating Law Enforcement

Measure: Compliance with Specified Commission Rules or State Law

Action (check one):

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure.
- Backup for performance measure.

Data Sources and Methodology:

Three issues are used to compile data for this measure: boating safety violations, net limitation violations, and manatee protection.

Officers document their arrests and warnings on their Activity Report. This report is submitted to their supervisor for review, who then sends them to the Regional Office where they are again reviewed. The reports are then sent to Tallahassee Headquarters where they are data entered by agency OPS personnel. Additionally, all citations and dispositions are entered by agency OPS personnel into this database. Field Services then compiles the data in the reports using computer software programs. Reports are generated from the database for this and other measures. The reports are sampled by the Data Quality Control specialist against hard copies of the reports for accuracy and completeness.

With the advent of the new computer aided dispatch (CAD) system, officers will also tell the radio dispatcher their activities as they complete them. These activities will then be saved into the regional CAD server. The criminal analyst will compile each regions data and produce statewide statistical reports.

Validity:

The documents used to compile this data are appropriate for this and other measures. The CAD data is directly entered as the officer completes each task and will allow the agency to document users that are in compliance as well as those out of compliance. The arrest database is a proven system that is an appropriate method to track arrest and disposition information.

Reliability:

This data may be relied upon because officers are required by policy to submit the Activity Reports. Therefore, the issue becomes the quality of the information contained in the reports. They are checked by at least two levels of supervision for accuracy and completeness. It is not uncommon for a supervisor to physically verify activities that one of his subordinates submits. Officers have been disciplined for submission of false or inaccurate Activity Reports. The data entry operator detects discrepancies on the Activity Reports prior to entry. The data entry operator identifies incomplete or incorrect reports and gives them to the Field Services Lieutenant. The Lieutenant will then return the incomplete or incorrect report to the Regional Captain. After the activity reports are entered, they are sampled by comparing them with the hard copies of the reports for accuracy and completeness. Because the CAD data is entered as it occurs, it is a very reliable method to capture the information. The data entry operator detects discrepancies on the citations and dispositions prior to entry. The data entry operator identifies incomplete or incorrect citations and gives them to the Field Services Lieutenant. The Lieutenant will then return the incomplete or incorrect citations to the Regional Captain. After the citations are entered, they are sampled by comparing them with the hard copies of the reports for accuracy and completeness.

While the data collection method is reliable, the actual extrapolation of a compliance rate from this information is not. Compliance rates are difficult to calculate and express because several variables of information is not available. For example, the number of violations observed or detected may be known, but the total number of violations that occur is not known. Additionally, the number of persons checked or licensed may be known, but the number of persons who utilize resources illegally is not known. Therefore, compliance can only be relative based on the limited statistics available for a particular activity. Based on this observation, compliance rates are a poor measure to indicate performance.

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission

Program: Law Enforcement

Service/Budget Entity: Fish, Wildlife, and Boating Law Enforcement

Measure: Number of Boating Safety Education Cards Issued

Action (check one):

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure.
- Backup for performance measure.

Data Sources and Methodology:

Any person may obtain a boater safety identification card by complying with the requirements of section 327.395, Florida Statutes. The Boating and Waterways Section is charged with maintaining these records and ensuring the issuance of cards in a timely manner.

Validity:

The Boating Education Database (Bobber) has proven effective and accurate since the day this law became effective in 1996. This database is also used to compile information pertaining to boater education statistics for the annual boating statistical report as required in section 327.804, Florida Statutes.

Reliability:

Each year the data is manually reconciled so as to ensure accurate reporting.

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission

Program: Law Enforcement

Service/Budget Entity: Fish, Wildlife, and Boating Law Enforcement

Measure: Number of Officers and Recruits Trained

Action (check one):

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure.
- Backup for performance measure.

Data Sources and Methodology:

Officers: To comply with Chapter 943.135, Florida Statutes, training's Administrative Assistant II entered into FDLE'S Automated Training Management System (ATMS) on the Mandatory Retraining Report (CJSTC-74) a minimum of 40 hours of continuing training every four years per officer. Regional Training Officers (Lieutenants) record this training by two methods. The first method is by use of an attendance roster. The roster required the student name, signature and social security number and must be signed by the instructor. The second method is to write the score achieved by the student on the score sheet or test. These two methods are used to prove that FWC officers have received mandatory re-training as required by FDLE, CJSTC.

Validity:

Officers: The signed attendance roster or score sheet has been used by the Training Section for years to certify attendance of each officer and is kept in the officer's training file. These rosters and/or score sheets are attached to the CJSTC form 74 as back up documents and the CJSTC form 74 is audited by FDLE.

Reliability:

Officers: The rosters and score sheets are reviewed by a supervisor and used to verify officers attendance for each block of training. These rosters and/or score sheets are used to certify that information submitted on the Mandatory Retraining Report (CJSTC-74) to FDLE is accurate.

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission

Program: Law Enforcement

Service/Budget Entity: Fish, Wildlife, and Boating Law Enforcement

Measure: Number of Patrol Hours

Action (check one):

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure.
- Backup for performance measure.

Data Sources and Methodology:

Officers document patrol hours on an activity report. The report is then submitted to their respective supervisors. The supervisor then reviews the reports and submits them for input into the Activity Net database. Reports are generated by the type of hours that the officer enters.

Validity:

The documents used to compile this data are an appropriate method for this and other measures in the program area. The Activity Net data has been proven to be effective and accurate.

Reliability:

All officers must submit the activity report of their hours and specific activities. These reports are checked by at least two levels of supervision, and checked for accuracy and consistency.

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission

Program: Law Enforcement

Service/Budget Entity: Fish, Wildlife, and Boating Law Enforcement

Measure: Number of Recreational Boating Injuries

Action (check one):

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure.
- Backup for performance measure.

Data Sources and Methodology:

Officers document these accidents using the Florida Boating Accident report. Reports completed by Commission officers are submitted to their supervisor for review, who sends them to the Regional Office where they are again reviewed. The reports are then sent to Tallahassee Headquarters where they are again reviewed by the boating safety staff and the data is entered by agency OPS personnel. The Boating and Waterways Section compiles the data into reports using computer software programs. Reports generated from this database supply data for this and other measures. The reports are sampled by the boating safety lieutenant against hard copies of the reports for accuracy and completeness.

Validity:

The document used to compile this data is an appropriate method for this and other measures.

Reliability:

This data may be relied upon because state law requires that accidents be reported. Sworn law enforcement officers complete accident reports in most cases. They are checked by at least two levels of supervision for accuracy and completeness. The boating safety lieutenant detects discrepancies on the accident reports prior to entry. The lieutenant will then return the incomplete or incorrect report to the regional captain or the appropriate law enforcement agency. After the boating accident reports are entered, they are sampled by comparing them with the hard copies of the reports for accuracy and completeness.

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission

Program: Law Enforcement

Service/Budget Entity: Fish, Wildlife, and Boating Law Enforcement

Measure: Number of Regulatory Zones Properly Permitted

Action (check one):

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure.
- Backup for performance measure.

Data Sources and Methodology:

The Boating & Waterways Section receives waterway marker permit applications from state and local governmental entities. Pending adherence to Federal and State requirements, permits are issued for the marking of boating safety zones, grassbed restoration areas, manatee zone (both state and local) as well as various informational markers on a temporary and permanent basis. Information includes, but is not limited to: location (lat/long), entity contact, ordinance/rule creating zone and permit number, description/type of zone.

Validity:

The provisions of 68D.23 FAC as well as 327.46 FS prescribe the procedures by which the Division permits and regulates the placement of markers in, on and over the waters of this state and shores thereof.

This chapter also provides for the design, construction, characteristics and coloring of all markers placed in, on and over the waters of this state and the shores thereof by adopting by reference the United States Aids to Navigation systems, Part 62 of Title 33 of the Code of Federal Regulations.

Reliability:

The data is confirmed prior to permits being issued. Data is input and maintained within a database controlled by the Boating and Waterways Section. Waterway markers not within this database are considered illegal.

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission

Program: Law Enforcement

Service/Budget Entity: Fish, Wildlife, and Boating Law Enforcement

Measure: Number of Vessel Safety Inspections

Action (check one):

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure.
- Backup for performance measure.

Data Sources and Methodology:

Officers document their water patrol vessel inspections on their Activity Report. This report is submitted to their supervisor for review, who then sends them to the Regional Office where they are again reviewed. The reports are sent to Tallahassee Headquarters where they are entered by agency OPS personnel. Field Services compiles the data in the reports using computer software programs. Reports generated from this database supplies the data for this and other measures. The reports are sampled by the Data Quality Control specialist against hard copies of the reports for accuracy and completeness.

Validity:

The document used to compile this data is an appropriate method for this and other measures.

Reliability:

This data may be relied upon because officers are required by policy to submit the Activity Reports. The reports are checked by at least two levels of supervision for accuracy and completeness. It is not uncommon for a supervisor to physically verify activities that one of his subordinates submits. Officers have been disciplined for submission of false or inaccurate Activity Reports. The data entry operator detects discrepancies on the Activity Reports prior to entry. The data entry operator identifies incomplete or incorrect reports and gives them to the Field Services Lieutenant. The Lieutenant will then return the incomplete or incorrect report to the Regional Captain. After the activity reports are entered, they are sampled by comparing them with the hard copies of the reports for accuracy and completeness.

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission

Program: Law Enforcement

Service/Budget Entity: Fish, Wildlife, and Boating Law Enforcement

Measure: Number of Vessels Checked

Action (check one):

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure.
- Backup for performance measure.

Data Sources and Methodology:

Officers document their activities on their Activity Report. This report is submitted to their supervisor for review, who then sends them to the Regional Office where they are again reviewed. The reports are then sent to Tallahassee Headquarters where they are data entered by agency OPS personnel. Field Services then compiles the data in the reports using computer software programs. Reports generated from this database supply the data for this and other measures. The reports are sampled by the Data Quality Control specialist against hard copies of the reports for accuracy and completeness. Currently there is not a field on the activity report to document vessels checked. There is one for vessel safety inspections. The Division's interpretation of this measure is identical to the measure "Number of Vessel Safety Inspections" and the data is captured in the same manner. With the advent of the new computer aided dispatch (CAD) system, officers will also tell the radio dispatcher their activities as they complete them. These activities will then be saved into the regional CAD server. The criminal analyst will compile each regions data and produce statewide statistical reports.

Validity:

The document used to compile this data is an appropriate method for this and other measures. The CAD data is directly entered as the officer completes each task and will allow the agency to document when a vessel check was completed.

Reliability:

This data may be relied upon because officers are required by policy to submit Activity Reports. Therefore, the issue becomes the quality of the information contained in the reports. They are checked by at least two levels of supervision for accuracy and completeness. It is not uncommon for a supervisor to

physically verify activities that one of his subordinates submits. Officers have been disciplined for submission of false or inaccurate Activity Reports. The data entry operator detects discrepancies on the Activity Reports prior to entry. The data entry operator identifies incomplete or incorrect reports and gives them to the Field Services Lieutenant. The Lieutenant will then return the incomplete or incorrect report to the Regional Captain. After the activity reports are entered, they are sampled by comparing them with the hard copies of the reports for accuracy and completeness. Because the CAD data is entered as it occurs, it is a very reliable method to capture the information.

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission

Program: Law Enforcement

Service/Budget Entity: Fish, Wildlife, and Boating Law Enforcement

Measure: Response Time to Emergency Calls

Action (check one):

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure.
- Backup for performance measure.

Data Sources and Methodology:

As calls are received by the radio dispatch center, they are logged and dispatched to the first available officer. The officer will then notify dispatch as soon as he or she arrives on scene. With the advent of the new computer aided dispatch (CAD) system, officers tell the radio dispatcher their activities as they complete them. These activities are saved into the regional CAD server. The criminal analyst compiles each regions data and produces statewide statistical reports.

Validity:

CAD data is directly entered as the officer completes each task and allows the agency to document response times in a much more effective and accurate manner.

Reliability:

CAD data is directly entered as the officer completes each task and allows the agency to document response times in a much more effective and accurate manner.

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission

Program: Law Enforcement

Service/Budget Entity: Fish, Wildlife, and Boating Law Enforcement

Measure: Aircraft Down Time

Action (check one):

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure.
- Backup for performance measure.

Data Sources and Methodology:

Pilots document the number of down days for maintenance on their monthly cost summary report. These forms are completed by the pilot and submitted to Headquarters monthly along with their individual daily flight logs. The Staff Lieutenant compiles a report and gives it to the Chief Pilot for review. The Aviation Administrator reviews aircraft down time monthly in an effort to identify trends and remedies for increasing aircraft availability.

Validity:

The monthly reports used to collect this data have been used for years by the aircraft section, resulting in a stable database that is routinely checked for accuracy and completeness.

Reliability:

Two levels of supervision review the monthly reports used to collect this data. This data is used to compile reports and other correspondence with regards to aircraft section activities.

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission

Program: Law Enforcement

Service/Budget Entity: Fish, Wildlife, and Boating Law Enforcement

Measure: Communications Equipment Down Time

Action (check one):

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure.
- Backup for performance measure.

Data Sources and Methodology:

Officers, Dispatchers and/or their supervisors and administrative help submit a Radio Technology Work Request (RTWR) form (FWC-DLE form # 667) when any of the officers electronic equipment needs repair. We have migrated to a computer based repair request and database. We no longer submit these forms manually. Radio Engineers manage their repairs and scheduling electronically. Radio Engineers contact the officer to set a time and place for repairs. Each step in the process is date and time stamped in the database. After the repair is completed, the Radio Engineer selects equipment type and corrective action(s) from pull-down menus. They briefly describe repair particulars in a free form narrative section. In the three years we have been electronically using the on-line RTWR process, we've developed many improvements to assure regularity and uniformity in both reporting and tracking, while maintaining the integrity of the older data.

Validity:

Some variation of the RTWR form have been used for 10 years by the Radio Technology Group, resulting in fine tuning an established process that is routinely checked for accuracy and completeness.

Reliability:

As needed and no less than bi-monthly, supervisory review and analysis of the data is performed. This data is used to compile reports and other correspondence with regards to Radio Technology activities. Follow up calls to the field officers is performed to spot-check the accuracy of the information.

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission

Program: Law Enforcement

Service/Budget Entity: Fish, Wildlife, and Boating Law Enforcement

Measure: Compliance with Specified Commission Rules or State Law

Action (check one):

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure.
- Backup for performance measure.

Data Sources and Methodology:

Three issues are used to compile data for this measure: boating safety violations, net limitation violations, and manatee protection.

Officers document their arrests and warnings on their Activity Report. This report is submitted to their supervisor for review, who then sends them to the Regional Office where they are again reviewed. The reports are then sent to Tallahassee Headquarters where they are data entered by agency OPS personnel. Additionally, all citations and dispositions are entered by agency OPS personnel into this database. Field Services then compiles the data in the reports using computer software programs. Reports are generated from the database for this and other measures. The reports are sampled by the Data Quality Control specialist against hard copies of the reports for accuracy and completeness.

With the advent of the new computer aided dispatch (CAD) system, officers will also tell the radio dispatcher their activities as they complete them. These activities will then be saved into the regional CAD server. The criminal analyst will compile each regions data and produce statewide statistical reports.

Validity:

The documents used to compile this data are appropriate for this and other measures. The CAD data is directly entered as the officer completes each task and will allow the agency to document users that are in compliance as well as those out of compliance. The arrest database is a proven system that is an appropriate method to track arrest and disposition information.

Reliability:

This data may be relied upon because officers are required by policy to submit the Activity Reports. Therefore, the issue becomes the quality of the information contained in the reports. They are checked by at least two levels of supervision for accuracy and completeness. It is not uncommon for a supervisor to physically verify activities that one of his subordinates submits. Officers have been disciplined for submission of false or inaccurate Activity Reports. The data entry operator detects discrepancies on the Activity Reports prior to entry. The data entry operator identifies incomplete or incorrect reports and gives them to the Field Services Lieutenant. The Lieutenant will then return the incomplete or incorrect report to the Regional Captain. After the activity reports are entered, they are sampled by comparing them with the hard copies of the reports for accuracy and completeness. Because the CAD data is entered as it occurs, it is a very reliable method to capture the information. The data entry operator detects discrepancies on the citations and dispositions prior to entry. The data entry operator identifies incomplete or incorrect citations and gives them to the Field Services Lieutenant. The Lieutenant will then return the incomplete or incorrect citations to the Regional Captain. After the citations are entered, they are sampled by comparing them with the hard copies of the reports for accuracy and completeness.

While the data collection method is reliable, the actual extrapolation of a compliance rate from this information is not. Compliance rates are difficult to calculate and express because several variables of information is not available. For example, the number of violations observed or detected may be known, but the total number of violations that occur is not known. Additionally, the number of persons checked or licensed may be known, but the number of persons who utilize resources illegally is not known. Therefore, compliance can only be relative based on the limited statistics available for a particular activity. Based on this observation, compliance rates are a poor measure to indicate performance.

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission

Program: Law Enforcement

Service/Budget Entity: Fish, Wildlife, and Boating Law Enforcement

Measure: Number of Boating Safety Education Cards Issued

Action (check one):

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure.
- Backup for performance measure.

Data Sources and Methodology:

Any person may obtain a boater safety identification card by complying with the requirements of section 327.395, Florida Statutes. The Boating and Waterways Section is charged with maintaining these records and ensuring the issuance of cards in a timely manner.

Validity:

The Boating Education Database (Bobber) has proven effective and accurate since the day this law became effective in 1996. This database is also used to compile information pertaining to boater education statistics for the annual boating statistical report as required in section 327.804, Florida Statutes.

Reliability:

Each year the data is manually reconciled so as to ensure accurate reporting.

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission

Program: Law Enforcement

Service/Budget Entity: Fish, Wildlife, and Boating Law Enforcement

Measure: Number of Boats Repaired

Action (check one):

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure.
- Backup for performance measure.

Data Sources and Methodology:

Officers prepare a Marine Maintenance Work Request form and send it through Shopnet. The Shopnet system sends it to the appropriate FWC shop or field mechanic. If the work request is sent to the shop, the shop supervisor will assign a Marine Maintenance Repair Order (RO) and assign the job to a marine mechanic. Once the work is completed the RO is returned to the supervisor. The supervisor checks the work closes out the RO and advises the Regional office to pick up the equipment and then a copy of the RO is sent back to the Region with the equipment. If the work request is sent to a field mechanic, the mechanic will schedule the work. Once completed the field mechanic advises the region of the completion of the work and a copy of the RO go to the Regional office for reference.

Validity:

The Marine Maintenance Work Request and the Marine Maintenance Repair Order have been used for many years to obtain the necessary data needed to operate the maintenance facilities.

Reliability:

All RO's are checked by the Storekeeper when parts are charged out; then by the shop supervisor when closed out.

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission

Program: Law Enforcement

Service/Budget Entity: Fish, Wildlife, and Boating Law Enforcement

Measure: Number of Data-Related Information Requests Fulfilled

Action (check one):

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure.
- Backup for performance measure.

Data Sources and Methodology:

Data Management receives requests for information related to arrests, numbers of arrests, and other various enforcement related statistics on a semi-regular basis. This information is retrieved and forwarded to the requesting party. If the request is received by phone, a call back number is taken and the information is given with a return call. If a request is received by fax or letter, it is returned in the same manner. With this procedure, verification of the identity of persons requesting information is kept in a file of public information requests. If there is a request for information that is questionable, a response is approved through proper chain-of-command.

Validity:

Several methods for responding to requests for public information have been used over the years and changes have evolved, but all changes use the Public Records guide for Law Enforcement as a reference.

Reliability:

Information for a record search or data-related report uses the ArrestNet or ActivityNet database as a search tool. ArrestNet is a database that all arrest citations are entered into, but it also merged all arrest record entries from the two prior agencies that comprise the existing Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission. ActivityNet is a database that all officer activity is entered into, keeping up with officer hours, counts, etc.

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission

Program: Law Enforcement

Service/Budget Entity: Fish, Wildlife, and Boating Law Enforcement

Measure: Number of Equipment Repairs

Action (check one):

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure.
- Backup for performance measure.

Data Sources and Methodology:

Officers, Dispatchers and/or their supervisors and administrative help submit a Radio Technology Work Request (RTWR) form (FWC-DLE form # 667) when any of the officers electronic equipment needs repair. We have migrated to a computer based repair request and database. We no longer submit these forms manually. Radio Engineers manage their repairs and scheduling electronically. Radio Engineers contact the officer to set a time and place for repairs. Each step in the process is date and time stamped in the database. After the repair is completed, the Radio Engineer selects equipment type and corrective action(s) from pull-down menus. They briefly describe repair particulars in a free form narrative section. In the three years we have been electronically using the on-line RTWR process, we've developed many improvements to assure regularity and uniformity in both reporting and tracking, while maintaining the integrity of the older data.

Validity:

Some variation of the RTWR form have been used for 10 years by the Radio Technology Group, resulting in fine tuning an established process that is routinely checked for accuracy and completeness.

Reliability:

As needed and no less than bi-monthly, supervisory review and analysis of the data is performed. This data is used to compile reports and other correspondence with regards to Radio Technology activities. Follow up calls to the field officers is performed to spot-check the accuracy of the information.

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission

Program: Law Enforcement

Service/Budget Entity: Fish, Wildlife, and Boating Law Enforcement

Measure: Number of Investigative Hours

Action (check one):

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure.
- Backup for performance measure.

Data Sources and Methodology:

Officers document investigation hours on an activity report. The report is then submitted to their respective supervisors. The supervisor then reviews the reports and submits them for input into the Activity Net database. Reports are generated by the type of hours that the officer enters.

Validity:

The documents used to compile this data are an appropriate method for this and other measures in the program area. The Activity Net data has been proven to be effective and accurate.

Reliability:

All officers must submit the activity report of their hours and specific activities. These reports are checked by at least two levels of supervision, and checked for accuracy and consistency.

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission

Program: Law Enforcement

Service/Budget Entity: Fish, Wildlife, and Boating Law Enforcement

Measure: Number of Warnings, Arrests, and Convictions

Action (check one):

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure.
- Backup for performance measure.

Data Sources and Methodology:

Officers document their arrests and warnings on their Activity Report. This report is submitted to their supervisor for review, who then sends them to the Regional Office where they are again reviewed. The reports are then sent to Tallahassee Headquarters where they are data entered by agency OPS personnel. Field Services compiles the data into reports using computer software programs. Reports generated from this database supplies the data for this and other measures. The reports are sampled by the Data Quality Control specialist against hard copies of the reports for accuracy and completeness. With the advent of the new computer aided dispatch (CAD) system, officers will also tell the radio dispatcher their activities as they complete them. These activities will then be saved into the regional CAD server. The criminal analyst will compile each regions data and produce statewide statistical reports. All citations and most dispositions are entered. The state law requires that the county clerk of court send all boating and saltwater fishing major violation dispositions to the Commission for data entry. The citations and dispositions are sent to Tallahassee Headquarters where they are data entered by agency OPS personnel. Field Services compiles the data into reports using computer software programs. Reports are generated from this database that supplies the data for this and other measures. The reports are sampled by the Data Quality Control specialist against hard copies of the citations for accuracy and completeness.

Validity:

The document used to compile this data is an appropriate method for this and other measures. The CAD data is directly entered as the officer completes each task and will allow the agency to document arrests and warnings. The arrest database is a proven system that is an appropriate method to track arrest and disposition information.

Reliability:

This data may be relied upon because officers are required by policy to submit Activity Reports. Therefore, the issue becomes the quality of the information contained in the reports. They are checked by at least two levels of supervision for accuracy and completeness. It is not uncommon for a supervisor to physically verify activities that one of his subordinates submits. Officers have been disciplined for submission of false or inaccurate Activity Reports. The data entry operator detects discrepancies on the Activity Reports prior to entry. The data entry operator identifies incomplete or incorrect reports and gives them to the Field Services Lieutenant. The Lieutenant will then return the incomplete or incorrect report to the Regional Captain. After the activity reports are entered, they are sampled by comparing them with the hard copies of the reports for accuracy and completeness. Because the CAD data is entered as it occurs, it is a very reliable method to capture the information.

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission

Program: Wildlife

Service/Budget Entity: Hunting and Game Management

Measure: Percent of Satisfied Hunters

Action (check one):

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure.
- Backup for performance measure.

Data Sources and Methodology: Annual data on hunter satisfaction are obtained from the annual FWC Statewide Hunter Survey.

Validity: The percentage of satisfied hunters is determined annually by mailing out surveys at the end of each year's hunting season to ~10% of all hunting license holders having licenses that conferred the privilege to hunt during the most recent hunting season. All responses to a question on hunter satisfaction are entered and summarized by counting the number of satisfied hunters (i.e., hunters who indicated that their hunting experience was fair, satisfying, or very satisfying) and dividing by the total number of respondents who answered the hunter satisfaction question.

Other factors contributing to the validity of this performance measure include the degree to which the survey sample is representative of the annual hunting population, the quality and completeness of the license holder database maintained by the Office of Licensing and Permitting, and the use of appropriate statistical methods to determine the level of statistical error associated with the performance measure estimate. The survey sample consists of an adequately sized stratified random sample of hunting license holders with relevant hunting privileges. Sample strata are defined by license type, with disability, general, sportsman, and lifetime hunting license holders proportionately sampled from a well-maintained and up-to-date database so as to insure that the survey sample is appropriately representative.

Reliability: To insure the reliability of the performance measure, the survey sample size is chosen to be large enough so that a typical survey response rate would yield an appropriately small level of statistical error in the estimate of the measure. Special measures are taken to insure an adequate survey response rate, including validation of the survey sample mailing address list by the U.S. Post Office prior to bulk mailing and the use of multiple mailing waves. Survey returns are closely monitored and close contact with the U.S. Post Office is

maintained during the survey return period so that problems pertaining to lost or misdirected survey responses can be identified and corrected as early as possible. Data from returned survey questionnaires are entered and verified. Every effort is made to conduct the hunter survey in a similar manner each year so that changes in the estimate of the performance measure from year to year can be reasonably attributed to changes in how the public views the hunting opportunities provided by FWC.

Office of Policy and Budget – July, 2008

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission

Program: Wildlife

Service/Budget Entity: Hunting and Game Management

Measure: Number of Hunters Served

Action (check one):

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure.
- Backup for performance measure.

Data Sources and Methodology: The agency has contracted with Central Government Systems, Inc. to provide a unified system for selling hunting and trapping licenses through all four of our sales channels (Retail Stores, Tax Collectors, Internet, and Telephone. This system, called the Total License System (TLS) has been used to sell all hunting and trapping licenses since November, 2003. Information about the customer and the type of licensed purchased is captured at the time of sale and stored in a central database. This information is then retrieved and summarized for reporting.

Validity: The TLS is the most appropriate means of collecting data for this measure. The data is valid because it captured at the time of sale and stored in a central database.

Reliability: 99%

Office of Policy and Budget – July, 2008

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission

Program: Wildlife

Service/Budget Entity: Hunting and Game Management

Measure: Number of hunting accidents

Action (check one):

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure.
- Backup for performance measure.

Data Sources and Methodology: The Hunter Safety Accident files, updated by the FWC's Division of Law Enforcement. These files include treestand falling accidents as well as shooting accidents. When a hunting accident occurs, an investigator from the agency's Division of Law Enforcement responds to the scene and begins an investigation to determine the cause of the accident. The investigator prepares a Hunting Accident Investigation Report and sends it to the statewide Investigations Supervisor. A copy is supplied to the Hunter Safety and Ranges Section.

Validity: The number of Hunting Accident Investigation reports is the most appropriate method of collecting data for this measure.

Reliability: The reports are reviewed at two levels before they arrive at the Hunter Safety and Ranges Section. Comparing these sources results in accurate, reliable data.

Office of Policy and Budget – July, 2008

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission

Program: Wildlife

Service/Budget Entity: Hunting and Game Management

Measure: Number of Recreational Sites

Action (check one):

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure.
- Backup for performance measure.

Data Sources and Methodology: Wildlife Management Areas (WMA's), Public Use Areas (PUA's), Public Small Game Hunting Areas (PSGHA's), and Wildlife and Environmental Areas (WEA's) make up the number of sites that offer hunting-related recreation. All of the above-described lands are evidenced by executive orders or establishment orders approved by the Commission. These orders contain legal descriptions and boundary information of the sites, including acreage figures. The procedure used to measure this indicator is to add the number of all sites including WMA, WEA, PUA, and PSGHA units that are evidenced by establishment order. Establishment orders are maintained by the Commission's Legal Office and in the Commission's central files.

Validity: The data is valid because it can be supported by documentation maintained by the Commission. The measuring instruments (executive and establishment orders) are valid because they identify the boundary and name of the site.

Reliability: The data is reliable because the number of sites that offer hunting-related recreation is supported by written documentation maintained by the Commission. External factors that could impact our ability to accomplish this measure include 1) available funding and 2) public interest. The measure is reliable because it provides accurate data indicating the total number of sites available.

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission

Program: Wildlife

Service/Budget Entity: Hunting and Game Management

Measure: Number of students graduating from hunter education courses

Action (check one):

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure.
- Backup for performance measure.

Data Sources and Methodology: Course instructors provide class attendance/graduation final report forms the regional Hunter Safety Coordinators, who in turn, enter this information into the Hunter Safety Database Program and then forward course final report forms to the Tallahassee office, where the forms from all 5 of the agencies administrative regions are maintained. We add graduation figures from all regions to determine performance.

Validity: These documents are valid because the instructors are the ones who record the data.

Reliability: The data are checked for accuracy by the instructors and then by two levels of supervision. Data from the database are sampled and compared with instructors' reports.

Office of Policy and Budget – July, 2008

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission

Program: Habitat and Species Conservation (Invasive Plant Management Section)

Service/Budget Entity: Invasive Plant Management

Measure: Percent of Florida's public water bodies in which hydrilla, water hyacinth and water lettuce are under maintenance control

Action (check one):

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure.
- Backup for performance measure.

Data Sources and Methodology:

Invasive Plant Management Section staff annually survey all sovereign, freshwater lakes and rivers that have improved boat ramps accessible to the public for three major aquatic plant species: hydrilla, water hyacinth, and water lettuce. Historically, more than 90% of the section's control budget has been spent managing these three invasive aquatic plants. Plants are managed only on waters that are considered to be state lands and are open to everyone in the State, since public funds are used for control. This amounts to approximately 450 waters covering more than 1.25 million acres. Plant acreage is estimated using a variety of methods including USGS quadrangle maps, GPS, LORAN, and LANDSAT mapping techniques. Data is stored in data base files in Tallahassee and updated information is available after verification by late December each year.

Validity:

Monitoring the number of acres of plants is a valid measure for determining if plant control efforts funded under this budget are resulting in protection of public waters from the invasion of non-native or undesirable plants. Because water hyacinth, water lettuce, and hydrilla re-grow so fast, and because they cannot be eradicated, many times more acres need to be controlled during a year than exist throughout the state at any one time. For example, water hyacinth and water lettuce have been under maintenance control in public waters since the late 1980s; however, nearly 30,000 acres are controlled at a cost of about \$3.0 million each year to keep the state-wide population below 5,000 acres.

Reliability:

Each year, prior to inventorying aquatic plants on public waters, section staff are trained and tested on plant identification and acreage assessment. Standardized field survey forms are used to record data. Surveys are conducted at the same

time each year to reduce seasonal plant growth biases. Data is entered into a database and verified against the original data sheet at each field office then staff in Tallahassee evaluate the data.

Office of Policy and Budget – July, 2007

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Florida Fish & Wildlife Conservation Commission

Program: Habitat Species Conservation Program

Service/Budget Entity: Habitat Species Conservation Program

Measure: Percent of Acres of Critical Habitat (Hot Spots) Protected through Land Acquisition, Lease, or Management Contract

Action (check one):

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure.
- Backup for performance measure.

Data Sources and Methodology:

The principal data sources to be used are (1) biodiversity hot spots as identified in the 1994 Commission report entitled, "Closing the Gaps in Florida's Wildlife Habitat Conservation System" and (2) managed acres as mapped by the Florida Natural Areas Inventory (FNAI). Biodiversity hot spots are areas where the potential habitats of three or more indicator species of biodiversity hot spots are areas where the potential habitats of three or more indicators species of biodiversity overlap, and they are presumed to indicate those areas of the state that are most important to biodiversity conservation. Managed areas are lands in public or private ownership that are managed to some degree for conservation purposes, and the digital file of managed area boundaries is updated every six months by FNAI. Once each year, the most recent managed areas file will be overlaid on biodiversity hot spots, and the increase in acres protected will be tabulated.

Validity:

Biodiversity hot spots were identified by creating potential habitat maps for 54 species of wildlife that are indicators of biodiversity in Florida and then overlaying the potential habitat maps to locate areas of overlap. Areas where more species overlap are presumed to be hot spots for the conservation of many other species. Thus, biodiversity hot spots are a surrogate used to measure progress towards the protection of many components of biodiversity in Florida. Managed areas indicate those lands having the greatest likelihood of conserving biological resources.

Reliability:

The biodiversity hot spots data layer was created in 1994, and it has not changed or been updated since. Therefore, it is presumed to be a stable data layer against which progress towards biodiversity conservation can be measured. The managed areas data layer, on the other hand, is updated every six months as new parcels of land come into public ownership. FNAI employs a strict quality assurance program to enter the boundaries of new parcels of public land into the managed areas database to ensure consistency with the existing data layer. The result is that a thoroughly researched, accurate, and updated managed areas data layer is available to overlay on a stable and unchanging map that indicates the locations of biodiversity hot spots.

Office of Policy and Budget – July, 2007

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Florida Fish & Wildlife Conservation Commission
Program: Habitat Species Conservation Program
Service/Budget Entity: Habitat Species Conservation Program
Measure: Percent of Wildlife Species That are Stable or Increasing

Action (check one):

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure.
- Backup for performance measure.

Data Sources and Methodology: 1. The Division of Habitat and Species Conservation maintains a database, which contains the biological vulnerability score of each valid wildlife taxon (species or subspecies) in Florida. The biological vulnerability score is a scientific method that utilizes different criteria to measure species vulnerability to extirpation. The lower the number, the less vulnerable the species is to extinction. One component of that score, the Florida Trend variable, is a quantitative measure of the population trend of each species. The Florida Trend variable yields a direct estimate of this GAA measure.

2. The procedure used to calculate this indicator is the accumulation of sufficient data by the Division of Habitat and Species Conservation to determine the Florida Trend score for all indigenous wildlife species. The number of species, whose Florida Trend score is stable or improving, is then summed and divided into the total number of wildlife species to obtain the percentage.

Validity:

1. The data is valid because the Florida Trend score assigned to each of the wildlife species can be supported by written, scientific documentation maintained in the Division of Habitat and Species Conservation.

2. The measuring instrument, the Florida Trend score, is valid because the Division of Habitat and Species Conservation has maintains sufficient, written, scientific data to support each score. Therefore, each of the individual species has a valid Florida Trend score that reflects the best available scientific knowledge.

Reliability: 1. The data is reliable because the methodology and criteria utilized to evaluate each of the wildlife species has been acknowledged and

accepted by the scientific community which studies and evaluates wildlife species. External factors which could impact the Commission's ability to accomplish this measure include 1) available funding; 2) habitat loss; and growth-related ecosystem impacts.

2. This measure is reliable because it provides quantifiable data indicating the biological vulnerability of wildlife species.

Office of Policy and Budget – July, 2008

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Florida Fish & Wildlife Conservation Commission
Program: Habitat Species Conservation Program
Service/Budget Entity: Habitat Species Conservation Program
Measure: Number of Acres Managed for Wildlife

Action (check one):

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure.
- Backup for performance measure.

Data Sources and Methodology:

1. All data is maintained in the Commission's Division of Habitat and Species Conservation. The total acreage figures for all Type I and Type II Wildlife Management Areas (WMA's), Critical Wildlife Areas (CWA's) and Wildlife and Environmental Areas (WEA's) is the number of acres managed for wildlife. All of the above-described lands are evidenced by establishment orders approved by the Commission. These establishment orders contain detailed legal boundaries, including acreage figures.
2. The procedure used to measure this indicator is to add the total acreage figures for all Type I and Type II Wildlife Management Areas, Wildlife and Environmental Areas and Critical Wildlife Areas.

Validity:

1. The data is valid because it can be supported by documentation maintained in the Commission's Division of Habitat and Species Conservation. Also, all Type I and Type II WMA's, CWA's and WEA's have been approved for establishment at official meetings of the Commission.
2. The measuring instruments (establishment orders) are valid because they contain accurate acreage figures for all Type I and Type II Wildlife Management Areas, Critical Wildlife Areas, and Wildlife and Environmental Areas. Additionally, all establishment orders have been approved at official meetings of the Commission.

Reliability:

1. The data is reliable because all acreage figures are supported by written documentation (establishment orders) maintained by the Commission. External factors that could impact the Commission's ability to accomplish this measure include 1) available funding; and 2) public interest.
2. The measure is reliable because it provides quantifiable, accurate data, indicating the total number of acres managed for wildlife habitat.

Office of Policy and Budget – July, 2008

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Florida Fish & Wildlife Conservation Commission

Program: Habitat Species Conservation Program

Service/Budget Entity: Habitat Species Conservation Program

Measure: Number of Written Technical Assists Provided

Action (check one):

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure.
- Backup for performance measure nor previously approved or for which validity, reliability and/or methodology information has not been provided.

Data Sources and Methodology: 1. The method for logging written technical assistance requests has improved since creating an in-house database system. Also, for accountability purposes, only written requests are included in our actual performance results. Maintaining accurate records for verbal or on-site requests was impossible. All data is maintained in the Division of Habitat and Species Conservation. Public and private landowners request assistance from the Commission in the form of written, formal management plans or written recommendations for their lands. Most of these requests (approximately 85% fall under the auspices of the Commission's Forest Stewardship Program.

2. The procedure used to measure this indicator is the number of written technical assistance requests received from public and private landowners.

Validity: 1. The data is valid because it can be supported by documentation maintained in the Commission's Division of Habitat and Species Conservation.

2. The measuring instrument is a database maintained by the Division of Habitat and Species Conservation that enables field personnel to log all written requests from public and private landowners.

Reliability: 1. The data is reliable because the individual taking the written request logs it into the database. There are no known external factors that could impact the Commission's ability to accomplish this measure.

2. The measure is reliable because it provides quantifiable data indicating the total number of landowners who have requested written technical assistance from the Commission's Division of Habitat and Species Conservation.

Office of Policy and Budget – July, 2007

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Florida Fish & Wildlife Conservation Commission
Program: Habitat Species Conservation Program
Service/Budget Entity: Habitat Species Conservation Program
Measure: Number of Survey and Monitoring Projects

Action (check one):

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure.
- Backup for performance measure.

1. Data Sources and Methodology:

1. All data is no longer maintained in the Commission's Division of Habitat and Species Conservation. The Commission has identified 571 species of wildlife within the State. Due to factors such as limited funding, population size, and public interest, the Commission has identified certain species for survey and monitoring projects.

2. The written documentation that is provided through PeopleFirst supports the number of survey and monitoring projects identified by the Commission. PeopleFirst captures staff time for each survey and monitoring project by species and location.

Validity:

1. The data is valid because it is supported with actual data from PeopleFirst. The number of survey and monitoring projects in the Division of Habitat and Species Conservation is derived from written information provided by employees through their PeopleFirst entries. Staff identify species work time and location for each survey and monitoring project they work on.

2. The measuring instrument (PeopleFirst) for identifying the number of survey and monitoring projects is valid evidence of the number of wildlife surveys and monitoring projects that the Commission's Division of Habitat and Species Conservation is involved in.

Reliability:

- 1. The data is reliable because it is extracted from PeopleFirst which is the agency's source for accounting for time spent on agency activities. External factors that could impact the Commission's ability to accomplish this measure include 1) problems with PeopleFirst; 2) available funding; 3) population size of the species; and 4) public interest.**

- 2. This measure is reliable because the data extracted from PeopleFirst provides the total number of wildlife survey and monitoring projects.**

Office of Policy and Budget – July, 2008

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Florida Fish & Wildlife Conservation Commission
Program: Habitat Species Conservation Program
Service/Budget Entity: Habitat Species Conservation Program
Measure: Acres of Fish and Wildlife Habitat purchased

Action (check one):

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure.
- Backup for performance measure.

Data Sources and Methodology:

This is an actual count of the acres purchased (closed) via the agency's Florida Forever Additions and Inholdings program. Because it is an actual cost, it is both valid and reliable.

Validity:

Data is from actual records of purchase.

Reliability:

Information taken from actual sales records.

Office of Policy and Budget – July, 2008

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Florida Fish & Wildlife Conservation Commission

Program: Habitat Species Conservation Program

Service/Budget Entity: Habitat Species Conservation Program

Measure: Number of Recovery Plan Actions Implemented

Action (check one):

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure.
- Backup for performance measure nor previously approved or for which validity, reliability and/or methodology information has not been provided.

Data Sources and Methodology:

1. No database is utilized for this workload measure. An annual report is prepared by the Section Leader of Imperiled Species Management and the Research Administrator of the Manatee Section of the Fish and Wildlife Research Institute.

2. The Section Leader and Research Administrator compile the list of recovery plan tasks and compare it with actual work done during the reporting period. Those two staff will indicate whether or not the activities of their units during the report period implemented an individual task or not.

Validity:

Program staff was interviewed and documentation reviewed for the purpose of analyzing the measure definition, data elements, and any source of external data. The degree to which a logical relation exists between the name of the measure, the definitions, and the formula used to calculate the measure was determined.

Based on our assessment methodology, there is a high probability that this measure is valid subject to data testing results. Data collection and measure calculations are presently taking place. The measure and data elements are well defined. There is a logical relation between the name of the measure, the definition, and the mathematical calculation. The formula in the measure documentation states clearly how the measure is calculated.

Reliability:

We interviewed program staff and reviewed documentation for the purpose of analyzing the measure's description of the reporting system structure. We determined the degree to which the measure definition, formula, and reporting system structure have been uniformly implemented.

Based on our assessment methodology, there is a high probability that this measure is reliable subject to verification of procedures and data testing results. The measure definition, the description of the structure of the reporting system, and the data definition have been implemented to some degree based on program assertions. Staff stated that everyone involved in the collection of data understands how and when to report information.

Office of Policy and Budget – July, 2008

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Florida Fish & Wildlife Conservation Commission

Program: Habitat Species Conservation Program

Service/Budget Entity: Habitat Species Conservation Program

Measure: Number of Water Bodies And Acres Where Habitat Rehabilitation Projects Have Been Completed

Action (check one):

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure.
- Backup for performance measure.

Data Sources and Methodology:

- 1. All data is maintained in the Division of Habitat Species and Conservation (HSC). The data source is the final report prepared by staff once habitat rehabilitation projects have been completed.**
- 2. The procedure used to measure this indicator requires counting the number of final reports pertaining to completed habitat rehabilitation projects. Acreage figures were derived from the Florida Lakes Gazetteer.**

Validity:

- 1. The data is valid because it can be supported by written documentation maintained in HSC. A final report is prepared for each completed habitat rehabilitation project. Acreage figures were derived from the Florida Lakes Gazetteer.**
- 2. The measuring instruments, final reports prepared by HSC and the Florida Lakes Gazetteer, are valid because they provide accurate data necessary to accomplish this measure.**

Reliability:

- 1. The data is reliable because each written report is supported by scientific documentation gathered by HSC staff. Acreage figures for each water body are derived from the Florida Lakes Gazetteer, a nationally recognized and accepted publication. There are no known external factors which impact the Commission's ability to accomplish the measure.**
- 2. This measure is reliable because it provides quantifiable data indicating the number of completed habitat rehabilitation projects during a given fiscal year. This data is relevant factor in determining whether or not HSC is achieving the program goal of ensuring the long-term, well-being of Florida's freshwater fish and their habitats.**

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Florida Fish & Wildlife Conservation Commission
Program: Habitat Species Conservation Program
Service/Budget Entity: Habitat Species Conservation Program
Measure: Number of Native Fish and Wildlife Species with Stable or Increasing Populations

Action (check one):

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
 Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
 Requesting new measure.
 Backup for performance measure nor previously approved or for which validity, reliability and/or methodology information has not been provided.

Data Sources and Methodology: 1. Consensus opinion of FWRI scientists based on summaries of available commercial and recreational landings, fishing effort, fishery catch rates, and fishery-independent sampling effort, and young-of-the-year and post-young-of-the-year abundance indices from annual stock assessments. Standardized annual catch rates are calculated using general linear models to adjust the mean observed catch rates to account for year-to-year differences in the timing and location of the catch and changes in characteristics of the fishing trips (e.g., number of anglers, length of time fishing) for the commercial and recreational sector. The evaluation process uses the results of recent stock assessments, if available; otherwise, linear regressions of the catch rates for the five most recent years were conducted. As a general rule, if a species or group had less than an annual average of 100 commercial trips and 100 recreational interviews and a very low Fisheries-Independent Monitoring Program catch rate, it was deemed to have insufficient data to evaluate its status. To facilitate comparison, FWRI aggregated the data from the recreational sector and FIM programs into the commercial categories. Some of these categories, especially those for marine life, are mixtures of species. Ultimately, FWRI collapsed all of the data into 137 categories.

2. Only those species reported as stable or increasing on both coasts of Florida are reported to the Legislature as stable or increasing Statewide.

Validity: 1. The data are valid because the Florida Trend score assigned to each species or species cluster is based on pooled, documented scientific data derived from a consensus of required commercial and voluntary recreational reporting, and assigned FWC sampling activities.
2. The instrument is valid because FWRI maintains sufficient written scientific data to support each score. Therefore, each of the individual species or species cluster scores has a valid Florida Trend score that reflects the best available scientific knowledge.

Reliability: 1. The data is reliable because the methodology and criteria utilized to evaluate each of the fish and invertebrate species has been acknowledged and accepted by the scientific community which studies and evaluates wildlife species. External factors which could impact the Commission's ability to accomplish this measure include 1) available funding, 2) habitat loss, 3) growth-related ecosystem impacts, and 4) growth-related increases in fishery pressures.

2. This measure is reliable because it provides quantifiable data indicating the biological vulnerability of marine fish and wildlife species.

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Florida Fish & Wildlife Conservation Commission

Program: Habitat Species Conservation Program

Service/Budget Entity: Habitat Species Conservation Program

Measure: Number of Exotic Species with Management Plans Written

Action (check one):

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure.
- Backup for performance measure.

Data Sources and Methodology: Management plans are written in various formats for problematic exotic species. These include distribution, abundance, control techniques, and monitoring. Data sources are from scientists from cooperating state, local and federal agencies, as well as state universities. Personal observations, literature, and surveys are used to gather data. Control techniques are field tested, and results recorded.

Validity: Data supporting management plans are recorded in summary reports, databases, technical reports and correspondence maintained in the Division of Habitat and Species Conservation.

Reliability: Data and management plans are subject to scrutiny from a variety of scientific perspectives from cooperating agencies and universities. Measure is reliable in that it is a gauge of action planned or taken to manage exotic species, rather than a simple compilation of occurrence data.

Office of Policy and Budget – July, 2008

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: FL Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission (Commission)

Program: Freshwater Fisheries

Service/Budget Entity: Freshwater Fisheries Management 77400200

Measure: Number of Water Bodies and Acres Managed to Improve Fishing (includes water bodies in Fish Management Areas, Urban Areas and other lakes and river)

Action (check one):

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure.
- Backup for performance measure.

DATA SOURCES AND METHODOLOGY:

All data is maintained in the Division of Freshwater Fisheries Management (DFFM). The number of water bodies and acres managed to improve fishing was derived by adding the number of water bodies and acres in Fish Management Areas and urban Ponds. Additionally, water bodies that have DFFM biologists assigned to them were included in these totals.

The procedure used to measure this indicator is to add number of water bodies and acres in all Fish Management Areas and Urban Ponds. In addition, water bodies that have DFFM biologists assigned to them were added to and included in the above-described totals.

VALIDITY:

The data is valid because it can be supported by data maintained in DFFM. All Fish Management Areas and Urban Ponds have been approved for establishment at official meetings of the Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission (Commission). The other lakes and rivers included in the above-described totals had their acreage figures determined from data contained in the Florida Gazetteer.

The measuring instruments, The Fish Management Areas Urban Ponds and Florida Gazetteer are valid because they can be supported by reliable documentation. Each Fish Management Area and Urban Pond can be supported by establishment orders, legal documents which have been approved at official meetings of the Commission. Acreage figures in the Florida Gazetteer are substantiated by legal surveys.

REALIABILITY:

The data is reliable because all acreage figures and number of water bodies can be supported by written documentation (establishment orders and the Florida Gazetteer) maintained by DFFM. There are no known external factors which could impact the Commission's ability to accomplish this measure.

This measure is reliable because it provides quantifiable data indicating the total number of water bodies and acres managed by DFFM for the public

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: FL Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission (Commission)

Program: Freshwater Fisheries

Service/Budget Entity: Freshwater Fisheries Management 77400200

Measure: Percent Angler Satisfaction

Action (check one):

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure.
- Backup for performance measure.

DATA SOURCES AND METHODOLOGY:

All data is maintained in the Division of Freshwater Fisheries Management (DFFM). Florida State University's College of Communications, Communications Research Center, randomly surveyed 600 licenses resident anglers in order to determine the percentage of angler satisfaction. For the 2001 – 2002 fiscal year, it was estimated that 70 – 75% of anglers surveyed were somewhat satisfied or very satisfied with their fishing experience.

The procedure used to measure this indicator requires evaluating and summarizing the survey responses.

VALIDITY:

The data is valid because it can be supported by documentation maintained in DFFM. The Communications Research Center prepares a report summarizing the survey results; DFFM has a copy of this report.

The measuring instrument, the report which summarizes the survey results, is valid because it can be supported by written documentation maintained by the Communications Research Center.

REALIABILITY:

The data is reliable because all respondents were selected randomly and the responses along with the phone numbers of those who responded to the survey are on file in DFFM. The only known factor which could impact the Commission's ability to accomplish this measure is that this survey is not conducted every year. According to personnel in DFFM, this survey is usually conducted every five years; therefore the Commission will not be able to provide current data each year.

This measure is reliable, when current survey information is available, because it provides quantifiable data indicating how satisfied Floridians are with the fishing opportunities provided by the Commission. This measure will also provide any changes in angler satisfaction.

<p>LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability</p> <p>Department: <u>FL Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission (Commission)</u></p> <p>Program: <u>Freshwater Fisheries</u></p> <p>Service/Budget Entity: <u>Freshwater Fisheries Management 77400200</u></p> <p>Measure: <u>Number of Fish Stocked</u></p> <p>Action (check one):</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Requesting revision to approved performance measure.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Requesting new measure.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Backup for performance measure.</p>
--

DATA SOURCES AND METHODOLOGY

All Data is maintained in the Division of Freshwater Fisheries Management (DFFM). The number of fish stocked is derived from reports (progress and annual) prepared by personnel stationed at the Florida Bass and Conservation Center (Richloam Fish Hatchery).

The procedure used to measure this indicator is to glean the required data from reports prepared by personnel stationed at the Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission’s (Commission’s) Richloam Fish Hatchery.

VALIDITY

The data is valid because it can be supported by documentation maintained in DFFM. Most fish stocked in Florida’s rivers and lakes come from the Commission’s Richloam Fish Hatchery. The hatchery maintains detailed records of the number of fish stocked and into which water body the fish are stocked.

REALIABILITY

The data is reliable because the number of fish stocked can be supported by written documentation (inventory and delivery records) maintained in DFFM. There are no known external factors which could impact the Commission’s ability to accomplish this measure.

This measure is reliable because it provides quantifiable data indicating the total number of fish stocked by the Commission in Florida’s water bodies.

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: ___Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission ___
Program: ___Division of Marine Fisheries Management___
Service/Budget Entity: ___Marine Fisheries Services / 77500200___
Measure: ___Number of educational and outreach contacts___

Action (check one):

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure.
- Backup for performance measure.

Data Sources and Methodology:

Mail: Written questions from the public about marine plants, animals and habitats are directed from the FWC mailroom to the Division of Marine Fisheries Management (DMFM), Outreach and Education Office. Letters come from anglers and boaters in response to news stories, from school children working on class projects and a variety of other sources. The method to be used will be the following: Mail requests are logged in a database. Recorded information includes contact name, address, and material sent. Total numbers of requests can be tracked as needed.

Web Site: The DMFM web site (www.myfwc.com/marine) provides an important contact point for people seeking information about fisheries regulations and activities. The DMFM web site is a link on many other web sites. DMFM's site contains regulation text, information on public workshops, artificial reefs, recreational and commercial license requirement, monofilament recovery and recycling, and fish identification. Web site user sessions are monitored by software. Numbers of user sessions can be generated by querying the software as needed.

Knowledge Base: Visitors to the DMFM web site are provided with an opportunity to inquire about marine fisheries issues through the Knowledge Base by contacting staff to obtain answers to questions that are not addressed by the DMFM web site. Questions are opened, reviewed and responded to on a daily basis. Incoming questions are stored and tracked by the Knowledge Base System.

Outreach: DMFM employees participate in fishing shows, boat shows, angler club meetings, and conduct children's and women's fishing classes. Outreach is a tie to citizens, organizations, agencies, communities and the general public. It shares meeting and workshop results, as well as scientific and practical information, to make management decisions useful beyond the agency. Outreach events are staffed by DMFM employees. The numbers of contacts with the public are obtained from gate counts and registration lists.

Validity:

There is ample documentation to analyze the measure definition, data elements, and sources of external data. There is a logical relation between the name of the measure, the data sources, and the procedure used to calculate the measure. Data collection and measure calculations are ongoing. The measure and data elements are well defined. There is a logical relation between the name of the measure, the definition, and the mathematical calculation. The measuring instruments are relevant, accurate, and timely.

Reliability:

A reliability assessment, which investigates the degree to which the measure definition, reporting system structure and calculation are being uniformly implemented, has been developed. There is a moderate probability that this measure is reliable subject to verification of procedures and data. The description of the reporting system structure is documented.

| *Office of Policy and Budget – July, 2008*

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission
Program: Division of Marine Fisheries Management
Service/Budget Entity: Marine Fisheries Services / 77500200
Measure: Number of marine fisheries service contacts

Action (check one):

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure.
- Backup for performance measure.

Data Sources and Methodology:

Service contact tallies are kept by individual employees of the Marine Fisheries Services Section. These contacts include: number of commercial regulations/newsletters distributed, number of Special Activity Licenses applications processed, number of correspondence (phone calls/e-mails) with constituents of Marine Fisheries, number of audits performed and number of administrative hearings conducted. This information is recorded regularly by the varying programs within the section, then this information is compiled to provide one number for reporting purposes.

Validity:

There is ample documentation to analyze the measure definition, data elements, and sources of external data. There is a logical relation between the name of the measure, the data sources, and the procedure used to calculate the measure. Data collection and measure calculations are ongoing. The measure and data elements are well defined. There is a logical relation between the name of the measure, the definition, and the mathematical calculation. The measuring instruments are relevant, accurate, and timely.

Reliability:

The measure definition, the description and structure of the reporting system, and the data definition have been implemented. Databases are maintained and internal controls in the reporting system are in place to ensure accurate calculations.

Office of Policy and Budget – July, 2008

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: ___Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission ___
Program: ___Division of Marine Fisheries Management___
Service/Budget Entity: ___Marine Fisheries Management / 77500200___
Measure: ___Percent of fisheries stocks that are increasing or stable___

Action (check one):

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure.
- Backup for performance measure.

Data Sources and Methodology:

A: Fisheries dependent catch and effort are Oracle databases on the FWRI mainframe alpha server. Methodology: All catch and species composition for each commercial fishing trip are recorded on trip tickets by wholesale seafood dealers and provided to the FWRI as required by FS Chapter 370.06. Trip Tickets are then checked against historical records, corrected if necessary, and then entered in the fisheries dependent catch and effort databases.

B: Fisheries independent monitoring information is a collection of SAS databases on the FWRI server. Methodology: Scientifically trained marine biologists collect information on species abundance by time and place using standard scientific methodologies. Information is maintained in the fisheries independent monitoring information databases.

C: Fisheries age, growth and reproduction information are PC SAS databases on FWRI computers. Methodology: Scientifically trained marine biologists develop estimates of age at sexual maturity, growth, fecundity (eggs produced per spawn) and mortality for selected fishery species using scientifically proven methodologies. Fisheries age, growth and reproduction information are housed in PC SAS databases on FWRI computers.

Validity:

Based on the assessment methodology and data testing, there is a high probability that this measure is appropriate. Data collection and measure calculation are presently taking place. The measure and data elements are well defined. There is a logical relation between the name of the measure, the definition, and the mathematical calculation. The formula in the measure documentation states clearly how the measure is calculated.

Reliability:

Based on the assessment methodology, there is a moderate probability that this measure is reliable based on data testing results. The measure definition, the description of the reporting system structure, and the data definition have been implemented to some degree based on program assertions. The program has a clear and specific description of the procedure for collecting data, reporting, and calculating the measure. Based on data testing, internal controls on the reporting system and calculations have been implemented to ensure accuracy.

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: ___Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission ___
Program: ___Division of Marine Fisheries Management___
Service/Budget Entity: ___Marine Fisheries Management / 77500200___
Measure: _Number of artificial reefs created and or maintained_____

Action (check one):

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure.
- Backup for performance measure.

Data Sources and Methodology:

The Dive Monitoring Database and the Statewide Artificial Reef Database (EXCEL software) are the responsibility of William Horn, Environmental Specialist III, Section of Marine Fisheries Management, (850) 922-4340. The number of reefs created and/or monitored are recorded in the Dive Monitoring Database based on the following definitions of creation and monitoring.

Number of artificial reefs created: An artificial reef created for purposes of this long range planning, occurs with the intentional and planned placement on the bottom at an approved permitted location in a marine environment of approved man-made or natural (rock) material funded wholly or partially by state or federal money administered through the Division of Marine Fisheries Management. An individual artificial reef for purposes of this activity is composed of one or more structures cumulatively weighing one or more tons, placed within 150 feet or less of each other. Other materials at distances beyond 150 feet would be considered separate reefs and counted separately. The distances from nearest neighbor would be determined based upon differences in Global Positioning System (GPS readings) (accurate to within 20-30 ft). The 150 feet selected represents a minimum distance that artificial reefs must be removed from natural habitat and represents a minimum forage area for reef fish moving away from the reef to feed. Individual reefs may be variable in size (one ton or 5,000 tons) and footprint depending on the objective to be achieved. Therefore a single reef may not represent a consistent dollar amount cost. Cost may vary depending on reef size, material availability, whether it is secondary use material donated free of charge or a designed module where both construction and transportation costs are involved. County location along the coast, distance from closest navigable inlet, distance from shore, contractor availability, location of materials to be secured, and proximity of land based staging areas and fluctuating diesel fuel costs also affect cost of reef construction. Reefs are intended to minimize diver hazards and threats to entrapment of threatened and endangered species.

Number of artificial reefs monitored: A reef monitored is an artificial reef formally monitored by one or more divers on a given day. The same reef monitored on four different days in a year would constitute four reefs monitored. A reef monitored by four different people engaged in different monitoring tasks on the same day, would constitute only one reef monitored. Replicate surveys conducted during the course of the day on the same reef, would only constitute one reef monitored. Monitoring events can be of varying levels of detail of varying aspects of the reef biota and or physical characteristics. Therefore, a single reef monitored may represent one survey or multiple surveys, each of variation duration, detail, and cost. The monitoring event must either be conducted in-house by FWC staff or be paid for in whole or part by FWC Division of Marine Fisheries in accordance with conditions of a formal contract. Reefs monitored will be shown in a breakout form that indicates monitoring events by month and whether FWC or non FWC personnel undertook the monitoring efforts.

Validity:

Program staff was interviewed and documentation was reviewed for the purpose of analyzing the measure definition, data elements, and any source of external data. The degree to which a logical relationship exists between the name of the measure, the definitions, and the formula used to calculate the measure was determined. Data testing was conducted on the measure documentation.

Reliability:

The measure definition, the description and structure of the reporting system, and the data definition have been implemented. Improvements to the databases have been made and internal controls in the reporting system are in place to ensure accurate calculations.

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission

Program: Research

Service/Budget Entity: Fish and Wildlife Research Institute

Measure: Number of manatees rehabilitated

Action (check one):

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure.
- Backup for performance measure.

Data Sources and Methodology:

Three facilities, SeaWorld of Florida, Lowry Park Zoo, and Miami Seaquarium, are federally authorized to medically treat and rehabilitate sick, injured, or orphaned manatees. These facilities are partially reimbursed by FWC as provided in Section 379.298(3), Florida Statute. Rehabilitated and healthy manatees are released back into the wild.

The number of manatees brought into Florida's three acute care facilities for treatment is reported by each facility for the previous fiscal year. This number of admissions is then added to the number of manatees released back into the wild by the facilities for the same period. The sum of manatees that were admitted by all three facilities and those released by all three facilities is reported as "number of manatees rehabilitated."

Validity: The methodology for enumerating this measure is based on audited data provided by FWC contractors.

Reliability: Not verified.

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission

Program: Research

Service/Budget Entity: Fish and Wildlife Research Institute

Measure: Number of technical and analytical GIS remote sensing requests completed and GIS oil spill training assistance provided

Action (check one):

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure.
- Backup for performance measure.

Data Sources and Methodology:

GIS and Remote Sensing Services and Support: FWRI's Center for Spatial Analysis provides a variety of GIS and remote sensing products and services. We respond to requests from government, industry, academia and the public. We can provide existing published maps, atlases, and reports; creation and delivery of custom maps, tables, and reports derived from analyzing our GIS databases in response to specific requests; user-initiated Internet Map Service data and map downloads; and custom GIS applications and tools.

Requested Change in Data Source: Currently, the Information Science and Management section reports under a measure titled "Number of technical and analytical GIS remote sensing requests completed and GIS oil spill training assistance provided". The Outcome/Output title is "GIS technical support and services". The Approved Current Standard is 1,470. We would like to request a new standard of 200,758.

We would like to make the following changes to better reflect our services and align with other programs.

First we would like to add a new measure that reflects GIS web page usage. Our GIS Internet Map Services are accessed by many users, who view, query and often download data and information. We feel that recording "Unique Website Visits", is a good way to track visitor usage. Actual 07-08 value is 200,000.

Additionally, we would like to refine the GIS Support and Services measurement to reflect just those RFIs that involve personal contact between staff and the requestor. This includes face-to-face, phone, mail and email. We will no longer count user-initiated data and map downloads that are handled entirely by the user. The main reason for this is that it is very difficult to get accurate counts of data downloads. Another reason is that many users let us know that they didn't want to fill out online forms to get the data. They felt this was an unnecessary

step and not something we should demand in order for them to get public information. Actual 07-08 value is 750.

We will continue to track spill response drills and training – about 8 per year.

Participation in spill response drills and training exercises: Drills are staged events designed to familiarize spill responders with each other and potential situations should a major spill occur. These drills serve to test and refine our abilities to coordinate with other spill responders. Training consists of expert instruction covering the use of specific tools, applications or protocols. Staff members participate in spill response training both as trainers on *Florida Marine Spill Analysis System* and as trainees on subjects such as *Natural Resource Damage Assessment* and *Shoreline Cleanup Assessment Team*.

Validity: The methodology for conducting assessments, analyses and data summaries is based on scientific principles and procedures documented in peer review literature. The validity of these procedures is based on acceptance in peer-reviewed scientific documents.

Reliability: Verified by the FWC Office of Inspector General (OIG). A measure is verified if reported performance is within plus/minus five percent of actual performance and if controls appear adequate to ensure accuracy for collecting and reporting performance data. The OIG overall opinion is that current data documentation and collection methodologies of the reviewed sample include sufficient essential control elements to adequately assess the validity and reliability of the Commission's performance measures.

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission

Program: Research

Service/Budget Entity: Fish and Wildlife Research Institute

Measure: Number of requests for assessments of seagrass, saltmarsh, mangrove, coral, aquatic, and upland habitat

Action (check one):

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure.
- Backup for performance measure.

Data Sources and Methodology: Reports of seagrass, saltmarsh, mangrove, aquatic, or upland habitat damages often arise from calls and emails from Law Enforcement, private citizens, and various governments. FWRI staffs respond with a returned phone call or e-mail to obtain further details. Events such as illegal removal of mangroves or seagrass damage caused by vessel groundings are usually accurately reported. However, cumulative damage or loss such as long-term prop-scarring or seagrass losses from prolonged turbidity or disease are typically reported only after there is widespread damage. Our participation in interagency workshops and presentations to various user groups helps to increase public awareness of the importance of responding to these events. We reinforce the need to conserve habitats. Pages on the FWRI website informs the public of the importance of habitat.

FWRI habitat research staffs usually make the decision to investigate chronic habitat damage or loss. The criteria include the location and extent of the damaged area, species and area of involved, and feasibility of restoring damaged habitat. FWC field office staff and a network of staff from federal, state, and county governments, and some universities, (depending on jurisdiction determination) provide assistance in the field surveys. We provide results of assessment to FWC and other agencies by telephone, letter, email, reports, and presentations and as expert witness in litigation as appropriate.

Reports of coral damages usually come from FWC Law Enforcement, Florida Keys National Marine Sanctuary staff, and other government agencies (primarily county environmental resource officials). FWC staff responded with a returned phone call, email, or site visits to obtain further details. Major vessel groundings are usually accurately reported; however, smaller boat groundings are likely under-reported and thus under-investigated. Extensive anchor damages by large ships are also usually reported; local staff in the Keys usually handle smaller anchoring damages. Damages caused by offshore cable laying operations are usually reported. FWRI receives calls for potential coral damages with beach

renourishment and offshore gas pipelines. Pages on the FWRI website informs the public of our response activities.

Validity: The methodologies for conducting assessments, analyses, and data summaries are based on scientific principles and procedures documented in peer review literature. The validity of these procedures is based on acceptance in peer-reviewed scientific documents.

Reliability: Not verified.

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission

Program: Research

Service/Budget Entity: Fish and Wildlife Research Institute

Measure: Number of requests for status of endangered and threatened species and wildlife completed

Action (check one):

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure.
- Backup for performance measure.

Data Sources and Methodology: The number of information requests completed for endangered, threatened, game and non-game wildlife species is a measure of the section's effort to enhance awareness and knowledge of the abundance, mortality, life history, and ecology of these species for both the scientific community and the public at large.

This measure represents an annual count of the number of information requests completed. This figure is a compilation of the number of requests for information that were completed on the *InfoRequest* system for the section; the number of monthly mortality reports distributed for selected wildlife species; the number of responses to inquiries about necropsy results; the number of manuscripts accepted for publication by staff members; the number of summaries and reports distributed; and the number of hits as determined by "user sessions" on the website. We also include the number of necropsies performed and selected survey events.

For web hits, "User Session" is defined as the number of unique users who visited a web site during a certain time. Measuring user sessions is more complicated than measuring hits or page views. The user session statistic can be seen as equivalent to "Unique Visits," which, unless every visitor only sees one page, will be less than the number of page views/impressions. User Sessions do, however, give a good idea of how many people are visiting the site and are the only successful way to track individual visits using current technology.

Validity: The methodology for conducting assessments, analyses and data summaries is based on scientific principles and procedures documented in peer review literature. The validity of these procedures is based on acceptance in peer-reviewed scientific documents.

Reliability: Not verified.

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission

Program: Research

Service/Budget Entity: Fish and Wildlife Research Institute

Measure: Number of fisheries assessment and data summaries conducted

Action (check one):

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure.
- Backup for performance measure.

Data Sources and Methodology:

FWRI staffs collect catch and effort information from commercial anglers through a legislatively mandated marine fisheries trip ticket program. Staffs process approximately 350,000 tickets from seafood per year. Catch and effort information from recreational anglers by FWRI uses scientifically valid survey techniques. We intercept anglers at docks, piers, bridges, etc. to obtain estimates of catch rates and species composition. FWRI staffs then use survey models to estimate total catch and effort by wave (two month period), mode (boat, charter, head, and beach bank), and species.

Biological research on age, growth, genetic identification and reproduction of important fish species or complexes provides the background life history parameters for stock assessments and interpreting the results of fisheries monitoring and anglers' observations. We intensely study approximately 25-30 species at any one time. Biological research also examines the impact of fishing gear on targeted stocks as well as non-targeted bycatch. Freshwater fish fisheries research is focused on approximately 50 index lakes distributed statewide.

FWRI develops estimates of recruitment and relative abundance of selected species through standard, scientifically valid survey monitoring techniques using fisheries independent methodologies. We conduct surveys lakes, streams, and estuaries. We design our sampling to target selected species of high importance and all associated environmental and ecological information including non-fishery species collected in conjunction with the target species.

Validity: The methodologies for conducting assessments, analyses and data summaries are based on scientific principles and procedures documented in peer review literature. The validity of these procedures is based on acceptance in peer-reviewed scientific documents.

Reliability: Not verified.

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission

Program: Research

Service/Budget Entity: Fish and Wildlife Research Institute

Measure: Number of red tide and aquatic health assessments completed

Action (check one):

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure.
- Backup for performance measure.

Data Sources and Methodology:

Red Tides The public, anglers, and charter boat guides reporting dead fish usually notify The Harmful Algal Bloom (HAB) Group in St. Petersburg of a possible red tide. Pilots and offshore fishing or research vessels report discolored water, particularly offshore, occasionally. Red tides typically affect the southwest coast of Florida in late summer or fall but can occur at any time of year and can occur anywhere along the Florida coast. Red tides can cause widespread multi-species fish kills, shellfish poisoning, respiratory irritation in humans, and manatee deaths. The coastal waters of west central Florida are monitored for red tide organisms and other potentially HAB species by a network of commercial and recreational fishing vessels. FWC, DEP, and other government staff collect water and sediment samples when dead fish or discolored water are observed. HAB staffs at FWRI in St. Petersburg evaluate water and sediment samples collected from around the state. Analytical results are recorded in an electronic database. Results from evaluations are provided by telephone, email, and on the FMRI web site. We track and report the number of web visits as determined by user sessions on the website. User Sessions are defined as the number of unique users who visited a web site during a certain time.

Aquatic Health The fish kill investigation process begins with the initial report to the Aquatic Health group. The majority of fish kills reported are calls from the public to the Fish Kill Hotline. Between 400 and 700 calls are made to hotline each year. Additional reports of fish kills or fish disease events are from calls directly to Ecosystem Assessment and Restoration staff, calls routed from the FWRI Education and Information office, other government agencies, and emails. A dedicated email address was established to allow the public to report fish kills or disease events directly to researchers. A statewide toll free Fish Kill Hotline was established in 1995 that the public, anglers, other government staff, and the media can call to report or request information about fish kills or aquatic disease events. Each call to the Fish Kill Hotline is responded to with a return phone call and a mailed response card. Region specific "wanted" posters, angler surveys on

fish health problems, articles in popular magazines, participation in local festivals, and presentations to various user groups help increase public awareness of the importance of reporting these events. A page on the FWRI website informs the public of current aquatic health issues and provides information on how to report incidences. The decision to investigate a call of a fish kill or fish disease event is made by Aquatic Health Group staff using a protocol with criteria that includes species and number of fish involved, location, other agency involvement, etc. Staff resources limit the number of reports that are actually investigated. FWC field office staff and a statewide network of staff from federal, state, county, and city governments, universities, and private citizens provide assistance in the collection and shipping of appropriate samples for evaluation. Fish and other appropriate samples are evaluated at FWRI. Results from water quality, necropsy, microbiological, and histological analyses are entered into an Access database. Results of evaluations are provided to the public and other agencies by telephone, letter, email, and web site postings as appropriate. We track and report the number of web visits as determined by *user sessions* on the website. *User Sessions* are defined as the number of unique users who visited a web site during a certain time.

Validity: The methodology for conducting assessments, analyses and data summaries is based on scientific principles and procedures documented in peer review literature. The validity of these procedures is based on acceptance in peer-reviewed scientific documents.

Reliability: Not verified.

LRPP Exhibit V: Identification of Associated "Proposed" Activity Contributing to Performance Measures

Measure Number	Approved Performance Measures for FY 2008-09 (Words)		Associated Activities Title
1	Compliance with recreational and commercial licensing rules and law		N/A
2	Percent change in licensed anglers		N/A
3	Percent change in the number of licensed hunters		N/A
4	Number of recreational licenses and permit issued		Recreational Licenses and Permits
5	Number of commercial and other marine fishing license processed		Commercial Licenses and Permits
6	Number of wildlife and freshwater fishing commercial licenses and permits		Commercial Licenses and Permits

LRPP Exhibit V: Identification of Associated "Proposed" Activity Contributing to Performance Measures

Measure Number	Approved Performance Measures for FY 2008-09 (Words)		Associated Activities Title
7	Number of rural counties counseled regarding use of nature-based recreation as an economic development tool		Public Awareness & Economic Development Conservation Coordination Wildlife-viewing recreation
8	Number of people reached with fish and wildlife messages		Media Relation: Inform & Educate Citizens about Fish and Wildlife Messages
9	Economic impact of fishing, hunting and wildlife viewing (dollars/job)		N/A
10	Number of people reached with conservation messages		Conservation Education: Educate Citizens about Fish and Wildlife Conservation
11	Administrative costs as a percent of total agency costs		N/A
12	Administrative positions as a percent of total agency costs		N/A

LRPP Exhibit V: Identification of Associated "Proposed" Activity Contributing to Performance Measures

Measure Number	Approved Performance Measures for FY 2008-09 (Words)		Associated Activities Title
13	Administrative costs per division		
			N/A
14	Administrative positions per division		
			N/A
15			
	Florida Wildlife Magazine - annual distribution		Florida Wildlife Magazine

LRPP Exhibit V: Identification of Associated Activity Contributing to Performance Measures

Measure Number	Approved Performance Measures for FY 2007-08 (Words)		Associated Activities Title
16	Compliance with specified commission rules and state law		Uniform Patrol and Investigations Inspections Aviation Law Enforcement Administration
17	Response time to emergency calls		Uniform Patrol and Investigations Inspections Aviation Law Enforcement Administration
18	Number of recreational boating injuries		Uniform Patrol and Investigations Inspections Law Enforcement Administration
19	Number of warnings, arrests, and convictions		Uniform Patrol and Investigations Inspections Aviation Law Enforcement Administration
20	Number of vessels checked		Uniform Patrol and Investigations Inspections Law Enforcement Administration
21	Aircraft down time		Aviation Law Enforcement Administration

22	Communications equipment down time		Field Services
			Law Enforcement Administration
23	Total number of hours spent in preventative patrol and investigations		Uniform Patrol and Investigations
			Inspections
			Aviation
			Law Enforcement Administration
24	Number of vessel safety inspections		Uniform Patrol and Investigations
			Inspections
			Law Enforcement Administration
25	Total number of boating accidents investigated		Uniform Patrol and Investigations
			Inspections
			Law Enforcement Administration
26	Number of patrol hours		Uniform Patrol and Investigations
			Inspections
			Aviation
			Law Enforcement Administration
27	Number of investigative hours		Uniform Patrol and Investigations
			Inspections
			Law Enforcement Administration
28	Number of officers and recruits trained		Training
			Law Enforcement Administration

29	Number of enforcement flight hours		Aviation
			Law Enforcement Administration
30	Number of boats repaired		Field Services
			Law Enforcement Administration
31	Number of equipment repairs		Field Services
			Law Enforcement Administration
32	Number of data-related information requests fulfilled		Field Services
			Law Enforcement Administration
33	Number of regulatory zones properly permitted		Boating and Waterways
			Law Enforcement Administration
34	Number of boating safety education cards issued		Boating and Waterways
			Law Enforcement Administration

LRPP Exhibit V: Identification of Associated Activity Contributing to Performance Measures

Measure Number	Approved Performance Measures for FY 2008-09 (Words)		Associated Activities Title
35	Percent of satisfied hunters		N/A
36	Number of recreational sites		N/A
37	Number of hunting accidents		N/A
38	Number of students graduating from hunter education courses		Hunter Safety and Ranges
39	Number of Hunters Served		Game Management - Hunting Opportunities
	N/A		Hunting and Game Management Coordination and Oversight

LRPP Exhibit V: Identification of Associated Activity Contributing to Performance Measures

Measure Number	Approved Performance Measures for FY 2008-09 (Words)		Associated Activities Title
40	Percent of critical habitat (hot spots) protected through land acquisition, lease or management contract		N/A
41	Percent of wildlife species whose biological status is stable or improving		N/A
42	Number of acres managed for wildlife		Manage and Restore Public Lands
43	Number of written technical assists provided		Plan and Coordinate Habitat and Land Use
44	Number of survey and monitoring projects		N/A
45	Acres of fish and wildlife habitat purchased		Land Acquisition
46	Number of recovery plan actions implemented		Protect Manatees, Sea Turtles, Panthers and Black Bears
47	Number of water acres where habitat rehabilitation projects have been completed		Manage and Restore Freshwater & Marine Habitats
48	Percent of Florida's public water bodies in which Hydrilla, water hyacinth and water lettuce are under maintenance control		N/A
new request	Number of native fish and wildlife species with stable or increasing populations		Protect Nongame Fish and Wildlife
New request	Number of exotic species with management plans written		158 Prevent Introduction of and Eliminate Undesirable Exotic Species

LRPP Exhibit V: Identification of Associated Activity Contributing to Performance Measures

Measure Number	Approved Performance Measures for FY 2008-09 (Words)		Associated Activities Title
49	Percent of Angler Satisfaction		Lakes and Rivers Fisheries Management
			Freshwater Fisheries Administration
50	Number of Water bodies Acres Managed to Improve Fishing		Freshwater Fish Stocking
			Freshwater Fisheries Administration
51	Number of Fish Stocked		Lakes and Rivers Fisheries Management
			Freshwater Fisheries Administration
52	Percent of index Lakes where Fish populations are stable or increasing		Lakes and Rivers Fisheries Management
			Freshwater Fisheries Administration

LRPP Exhibit V: Identification of Associated Activity Contributing to Performance Measures

Measure Number	Approved Performance Measures for FY 2007-08 (Words)		Associated Activities Title
53	Number of artificial reefs created and or maintained		ACT 5200 - Artificial Reef Management
54	Percent of fisheries stocks that are increasing or stable		ACT 5000 - Marine Fisheries Management
55	Number of educational and outreach contacts		ACT 5100 - Marine Fisheries Education and Outreach
56	Number of fishery management plans reviewed and analysis completed		ACT 5000 - Marine Fisheries Management
57	Number of Marine Fisheries Service contacts		ACT 5500 - Marine Fisheries Commercial Services

LRPP Exhibit V: Identification of Associated Activity Contributing to Performance Measures

Measure Number	Approved Performance Measures for FY 2008-09 (Words)		Associated Activities Title
58	Number of technical and analytical GIS remote sensing requests completed and GIS oil spill training assistance provided		GIS Technical Support and Services
59	Number of fisheries assessment and data summaries conducted		Fisheries Assessment
60	Number of requests for status of endangered and threatened species and wildlife completed		Imperiled Species and Wildlife Assessment
61	Number of red tide and aquatic health assessments completed		Harmful Algal Bloom & Aquatic Health Monit. & Assess.
62	Number of manatees rehabilitated		Manatee Rehabilitation
63	Number of requests for assessment of seagrass, salt marsh, mangrove, coral, aquatic, and upland habitat		Habitat Monitoring and Assessment

FISH AND WILDLIFE CONSERVATION COMMISSION		FISCAL YEAR 2007-08			
SECTION I: BUDGET		OPERATING		FIXED CAPITAL OUTLAY	
TOTAL ALL FUNDS GENERAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT			243,651,252	38,861,097	
ADJUSTMENTS TO GENERAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT (Supplementals, Vetoes, Budget Amendments, etc.)			(4,555,275)	(500,000)	
FINAL BUDGET FOR AGENCY			239,095,977	38,361,097	
SECTION II: ACTIVITIES * MEASURES		Number of Units	(1) Unit Cost	(2) Expenditures (Allocated)	(3) FCO
<i>Executive Direction, Administrative Support and Information Technology (2)</i>					129,136
Fisheries Assessment * Number of fisheries assessments and data summaries conducted		161,572	118.47	19,140,736	
Imperiled Species And Wildlife Assessments * Number of requests for status of endangered and threatened species and wildlife		100,330	72.31	7,254,544	
Harmful Algal Bloom And Aquatic Health Monitoring And Assessment * Number of red tide and aquatic health assessments completed		385,009	20.97	8,072,740	
Habitat Monitoring And Assessment * Number of requests for assessments or seagrass, saltmarsh, or mangrove, coral, aquatic, and upland habitat		29,002	65.50	1,899,740	
Gis Technical Support And Services * Number of technical and analytical GIS remote sensing requests completed and GIS oil spill training assistance provided		760	5,588.80	4,247,486	
Manatee Rehabilitation * Number of Manatees Rehabilitated		59	19,490.95	1,149,966	
Recreational Licenses And Permits * Number of Recreational Licenses and Permits Issued		2,327,555	1.13	2,620,241	
Commercial Licenses And Permits * Number Commercial fishing and wildlife licenses, permits and tags issued		2,811,497	0.43	1,216,572	
Conservation Stewardship: Educate Citizens About Fish And Wildlife Conservation * Number of people reached with conservation messages		3,245,697	0.03	98,471	
Hunter Safety And Ranges * Number of students graduating from Hunter Safety courses		10,587	152.07	1,609,977	
Media Relation - Inform And Educate Citizens About Fish And Wildlife Messages * Number of People reached with fish and wildlife messages		6,190,601	0.24	1,490,731	
Florida Wildlife Magazine * Annual Distribution		100,000	3.86	385,713	
Public Awareness And Economic Development * # of multi-yr hunting and fishing licenses & # of rural counties counseled/natural-based recreation		22	1,419.09	31,220	
Land Acquisition * Acres of fish and wildlife habitat purchased		3,327	182.48	607,112	14,500,000
Conservation Coordination * Number of request from other agencies and the number of agency rules that are processed		1,493	293.49	438,175	
Uniform Patrol And Investigations * Number of patrol and investigation hours		966,045	74.68	72,143,543	1,130,000
Inspections * Number of Inspections		4,500	426.08	1,917,374	
Aviation * Number of flight hours		3,337	730.24	2,436,799	
Boating And Waterways * Number of boating and waterway projects supported		476	11,313.82	5,385,376	9,466,097
Field Services * Number of service/repair hours		19,744	262.84	5,189,424	
Training * Hours of training completed		39,636	56.57	2,242,131	
Manage And Restore Public Lands * Number of acres managed for wildlife		5,737,012	4.70	26,966,905	5,875,000
Game Management - Hunting Opportunities * Number of hunters served		166,669	25.38	4,230,259	
Plan And Coordinate Habitat And Land Use * Number of written technical assists provided		299	7,518.30	2,247,971	
Wildlife Viewing Recreation * Number of Floridians and visitors engaged in wildlife viewing/interpretive materials to enhance		4,137,660	0.33	1,350,881	
Protect Manatees, Sea Turtles, Panthers And Black Bear * Number of recovery plan actions implemented		46	44,000.33	2,024,015	
Manage And Restore Freshwater And Marine Habitats * Number of water acres where habitat projects have been completed		87,836	109.37	9,606,438	6,000,000
Protect Nongame Fish And Wildlife * Number of native fish and wildlife species with stable or increasing populations		362	6,753.63	2,444,813	
Prevent Introduction Of And Eliminate Undesirable Exotic Species * Number of exotic species with management plans written		6	147,149.50	882,897	
Lakes And Rivers Freshwater Fisheries Management * Number of Water Bodies and Acres Managed to Improve Fishing		1,049,106	4.85	5,085,190	
Freshwater Fish Stocking * Number of Fished Stocked		2,352,275	0.70	1,653,192	
Marine Fisheries Management * Number of Fishery Management Plans Reviewed and Analysis Conducted		15	46,403.27	696,049	
Marine Fisheries Education And Outreach * Number of Educational and Outreach Contacts		328,623	3.01	990,140	
Artificial Reef Management * Number of Reefs Created and/or Monitor		117	9,770.49	1,143,147	700,000
Marine Fisheries Commercial Services * Number of Marine Fisheries Service Contacts		416,443	1.53	636,762	
TOTAL				199,536,730	37,800,233
SECTION III: RECONCILIATION TO BUDGET					
PASS THROUGHS					
TRANSFER - STATE AGENCIES					
AID TO LOCAL GOVERNMENTS					
PAYMENT OF PENSIONS, BENEFITS AND CLAIMS					
OTHER				14,535,531	
REVERSIONS				25,023,757	560,864
TOTAL BUDGET FOR AGENCY (Total Activities + Pass Throughs + Reversions) - Should equal Section I above. (4)				239,096,018	38,361,097

SCHEDULE XI/EXHIBIT VI: AGENCY-LEVEL UNIT COST SUMMARY

- (1) Some activity unit costs may be overstated due to the allocation of double budgeted items.
- (2) Expenditures associated with Executive Direction, Administrative Support and Information Technology have been allocated based on FTE. Other allocation methodologies could result in significantly different unit costs per activity.
- (3) Information for FCO depicts amounts for current year appropriations only. Additional information and systems are needed to develop meaningful FCO unit costs.
- (4) Final Budget for Agency and Total Budget for Agency may not equal due to rounding.

ACTIVITY ISSUE CODES SELECTED:

TRANSFER-STATE AGENCIES ACTIVITY ISSUE CODES SELECTED:

1-8:

AID TO LOCAL GOVERNMENTS ACTIVITY ISSUE CODES SELECTED:

1-8:

THE FOLLOWING STATEWIDE ACTIVITIES (ACT0010 THROUGH ACT0490) HAVE AN OUTPUT STANDARD (RECORD TYPE 5) AND SHOULD NOT:

*** NO ACTIVITIES FOUND ***

THE FCO ACTIVITY (ACT0210) CONTAINS EXPENDITURES IN AN OPERATING CATEGORY AND SHOULD NOT:
 (NOTE: THIS ACTIVITY IS ROLLED INTO EXECUTIVE DIRECTION, ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT AND INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY)

*** NO OPERATING CATEGORIES FOUND ***

THE FOLLOWING ACTIVITIES DO NOT HAVE AN OUTPUT STANDARD (RECORD TYPE 5) AND ARE REPORTED AS 'OTHER' IN SECTION III: (NOTE: 'OTHER' ACTIVITIES ARE NOT 'TRANSFER-STATE AGENCY' ACTIVITIES OR 'AID TO LOCAL GOVERNMENTS' ACTIVITIES. ALL ACTIVITIES WITH AN OUTPUT STANDARD (RECORD TYPE 5) SHOULD BE REPORTED IN SECTION II.)

BE	PC	CODE	TITLE	EXPENDITURES	FCO
77650200	1406000000	ACT0650	FWRI - ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES AND	6,267,751	
77200100	1202000000	ACT2500	LAW ENFORCEMENT ADMINISTRATION	2,515,769	
77350200	1406000000	ACT3550	HABITAT AND SPECIES CONSERVATION	4,635,737	
77300200	1406000000	ACT3900	HUNTING AND GAME MANAGEMENT	385,205	
77400200	1406000000	ACT4500	FRESHWATER FISHERIES ADMINISTRATION	259,681	
77500200	1406000000	ACT5400	MARINE FISHERIES ADMINISTRATION	471,388	

TOTALS FROM SECTION I AND SECTIONS II + III:

DEPARTMENT: 77	EXPENDITURES	FCO
FINAL BUDGET FOR AGENCY (SECTION I):	239,095,977	38,361,097
TOTAL BUDGET FOR AGENCY (SECTION III):	239,096,018	38,361,097
DIFFERENCE:	41-	
(MAY NOT EQUAL DUE TO ROUNDING)	=====	=====

THE FOLLOWING STATEWIDE ACTIVITIES (ACT0010 THROUGH ACT0490) HAVE AN OUTPUT STANDARD (RECORD TYPE 5)
AND SHOULD NOT:

*** NO ACTIVITIES FOUND ***

THE FCO ACTIVITY (ACT0210) CONTAINS EXPENDITURES IN AN OPERATING CATEGORY AND SHOULD NOT:
(NOTE: THIS ACTIVITY IS ROLLED INTO EXECUTIVE DIRECTION, ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT AND INFORMATION
TECHNOLOGY)

*** NO OPERATING CATEGORIES FOUND ***

FWCC -Glossary of Terms and Acronyms

Aquatic Gap Analysis: - A method for developing a computerized map of the locations of biological resources in aquatic ecosystems, identifying hot spots of aquatic biodiversity, and analyzing aquatic biodiversity in relation to watershed land practices to locate gaps in the protection system.

ARC – An analysis tool for Geographic Information Systems (GIS)

Artificial Reefs – A marine reef is one or more natural or manmade objects intentionally prepared and purposefully placed on the sea floor to mimic some aspects of a natural reef in order to influence physical, biological or socio-economic processes related to living marine organisms for fisheries, nature conservation, habitat restoration, or recreation purposes.

Change Detection Analysis –A method of analyzing satellite imagery to identify locations and types of changes in land use (e.g., urban, agriculture, mining) and land cover over time.

CDPD – Cellular Digital Packet Data; communications technology that supports access to the internet. Allow mobile units to connect to the internet.

Customer Service – Those individuals who use the Commissions products or services whether or not they directly pay for them.

Geographic Information System – The computer hardware, software, and peripherals (e.g., printers, plotters, digitizing tablet) used to create maps and perform spatially explicit analyses.

Hard Bottom - Coral communities lacking the coral diversity, density and reef development of patch and outer bank reefs. Some hard bottom is more appropriately termed hard banks, organic banks or simply banks.

Hunter Education Program – A federally funded section within the Office of Information Services charged with developing and administering course curriculums as required by Florida Statutes 372.5717, a Hunter Safety course for certification and Jr. Hunter Safety Courses. Additional hunter education related programs include; development, construction, and maintenance of public shooting ranges, administering the Becoming an Outdoors Women Workshops, and managing a Hunter Education/Outdoors Skills Training Center with a resident summer camp program.

Hybrid Striped Bass – The offspring by breeding a striped bass with a white bass.

Continued
FWCC -Glossary of Terms

Loaner PFD – Personal floatation device (life Jacket) loaned to public by FWC officers on patrol.

Manatee Recovery Plan Tasks – Specific action defined in the Recovery Plan for the Florida manatee, published by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

Outreach – A form of education that integrates research, management and customer service. It involves generating, transmitting, applying and preserving information for the direct benefit of external audiences in ways that are consistent with the agency mission.

Project Eagle – A cooperative litter clean-up campaign that involves the FWC and other public/private entities.

Put-Grow-and Take Stocking – A type of fish stocking in which fish are stocked (put in the water) and allowed to grow for a period of time before harvest.

Special Opportunity Hunts - These are high quality hunts established by the Commission on a limited entry basis where there are low hunter densities and a high probability of success. Application and permit fees are established and administered separately from traditional public hunts and application fees (\$5 each) are nonrefundable.