



**Florida Fish
and Wildlife
Conservation
Commission**

Commissioners

Rodney Barreto
Chair
Miami

Kathy Barco
Jacksonville

Ronald M. Bergeron
Fort Lauderdale

Richard A. Corbett
Tampa

Dwight Stephenson
Delray Beach

Kenneth W. Wright
Winter Park

Brian S. Yablonski
Tallahassee

Executive Staff

Kenneth D. Haddad
Executive Director

Victor J. Heller
Assistant Executive
Director

Karen Ventimiglia
Deputy Chief of Staff

Office of the
Executive Director
Kenneth D. Haddad
Executive Director
(850) 487-3796
(850) 921-5786 FAX

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

620 South Meridian Street
Tallahassee, Florida
32399-1600
Voice: (850) 488-4676

Hearing/speech impaired:
(800) 955-8771 (T)
(800) 955-8770 (V)

MyFWC.com

September 30, 2009

Mr. Jerry L. McDaniel, Director
Office of Policy and Budget
Executive Office of the Governor
Room 1701
Tallahassee, Florida 32399-0001

Ms. JoAnne Leznoff, Council Director
House Full Appropriations Council on General Government & Health Care
221 Capitol
Tallahassee, Florida 32399-1300

Mr. Skip Martin, Council Director
House Full Appropriations Council on Education & Economic Development
221 Capitol
Tallahassee, Florida 32399-1300

Ms. Cynthia Kelly, Staff Director
Senate Policy and Steering Committee on Ways and Means
201 Capitol
Tallahassee, Florida 32399-1300

Re: Long Range Program Plan

Dear Directors:

Pursuant to Chapter 216, *Florida Statutes*, the Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission's Long Range Program Plan (LRPP) for FY 2010-2011 through FY 2014-2015 is submitted in the format prescribed in the budget instructions.

The information has been provided electronically and I have approved this submission. To the best of my knowledge, the information is true and accurate.

If you have any questions, please contact Ms. Sandra Wilson at (850) 488-6551.

Sincerely,

Kenneth D. Haddad
Executive Director

kdh/jms

cc: Mr. Glenn Reagan, Governor's Office of Policy and Budget
Ms. Sandra Wilson, FWC, Office of Executive Director

FLORIDA FISH AND WILDLIFE CONSERVATION COMMISSION

Final



LONG RANGE PROGRAM PLAN

FY 2010-2011 THROUGH 2014-2015

SUBMITTED - SEPTEMBER 30, 2009

Rodney Barreto - Chairman

Kathy Barco - Vice-Chairman

Richard A. "Dick" Corbett

Dwight Stephenson

Kenneth W. Wright

Ronald M. Bergeron

Brian S. Yablonski

Mission Statement

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

Goals

To provide for healthy resources and satisfied customers

FLORIDA FISH AND WILDLIFE CONSERVATION COMMISSION

OBJECTIVES

- 1) OBJECTIVE 1A: TO PROVIDE FOR INCREASING OR STABLE FISH AND WILDLIFE POPULATIONS
- 2) OBJECTIVE 2A: TO INCREASE THE NUMBER OF CUSTOMERS AND CONTINUE TO PROVIDE CUSTOMER SATISFACTION

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 2010-11	FY 2011-12	FY2012-13	FY2013-14	FY2014-15
38%	39%	39%	40%	40%	41%

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

Baseline/ Year	FY 2010-11	FY 2011-12	FY2012-13	FY2013-14	FY2014-15
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 2010-11	FY 2011-12	FY2012-13	FY2013-14	FY2014-15
80%	80%	80%	80%	80%	80%

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

Baseline/ Year	FY 2010-11	FY 2011-12	FY2012-13	FY2013-14	FY2014-15
973,920	1,032,488	1,052,105	1,072,095	1,093,322	1,098,789

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

Baseline/ Year	FY 2010-11	FY 2011-12	FY2012-13	FY2013-14	FY2014-15
100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

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

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

Baseline/ Year	FY 2010-11	FY 2011-12	FY2012-13	FY2013-14	FY2014-15
-0.1%	5%	0.4%	0.3%	0.3%	0.3%

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

Baseline/ Year	FY 2010-11	FY 2011-12	FY2012-13	FY2013-14	FY2014-15
0%	2%	2%	2%	2%	2%

OUTCOME 2C Percent of satisfied hunters

Baseline/ Year	FY 2010-11	FY 2011-12	FY2012-13	FY2013-14	FY2014-15
80%	80%	80%	80%	80%	80%

OUTCOME 2D Percent of satisfied freshwater anglers

Baseline/ Year	FY 2010-11	FY 2011-12	FY2012-13	FY2013-14	FY2014-15
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) exercises the regulatory and executive powers of the state with respect to wild animal life and exercises 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 networked laptop computers for use during the meeting to enter and organized their comments.

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 (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 an Agency Strategic Plan (ASP) containing a mission, vision, agency goal, elements of success, guiding principles, values, competencies, strategies and priority issues. In late 2006, FWC revised and condensed the ASP to streamline it and make it easier to understand. The overall strategic direction of the agency did not change in this revision (Attachment B).

When FWC began developing plans for implementing the ASP, we realized we were not optimally organized to deliver on the Plan. We concluded that we were merged as a result of the 1998 constitutional change and action of the 1999 Florida Legislature, but not well 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.

One solution was to align like functions, flatten the organization, and provide better support to our mainline programs. This resulted in a proposed restructuring of the agency designed to better deliver on the ASP and become more efficient.

The restructuring primarily (1) integrated biological conservation and research functions to better focus on the habitat, user conflict and species issues identified by stakeholders, while

maintaining our core focuses on fishing, hunting, and fish and wildlife law enforcement; and (2) better organized internal support functions into Offices that serve to support the Programs.

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

As structured today, FWC has six Divisions: Habitat and Species Conservation, Fish and Wildlife Research Institute, Law Enforcement, Marine Fisheries Management, Freshwater Fisheries Management, and Hunting & Game Management.

Twelve offices support these Divisions or provide other external services. These are: Finance and Budget, Legal, Human Resources, Licensing and Permitting, Recreation Services, Information Technology, Data Portal, Community Relations, Legislative Affairs, Planning and Policy Coordination, Inspector General, and Regional Operations.

To support the priorities developed in the ASP, divisions and offices maintain various implementation plans for their units that specifies actions to be taken in timeframes from one year to five years.

A description of each Division and Office follows:

Habitat and Species Conservation

With a goal of ensuring healthy, diverse fish and wildlife populations for future generations, the Division of Habitat and Species Conservation uses a mixture of the best available science, applied habitat management and successful partnerships.

To provide the greatest benefits to the widest possible array of fish and wildlife species, projects are designed on the ecosystem or landscape scale. The work includes:

- aquatic habitat management for marine, estuarine and freshwater systems;
- habitat management for terrestrial systems, including public lands management;
- land acquisition;
- scientific support and assistance for habitat-related issues to private and public sector landowners, including local, state and federal governments;
- species management and recovery plan development;
- non-native species coordination focused on prevention and control divisions;
- Florida manatee, Florida black bear, Florida panther and sea turtle population recovery.
- acres of public water bodies managed
- acres of invasive exotic upland plants managed

Law Enforcement

The Division of Law Enforcement represents about half of the agency's personnel. The division is a partner with other state law enforcement agencies in Florida's Mutual Aid Plan, administered by the Department of Community Affairs. Officers perform search and rescue, as well as provide information and law enforcement service and assistance to citizens and visitors alike. The division emphasizes compliance with

- fishing and hunting regulations,

- state and federal laws that protect threatened and endangered species,
- laws dealing with commercial trade of wildlife and wildlife products, and
- boating safety laws and regulations.

Fish and Wildlife Research Institute

The Fish and Wildlife Research Institute's work includes assessment and restoration of ecosystems and studies of freshwater and marine fisheries, aquatic and terrestrial wildlife, imperiled species, and red tides. The institute develops the information science required to analyze and disseminate research products and engages in outreach activities to compliment all programs.

Marine Fisheries Management

The Division of Marine Fisheries Management develops regulatory and management recommendations for consideration by FWC Commissioners designed to ensure the long-term conservation of Florida's valuable marine fisheries resources. The director of the division serves as a liaison to a number of federal agencies on marine issues and is the state's representative on the Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council and South Atlantic Fishery Management Council.

Freshwater Fisheries Management

The Division of Freshwater Fisheries Management (DFFM) provides expertise on freshwater fish populations, angler use, or other aspects of freshwater fisheries needed for management decisions by the FWC, and to assess impacts of decisions made by others to ensure quality fisheries and fishing in selected Florida lakes, fish management areas, rivers and streams.

Hunting and Game Management

The Division of Hunting and Game Management provides for the safe and responsible use of wildlife species that are hunted. Specifically, it:

- offers scientific expertise on game wildlife such as alligators, deer, small game, waterfowl and wild turkeys;
- develops science-based management strategies for game wildlife, including hunting regulations;
- provides hunter safety training and certification to citizens through volunteer instructors.
- develops and manages public shooting ranges;
- develops regulations and brochures for wildlife management areas, wildlife and environmental areas, and other public hunting areas throughout the state.

Finance and Budget

The Finance and Budget Office is responsible for the FWC's accounting and operational services and for central agency budget support for all programs and offices.

Community Relations

The Community Relations (CR) Office coordinates the public-communication efforts of the divisions and offices. These efforts include issuing news releases on agency programs and activities and serving as media spokespersons. CR coordinates activities to inform Floridians and visitors of the role and value of Florida's fish and wildlife resources and to foster a sense of stewardship for these resources.

[Licensing & Permitting](#)

The Office of Licensing and Permitting provides a coordinated point of contact for customers to obtain [licenses and permits](#), and it coordinates the agency's efforts to provide answers to general information questions from the public. The Licensing and Permitting section processes all licenses and permits issued by FWC, making them available at over 900 agent and tax collector locations, through the Internet and by telephone. This section also processes commercial freshwater and saltwater licenses, and captive wildlife licenses.

[Executive Director](#)

The executive director provides day-to-day administrative leadership for more than 1,875 full-time and 840 OPS employees of Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission. The director serves at the pleasure of the Commissioners, and any new appointee the Commissioners select must also be confirmed by the Senate.

[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 Office of Human Resources assists FWC employees in areas such as payroll, benefits, attendance and leave, retirement and workers' compensation. The office also serves as a resource and contact for Equal Employment Opportunity, Affirmative Action and Americans with Disabilities Act issues.

[Recreation Services](#)

The Office of Recreation Services (ORS) provides opportunities for Floridians and visitors to [view wildlife](#) and experience the rugged expanses of Florida's [wildlife management area system](#). ORS staffs work with agency biologists to develop wildlife-viewing sites and recreational trails. We also develop [recreation guides and interpretive products](#) to increase visitors' enjoyment and understanding of wildlife and wildlife habitat and how the FWC works to sustain them. ORS staffs develop statewide wildlife-viewing projects such as the [Great Florida Birding Trail](#) and provide technical assistance to local governments and other agencies to help them develop wildlife-viewing sites and programs that conserve wildlife habitat while creating economic benefits in their

communities. Hundreds of volunteers help develop recreational trails, offer interpretive programs and conduct conservation work through the volunteer projects coordinated by this office.

Information Technology

The Office of Information Technology provides technical support and guidance to each program and office within the FWC to help them meet the business goals and priorities of their areas. Key components include enabling the creation, manipulation, storage, management and rapid retrieval of information and providing appropriate tools to navigate those resources. There are currently seven areas of expertise: Desktop Services, Network Services, Application Services, Internet Services, SharePoint and Collaboration Services, Records Management and Telecommunications Management.

Legislative Affairs

The Legislative Affairs Office is responsible for the Commission's legislative program: developing legislation and support information and serving as the central point of contact for legislators and their staffs for information about the FWC's programs and activities.

The office coordinates the Commission's legislative lobbying efforts and prepares legislative proposals, as well as any planning, policy and budgetary analyses or recommendations on legislative bills. This information helps the Legislature, Governor's Office and the public understand the Commission's legislative proposals. In addition, the Legislative Affairs Office handles agency Congressional issues.

Office of Planning and Policy Coordination

In 2009, FWC merged two offices: The Strategy and Planning Office (SPO) and the Office of Policy and Stakeholder Coordination (OPSC). The new office is the Office of Planning and Policy Coordination (OPPC). OPPC services are:

- Overall FWC strategic planning and assessment
- Operational measurement and analysis
- Performance improvement methodology and support
- Human Dimensions coordination
- FWC inter-agency commenting coordination
- FWC rule-development management
- External stakeholder engagement and facilitation
- Climate change team coordination, Florida Wildlife Legacy Initiative representative, and stakeholder database management
- Teaming coordinator and internal facilitation assignment

Inspector General

The Office of Inspector General (OIG) provides a central point for coordination of and responsibility for activities that promote accountability, integrity and efficiency within the FWC. The OIG 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 whistle-blower statute and complaints involving alleged sexual harassment.

Office of Regional Operations

Five regional FWC offices coordinate and integrate agency programs at the local level to ensure the FWC’s mission, policies, and service are consistent across the state. These offices maintain effective and inclusive internal and external communications. Each regional director provides an access point to the FWC’s leadership on a local level, serving as liaison with federal, state and local government officials within each specific region.

Teams, Working Groups and Management Plans

FWC has also determined that greater use of issue teams that involve knowledgeable staff from different divisions and offices would lead to greater integration and more effective implementation fish and wildlife conservation priorities. The current teams are listed in part below and this list also serves to identify important priorities of the FWC.

Habitat and Human Interaction Teams	Species Conservation Teams
Critical Wildlife Areas Policy	Florida Black Bear
Disaster Preparedness	Management and Regulation of Harvested Non-Game Wildlife
Gopher Tortoise Permit System	Wildlife 2060
Climate Change	Peregrine Falcon Management Plan
Human Dimensions of Wildlife	Shorebird Working Group
Off Road Vehicles (ORV)	Species Ranking
Sandhill Management	Wildlife Diseases
Wildlife Legacy Initiative	
Volunteers	
Social Media/Networking	

FWC has also adopted a strategy of developing management plans for priority species that have been identified as imperiled. These Florida specific management plans are the result of an imperiled species listing process that includes extensive public input, internal scientific recommendations, and external scientific expertise. Current management plans are in place for the following priority species:

- [Bald Eagle](#)
- [Florida Manatee](#)
- [Gopher Tortoise](#)
- [Flatwoods Salamander](#)
- [Peregrine Falcon](#)
- [Red-cockaded Woodpecker](#)
- [Miami Blue Butterfly](#)

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

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 caused by 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

A number of marine fish species are declining because of unsustainable harvest pressure and habitat degradation. 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 the number of contacts with the public fluctuate based on a number of factors outside the control of FWC that include: staff vacancies, natural disasters or unusual weather, resource use by the public, and demands for homeland security directed patrols. Current economic conditions have limited or reduced funding for law enforcement operations. These factors eventually negatively affect the opportunities for officers to make direct public contacts. We project these 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 project an increase of 5% in licenses issued by FWC in FY 2010-11. The increase will result from a new saltwater license that is required for anglers to fish from shorelines. In the fiscal

years beyond FY 2010-11, we expect license sales to fluctuate nominally. Many factors affect the demand for licenses, e.g., interest in fishing and hunting, general economic conditions, fuel prices, and demographic and sociological trends.

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

FWC will continue to move towards providing more information, reports, publications and other material via the internet. We are reducing traditional printing and associated costs. We expect delivery of information to the public to continue to increase even though traditional distribution of FWC printed materials may decrease.

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. State Bird

This proposal would change the designation of Florida's state bird from the Northern Mockingbird to the Osprey, a bird that better represents the uniqueness of Florida. The proposed new state bird was chosen by Florida's 4th – 8th graders in an on-line election, November 4, 2008, National Election Day.

2. Commercial Saltwater Fishing License Clarification

This proposal clarifies that a resident commercial saltwater products license (SPL) also authorizes a commercial fisherman to recreationally fish. Currently, this authorization is stated in the recreational saltwater fishing statute, s. 379.353 (2) (k), F.S., but not in the SPL statute, s.379.361, F.S. This proposal does not change the intent of current law, but rather would clarify the authorization in both sections of law, and would allow the agency to qualify for additional federal match monies tied to recreational licenses that are available through the federal Sport Fish Restoration Program.

g. List of changes, which would require legislative action, including the elimination of programs, services and / or activities

The proposed changes listed in question f. above will require legislative action.

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

Vessel Mooring Study

Chapter 2009-86, Laws of Florida (CS/CS/HB/1423) directs the Commission, in consultation with the Florida Department of Environmental Protection, to establish a pilot program for exploring options in regulating the anchoring of non-live-aboard vessels outside the marked boundaries of public mooring fields. FWC is developing a process to solicit and rank projects for selection by the Commission for the pilot program.

Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission Advisory Entities

Advisory Group Name	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 individual FWC-managed areas. These areas 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 Last Revised - 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 that will include specific and measurable outcome objectives."

Performance Measures and Standards- LRPP Exhibit II

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 2009-10 (Words)	Approved Prior Year Standard FY 2008-09 (Numbers)	Prior Year Actual FY 2008-09 (Numbers)	Approved Standards for FY 2009-10 (Numbers)	Requested FY 2010-11 Standard (Numbers)
Compliance with recreational and commercial licensing rules and law	99%	99.9%	99%	99%
Percent change in licensed anglers	1.00%	-2.87%	1.00%	1.00%
Percent change in the number of licensed hunters	-2.00%	3.51%	-2.00%	-2.00%
Number of recreational licenses and permit issued	2,300,000	2,320,896	2,300,000	2,300,000
Number of wildlife and freshwater fishing commercial licenses and permits issued	84,405	151,509	84,405	84,405
Number of commercial and other marine fishing license processed	2,049,835	2,200,900	2,049,835	2,049,835
Number of rural counties counseled regarding use of nature-based recreation as an economic development tool*	28	22	28	22
Number of people reached with fish and wildlife messages	4,327,601	5,564,304	4,327,601	4,327,601
Economic impact of fishing, hunting and wildlife viewing(dollars/jobs)	\$10.1 Billion / 105,636	\$11.8 Billion / 124,664	\$10.1 Billion / 105,636	\$10.1 Billion / 105,636
Number of people reached with conservation messages	3,188,500	3,545,645	3,188,500	3,188,500
Florida Wildlife Magazine - annual distribution	50,000	100,000	50,000	90,000
Administrative costs as a percent of total agency costs	6.39%	5.55%	6.39%	6.39%
Administrative positions as a percent of total agency positions	8.58%	8.32%	8.58%	8.58%
Administrative costs per division	1,238,089	1,330,328	1,238,089	1,238,089
Administrative positions per division	14.5 FTE	12.5 FTE	14.5 FTE	14.5 FTE

* Title change Request - "Number of counties counseled regarding use nature-based recreation as an economic development tool"

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 2009-10 (Words)	Approved Prior Year Standard FY 2008-09 (Numbers)	Prior Year Actual FY 2008-09 (Numbers)	Approved Standards for FY 2009-10 (Numbers)	Requested FY 2010-11 Standard (Numbers)
Compliance with specified commission rules and state law	81.4%	90%	81.4%	81.4%
Response time to emergency calls	43 minutes	55 minutes	43 minutes	43 minutes
Number of recreational boating injuries	450	386	450	450
Number of warnings, arrests, and convictions	127,692	91,031	127,692	127,692
Number of vessels checked	320,345	223,089	320,345	320,345
Aircraft down time	<5.1 day/month/aircraft	<5 day/month/aircraft	<5.1 day/month/aircraft	<5.1 day/month/aircraft
Communications equipment down time	<2.5 day/year/radio	<1.9 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	1,020,042	930,391	930,391
Number of vessel safety inspections	320,345	223,089	320,345	320,345
Total number of boating accidents investigated	1,292	657	1,292	1,292
Number of patrol hours	861,026	823,318	861,026	861,026
Number of investigative hours	69,365	196,724	69,365	69,365
Number of officers and recruits trained	737	821	737	737
Number of enforcement flight hours	4,821	3,050	4,821	4,821
Number of boats repaired	351	913	351	351
Number of equipment repairs	3,282	5,356	3,282	3,282
Number of data-related information requests fulfilled	156	149	156	156
Number of regulatory zones properly permitted	50	40	50	50
Number of boating safety education cards issued	20,000	23,964	20,000	20,000

LRPP Exhibit II - Performance Measures and Standards

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

Program: Wildlife	Code: 77300000
Service/Budget Entity: Hunting and Game Management	Code: 77300200

NOTE: Approved primary service outcomes must be listed first.

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2009-10 (Words)	Approved Prior Year Standard FY 2008-09 (Numbers)	Prior Year Actual FY 2008-09 (Numbers)	Approved Standards for FY 2009-10 (Numbers)	Requested FY 2010-11 Standard (Numbers)
Percent of satisfied hunters	80%	83%	80%	80%
Number of students graduating from hunter education courses	10,000	12,652	10,000	10,000
Number of recreational sites	144	161	144	144
Number of hunting accidents	10	21	10	10
Number of Hunters Served	150,000	168,990	150,000	150,000

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 2009-10 (Words)	Approved Prior Year Standard FY 2008-09 (Numbers)	Prior Year Actual FY 2008-09 (Numbers)	Approved Standards for FY 2009-10 (Numbers)	Requested FY 2010-11 Standard (Numbers)
Percent of critical habitat (hot spots) protected through land acquisition, lease or management contract	44.0%	45.6%	44.0%	44.0%
Percent of wildlife species whose biological status is stable or improving	48.7%	49.00%	48.7%	48.7%
Number of acres managed for wildlife	5,539,815	5,784,585	5,539,815	5,539,815
Number of written technical assists provided	204	283	204	204
Number of survey and monitoring projects	195	184	195	195
Acres of fish and wildlife habitat purchased	2,800	2,983.43	2,800	2,800
Number of recovery plan actions implemented	44	53	44	44
Number of water acres where habitat rehabilitation projects have been completed	69,592	69,838	69,592	69,592
Number of acres of public water bodies managed	1,250,000	1,250,000	1,250,000	1,250,000
Acres of public conservation lands infested with upland invasive exotic plants that have been managed	80,345	266,774	80,345	80,345

LRPP Exhibit II - Performance Measures and Standards

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

Program: Freshwater Fisheries	Code: 77400000
Service/Budget Entity: Freshwater Fisheries Management	Code: 77400200

NOTE: Approved primary service outcomes must be listed first.

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2009-10 (Words)	Approved Prior Year Standard FY 2008-09 (Numbers)	Prior Year Actual FY 2008-09 (Numbers)	Approved Standards for FY 2009-10 (Numbers)	Requested FY 2010-11 Standard (Numbers)
Number of Water Bodies acres managed to improve fishing	904,781	1,471,885	904,781	904,781
Number of Fish Stocked	3,600,000	2,035,324	3,600,000	3,600,000
Percent angler satisfaction	75%	75%	75%	75%
Percent of Index Lakes where Fish Population are stable or increasing	70%	78%	70%	70%

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 2009-10 (Words)	Approved Prior Year Standard FY 2008-09 (Numbers)	Prior Year Actual FY 2008-09 (Numbers)	Approved Standards for FY 2009-10 (Numbers)	Requested FY 2010-11 Standard (Numbers)
Percent of fisheries stocks that are increasing or stable	80%	72%	80%	80%
Number of fishery management plans reviewed and analysis completed*	15	38	15	30
Number of educational and outreach contacts	350,000	1,246,820	350,000	350,000
Number of artificial reefs created and/or monitored	175	134	175	175
Number of marine fishery services contacts	179,650	216,431	179,650	179,650
* Note that a title change is requested to "Number of fisheries management issues for which analysis was conducted and/or completed"				30

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 2009-10 (Words)	Approved Prior Year Standard FY 2008-09 (Numbers)	Prior Year Actual FY 2008-09 (Numbers)	Approved Standards for FY 2009-10 (Numbers)	Requested FY 2010-11 Standard (Numbers)
Number of fisheries assessment and data summaries conducted	149,602	184,638	149,602	149,602
Number of technical and analytical GIS remote sensing requests completed and GIS oil spill training assistance provided	1,470	889	1,470	180,000
Number of requests for status of endangered and threatened species and wildlife completed	99,522	93,301	99,522	99,522
Number of red tide and aquatic health assessments completed	200,947	400,382	200,947	200,947
Number of manatees rehabilitated	52	76	52	52
Number of requests for assessments of seagrass, salt marsh, mangrove, coral, aquatic, and upland habitat	28,207	16,786	28,207	28,207

**Assessment of Performance for
Approved Performance Measures -
LRPP Exhibit III**

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
Measure: Percent change in licensed anglers

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
1.00%	-2.87%	-1.87%	187%

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 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 license fees were increased and there were large increases in the cost of gasoline resulting in lower numbers of people fishing and traveling to Florida to fish.

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:

Past experiences with license fee increases suggest that anglers put off by the price increase will come back over the next 2 years.

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

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

External Factors (check all that apply):

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

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 thus limits the agency's ability to meet this measure. Also request changing the measure to remove the word "rural" so assistance provided to other than rural counties may be applied to this measure.

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

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

Recommendations: Attempting to provide more resources online.

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
Measure: Administrative costs as a percent of total agency cost

Action:

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Performance Assessment of <u>Outcome</u> Measure | <input checked="" 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
6.39%	5.03%	-1.36%	-1.36%

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other (Identify) |

Explanation: The data source had to be revised due to the reorganization

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: The Community Relations 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.

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: Executive Direction and Administrative Services

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

Measure: Administrative position as a percent of total agency positions

Action:

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Performance Assessment of <u>Outcome</u> Measure | <input checked="" 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
8.58%	8.32%	-0.26%	-0.26%

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other (Identify) |

Explanation: The data source had to be revised due to the reorganization

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: The Community Relations 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.

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: Executive Direction and Administrative Services
Service/Budget Entity: Office of Executive Direction and Administrative Support Services
Measure: Administrative position per division

Action:

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Performance Assessment of <u>Outcome</u> Measure | <input checked="" 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
14.5 FTE	12.5 FTE	-2.00 FTE	-2.00%

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other (Identify) |

Explanation: The data source had to be revised due to the reorganization

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: The Community Relations 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.

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: 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%	89.6%	8.2	10%

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: Response Time to Emergency Calls

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
43 minutes	55 minutes	12	27%

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other (Identify) |

Explanation:

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.

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, 2009

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:

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

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
450	386	64	- 14%

Factors Accounting for the Difference:

Internal Factors (check all that apply):

- Personnel Factors
- Competing Priorities
- Previous Estimate Incorrect
- Staff Capacity
- Level of Training
- 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):

- 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

Office of Policy and Budget – July, 2009

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 |
| <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
127,692	91,031	36,661	-28%

Factors Accounting for the Difference:

Internal Factors (check all that apply):

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

Explanation:

The Division had 98 sworn vacancies at the beginning of this reporting period. These vacancies, coupled with the time required to hire and train personnel to fill vacant positions, negatively impacted our ability to achieve this standard.

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

Office of Policy and Budget – July, 2009

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 |
| <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
320,345	223,089	97,256	- 20%

Factors Accounting for the Difference:

Internal Factors (check all that apply):

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

Explanation:

The Division had 98 sworn vacancies at the beginning of this reporting period. These vacancies, coupled with the time required to hire and train personnel to fill vacant positions, negatively impacted our ability to achieve this standard.

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

Office of Policy and Budget – July, 2009

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 |
| <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
<5.1 day/month/aircraft	<5 day/month/aircraft	.1	- 1.9%

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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:

- | | |
|---|--|
| <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
<2.5 day/year/radio	<1.9 day/year/radio	.6	- 24%

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:

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):

- | | |
|--|---|
| <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: 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 |
| <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
930,391	1,020,042	89,651	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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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

Office of Policy and Budget – July, 2009

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 |
| <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
320,345	223,089	97,256	- 30%

Factors Accounting for the Difference:

Internal Factors (check all that apply):

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

Explanation:

The Division had 98 sworn vacancies at the beginning of this reporting period. These vacancies, coupled with the time required to hire and train personnel to fill vacant positions, negatively impacted our ability to achieve this standard.

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

Office of Policy and Budget – July, 2009

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 Boating Accidents Investigated

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
1,292	657	635	- 49%

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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 number of accidents that occur and are reported directly impact the number of boating accident investigations. 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

Office of Policy and Budget – July, 2009

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 |
| <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
861,026	823,318	37,708	- 4.3%

Factors Accounting for the Difference:

Internal Factors (check all that apply):

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

Explanation:

The Division had 98 sworn vacancies at the beginning of this reporting period. These vacancies, coupled with the time required to hire and train personnel to fill vacant positions, negatively impacted our ability to achieve this standard.

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, 2009

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 |
| <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
69,365	196,724	127,359	183%

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other (Identify) |

Explanation:

Standard Achieved. Reporting processes have been revised to better define and capture investigative hours – this contributed to the increase in actual performance results. As these processes are refined, statistics for this measure may fluctuate. 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

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 Officers and Recruits Trained

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
737	821	84	11.3%

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other (Identify) |

Explanation:

Standard Achieved. The actual performance results includes officers, recruits, and reserve officers.

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, 2009

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 Enforcement Flight Hours

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
4,821	3,050	1,771	- 36.7%

Factors Accounting for the Difference:

Internal Factors (check all that apply):

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

Explanation:

Budget restrictions caused by increased fuel costs and labor rates contributed to fewer flight hours for this reporting period. Additionally, one pilot position was vacant for most of the reporting period – which resulted in a loss of approximately 400 flight hours.

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, 2009

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:

- | | |
|---|--|
| <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
351	913	562	160%

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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):

- | | |
|--|---|
| <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, 2009

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 |
| <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
3,282	5,356	2,074	63%

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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

Office of Policy and Budget – July, 2009

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 |
| <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
156	149	7	- 4%

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other (Identify) |

Explanation:

Standard Achieved. 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

Office of Policy and Budget – July, 2009

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 Regulatory Zones Properly Permitted

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
50	40	10	- 20%

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other (Identify) |

Explanation:

The overall economic downturn has reduced the number of permit requests. Counties and municipalities have fewer funds available for uniform waterway marker permits – which negatively impacts applications for permits and 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, 2009

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 |
| <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
20,000	23,964	3,964	19.8%

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 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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

Office of Policy and Budget – July, 2009

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%	82.9%	2.9%	3.6%

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:

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 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	161	17	11.8

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 | <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 2009

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	21	11	110%

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: 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	12,652	2,652	26.5%

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	168,990	18,990	12.7%

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: 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 checked="" 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: Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission

Program: Freshwater Fisheries

Service/Budget Entity: Freshwater Fisheries Management

Measure: Number of waterbodies acres managed to improve fishing

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
904,781	1,471,885	567,104	63%

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: 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	2,035,324	-1,564,675	-43%

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 2008-09 , a total of 2,035,324 fish were stocked in public waterbodies which was 85% of the original number requested. Additional fishes were produced for research activities. Unseasonably cold weather conditions resulted in the loss of largemouth bass fry produced in outdoor ponds. Drought conditions resulted in cancelling the majority of bluegill and redear sunfish requests. Channel catfish produced at the hatchery, but being grown out at a federal hatchery, were lost to environmental conditions. Clinical trials and research on advanced fingerling largemouth bass utilized both indoor space and hatchery pond availability.

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: Freshwater Fisheries

Service/Budget Entity: Freshwater Fisheries Management

Measure: Percent of Index Lakes where population are stable or increasing

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
70%	77.6%	7.6%	10%

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: 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	134	-41	-23.43%

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: The Environmental Protection Agency mandated monitoring of Escambia County's Oriskany Reef (polychlorinated biphenyl levels in fish tissue) which counted for only one monitoring effort. A similar amount of funds could have funded more basic reef monitoring events of a less costly nature. In addition, the target for reefs monitored by agency personnel per federal SFR grant F-42 was not achieved due to extensive time spent on the final phase of the U.S.S Hoyt Vandenberg Project.

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: Insufficient monetary resources were available to fund all projects that would have met the target standard. Also there was a change in the grant cycle time frame so that reef construction projects that originally would have been completed and counted by June 30, 2009 had until August 31, 2009 for completion.

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: Increase annual funding for artificial reef construction and monitoring from \$700,000 to \$800,000.

LRPP Exhibit III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT

Department: Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission

Program: Marine Fisheries

Service/Budget Entity: Marine Fisheries Management

Measure: Percent of fishery stocks that are increasing or stable

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
80%	72%	-8%	10%

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:

Not applicable

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:

The reason that our actual performance results were below 80% was due to the way the data is combined to obtain the statewide estimate and the high number of species with insufficient data to calculate their status. When the data are examined by coast, the percent of fish stocks increasing or stable on the Gulf coast is 83% and only 61% on the Atlantic coast. Thus, when combining these percentages, the statewide percent is less than our approved standard of 80% because of the percentage on the Atlantic coast. One of the reasons why the Atlantic coast's percentage is lower than expected is because 36% of the species on the Atlantic coast have insufficient data (compared to only 17% with insufficient data on the Gulf coast). These data deficiencies are contributing to the appearance of lower performance on the Atlantic coast.

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

Training

Technology

Personnel

Other (Identify)

Recommendations:

Many of the species that are found on the Atlantic coast of Florida occur in both state and federal waters and thus are managed by the FWC, the South Atlantic Fisheries Management Council, and the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission. Recently, many stocks along the Atlantic coast are being assessed at the federal level and ones that are found to be in decline, overfished, or undergoing overfishing are being examined by the federal entities for more restrictive management actions in order to correct these problems. Likewise, these federal entities and the FWC are constantly striving to improve our data collection on species that occur in Florida waters and federal waters. Thus, we believe that within the next two to three years that the performance measures on the Atlantic coast will continue to improve as these fisheries begin to rebound and as more data are collected for these species.

Office of Policy and Budget – July 2009

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 technical and analytical GIS remote sensing requests completed and GIS oil spill training assistance provided

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
1,470	889	-581	-39.5

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 III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT

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:

- 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
99,552	93,301	-6,221	-6.3%

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: We received fewer requests than anticipated.

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: The sea turtle program has begun submitting sea turtle stranding reports on-line to National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) and users are downloading them from the NMFS site instead of FWC distributing weekly and monthly reports. It's a new requirement from NMFS.

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

- Training Technology
- Personnel Other (Identify)

Recommendations: User initiated access to sea turtle stranding data is more efficient, however FWC has lost the ability to track the number of times data is distributed in this manner. FWC will work with its partner, NMFS, to put a counter on the NMFS web site that will allow FWC to track the number of downloads.

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 requests for assessments of seagrass, salt marsh, mangrove, coral, aquatic, and upland habitat

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
28,207	16,786	-11,421	-40.5%

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: Fewer requests than anticipated were received.

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: Fewer requests than anticipated were received.

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: Performance measure could be revised to reflect average of prior years' data. However, an increase in federal funding for coral work is expected in FY 2010-11 that will likely increase the actual performance results.

Performance Measures Validity and Reliability - LRPP Exhibit IV

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission

Program: Executive Direction and Administrative Services

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

Measure: Compliance with recreational and commercial licensing rules and 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:

Two types of data are used to generate this measure: law enforcement citations and the number of recreational and commercial licenses issued.

Law Enforcement Citations

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.

Issuance of Recreational and Commercial Licenses

Recreational and Commercial licenses and permits are purchased and recorded through there respective systems, primarily the Total Licensing System (TLS) for recreational licenses and permits and the Commercial Saltwater Licensing (CSL) system for commercial license.

Methodology

The number of citations and warnings for license violations divided by the number of licenses issued (Recreational hunting and fishing, wildlife, Fresh and Saltwater commercial fishing licenses) subtracted from 100% giving percent in complacence.

Validity:Law Enforcement Citations

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.

Issuance of Recreational and Commercial Licenses

The systems used to compile this data are appropriate for this and other measures. These systems are proven systems used for collection of payments, issuance of licenses and permits, and accounting for the collection revenue.

Reliability:Law Enforcement Citations

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 actually 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.

Issuance of Recreational and Commercial Licenses

This data may be relied upon because it is validated by the customer acquiring the license or permit for accuracy and is reconciled by accounting against revenue deposits.

Office of Policy and Budget – July, 2009

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: 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 not previously approved or for which validity, reliability and/or methodology information has not been provided.

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%

Office of Policy and Budget – July, 2009

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: 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 nor previously approved or for which validity, reliability and/or methodology information has not been provided.

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%

Office of Policy and Budget – July 2009

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: 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 recreational licenses and permit issued

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:

FWC has contracted with Central Government Systems, Inc. to provide a unified system for selling recreational fishing and hunting licenses and permits through all four of our sales channels (Retail Stores, Tax Collectors, Internet, and Telephone). This system, called the Total License System (TLS) started processing license and permits (L&P) as a pilot in July of 2003 and has been used to sell all recreational fishing and hunting L&P since November, 2003.

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 – July, 2009

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: 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 not previously approved or for which validity, reliability and/or methodology information has not been provided.

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 – July 2009

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: 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 nor previously approved or for which validity, reliability and/or methodology information has not been provided.

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 – July, 2009

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission

Program: Executive Direction and Administrative Services

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

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

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

Validity: A variety of services are provided to counties including wildlife viewing economic and visitation data and reports; Wildlife Viewing staff participate in or provide information to other FWC staff participating in county Evaluation and Reappraisal comprehensive plan workshops; and hold nature-based tourism workshops for local governments. (Please note: 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 thus limit the agency's ability to meet this measure. Agency provides assistance with a focus on rural counties but does not limit it to rural counties.)

Reliability: Reliability of this measure is documented through mail records, workshop advertisements and attendance records.

Office of Policy and Budget – July, 2009

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission

Program: Executive Direction and Administrative Services

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

Measure: Number of people reached with fish and wildlife messages.

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 data is obtained from different sources (ex: management area maps, hunting, fishing, duck & dove regulations distributed, news releases, websites)

Validity:

The data is valid because it can be supported by documentation maintained in Community Relations.

Reliability:

The measure is reliable because it provides data that is being captured through publications, websites, news releases, etc., reaching many people with fish and wildlife messages.

Office of Policy and Budget – July, 2009

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission

Program: Executive Direction and Administrative Services

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

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

Action (check one):

- Requesting Revision to Approved Measure
- Change in Date 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 2008 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 – July, 2009

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission

Program: Executive Direction and Administrative Services

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

Measure: Number of people reached with conservation messages.

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 data is obtained from different sources (ex: Project WILD, Great Florida Birding Trail, Florida Monthly, Bear info, websites, etc.)

Validity:

The data is valid because it can be supported by documentation maintained in Community Relations.

Reliability:

The measure is reliable because it provides data that is being captured through publications, websites, etc., reaching many people with conservation messages.

Office of Policy and Budget – July, 2009

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission

Program: Executive Direction and Administrative Services

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

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 Relations 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, July 2009

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission

Program: Executive Direction and Administrative Services

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

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 Relations 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 and Wildlife Conservation Commission

Program: Executive Direction and Administrative Services

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

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 Relations 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 – July, 2009

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission

Program: Executive Direction and Administrative Services

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

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 Relations 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 and Wildlife Conservation Commission

Program: Executive Direction and Administrative Services

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

Measure: Florida Wildlife Magazine

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 distribution of magazines, featuring hunting, fishing, Florida habitat, wildlife viewing, etc.

Validity:

The data is valid because it can be supported by documentation maintained in Community Relations.

Reliability:

The measure is reliable because it provides the number of magazines being distributed by subscriptions, special mailing lists, events, etc.

Office of Policy and Budget – July, 2009

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: 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: 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 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.

Office of Policy and Budget – July, 2009

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.

Office of Policy and Budget – July, 2009

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: Total Number of Hours Spent in Preventative Patrol and Investigations

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 and 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 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: Total Number of Boating Accidents Investigated

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 accidents using the Florida Boating Accident report. Reports completed by Commission officers are 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 again reviewed by the boating safety staff and data entered by agency OPS personnel. Boating and Waterways then 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 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 the 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 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 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.

Office of Policy and Budget – July, 2009

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 Enforcement Flight 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:

Pilots utilize a Flight Data Record (database) system developed by our agency to document flights and prepare reports. Flight logs are reviewed by the pilot's supervisor and sent to Tallahassee to the Aviation Section for review. The Staff Assistant compiles a report of total activity and gives it to the Aviation Administrator for review. The Department of Management Services requires that we maintain our own records and that we report total hours flown each year.

Validity:

The database provides accurate data collection and is routinely checked for accuracy and completeness.

Reliability:

Flight data is reviewed by two levels of supervision and is routinely checked for accuracy and completeness.

Office Policy and Budget – July, 2009

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.

Office of Policy and Budget – July, 2009

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 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 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 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.

Office of Policy and Budget – July, 2009

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, 2009

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 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, 2009

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, 2009

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%

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Fish and 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, 2009

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission

Program: Habitat Species Conservation Program

Service/Budget Entity: Habitat Species Conservation

Measure: Percent of Wildlife Species whose biological status is Stable or Improving

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 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, 2009

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Fish and 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:

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.

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:

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.

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:

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.

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, 2009

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission

Program: Habitat Species Conservation

Service/Budget Entity: Habitat Species Conservation

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 methods for logging written technical assistance responses has improved through the development of on-line database systems including FWC's Landowner Assistance Program (LAP) database, Agency Commenting Log and Florida Department of Transportation's (FDOT) Environmental Screening Tool. For accountability purposes, only written forms of technical assistance are included in our actual performance results. Maintaining accurate records for verbal or on-site requests has proven difficult. Public and private landowners request wildlife-related technical assistance from the Commission in the form of management plan development or review, site-specific wildlife management prescriptions, and permit application review and assistance. These requests are handled primarily by Commission staff through FWC's Landowner Assistance Program, agency commenting on regulated land use activities, and review and input to federal-owned lands such including wildlife refuges, national forests, and military installations.

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 LAP database, Office of Planning and Policy Coordination's Agency Commenting Log and the FDOT Environmental Screening Tool (EST).

2. The measuring instrument is include Share Point databases maintained by the Division of Habitat and Species Conservation and Office of Planning and Policy Coordination that tracks all written requests from public and private landowners and archives related responses. The FDOT's EST is a web application that maintains project –related information, including FWC technical assistance to highway projects.

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, 2009

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission

Program: Habitat Species Conservation Program

Service/Budget Entity: Habitat Species Conservation

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.

Data Sources and Methodology: 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 People First supports the number of survey and monitoring projects identified by the Commission. People First 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 People First. 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 People First entries. Staff identify species work time and location for each survey and monitoring project they work on.

2. The measuring instrument (People First) 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, 2009

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Fish and 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 In holdings 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, 2009

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission

Program: Habitat Species Conservation Program

Service/Budget Entity: Habitat Species Conservation Program

Measure: Number of Recovery Plan Tasks Implemented

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:

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 Fish and Wildlife Research Institute.

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, 2009

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission

Program: Habitat Species Conservation

Service/Budget Entity: Habitat Species Conservation

Measure: Number of Water 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:

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.

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:

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.

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:

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.

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.

Office of Policy and Budget – July, 2009

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission

Program: Habitat and Species Conservation – Invasive Plant Management

Service/Budget Entity: Invasive Plant Control

Measure: Number of acres of public water bodies managed

Action (check one):

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure. Requested change in Measure Language: **Number of acres of public water bodies managed.**
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure.
- Backup for performance measure.

Data Sources and Methodology:

Invasive Plant Management Section (section) staff annually survey all sovereign, freshwater lakes and rivers that have improved boat ramps accessible to the public for invasive aquatic plants. Historically, more than 80% of the section's control budget has been spent managing 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. Acreage of invasive aquatic plants is estimated annually by staff conducting on the water surveys. Invasive plants are controlled using chemical, mechanical and physical control methods. Contractors submit forms that list the water body where invasive plants were controlled, dates plant control occurred, plant species controlled, acres controlled, and method of control used. Data related to survey and control is stored in data base and excel files in Tallahassee.

Validity:

Monitoring the number of acres of invasive plants is a valid measure for determining if plant control efforts funded under this budget are resulting in protection of public water bodies from the invasion of non-native or undesirable plants. Because invasive plants 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:

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 approximately the same time each year to reduce seasonal plant growth biases. Data is entered into a web-based database and is verified against information on the original field survey form. Control data is recorded by contractors on a standardized form. Contractors fill out one form for each water body for each week that control is performed on that water body.

Acres of plants controlled are listed by plant type or species. These forms are reviewed and approved by field staff before being sent to Tallahassee for input into an excel spreadsheet. Field staff conducts random monitors of work performed by contractors. Control data submitted by contractors is verified by staff through field surveys to ensure that reported acres treated are accurate and to make sure that effective control occurred with out damage to non-target species.

Office of Policy and Budget – July, 2009

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: Upland Invasive Plant Control

Measure: Acres of public conservation lands infested with upland invasive exotic plants that have been managed

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 Invasive Plant Management Section, Uplands Program staff annually contract for plant control on publicly-managed conservation lands throughout the state. The total of conservation land in the state is estimated at 11 million acres, of which an estimated 1,650,000 acres is infested to some degree by invasive plants. The goal of the Uplands Program is two-fold: (1) to provide initial control on all infested acres and (2) to ensure maintenance control on all previously treated acres. Plant acreage is estimated by the land manager requesting project funding. The actual number of acres managed is reported by the contractor on a daily work log. This information is stored in database files in Tallahassee and annually updated. The information is made available in an annual report published by mid-March of the following fiscal year.

Validity:

Reporting the number of acres of plants managed is a valid measure for determining if plant control efforts funded under this budget are resulting in protection of public conservation lands from the invasion of non-native plants. Initial treatment will be required until all infested acres have received treatment. Because many species of invasive plants re-grow quickly, and because eradication is not feasible, many acres are re-treated over successive years. Re-treatment is necessary to maintain control; however, the amount of maintenance control needed on a site will decrease over time (absent re-infestation). The total acres managed in a year is directly dependent on funding. A standard of 80,345 acres managed is based upon receiving the base program funding of \$8,686,929.

Reliability:

A standardized daily work log is used by contractors to record data. Data is compiled and verified against information in the original scope of work provided by the land manager. Acres of plants controlled are listed by plant type or species. These forms are reviewed and approved by designated site managers before being sent to Tallahassee for input into an excel spreadsheet. Section staff conducts random monitors of work performed by contractors. Control data submitted by contractors is verified by staff through field surveys to ensure that reported acres treated are accurate and to make sure that effective control occurred with out damage to non-target species.

Office of Policy and Budget – July, 2009

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission

Program: Freshwater Fisheries

Service/Budget Entity: Freshwater Fisheries Management

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.

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission

Program: Freshwater Fisheries

Service/Budget Entity: Freshwater Fisheries Management

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

Office of Policy and Budget – July, 2009

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission

Program: Freshwater Fisheries

Service/Budget Entity: Freshwater Fisheries Management

Measure: Number of Fish Stocked

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 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: Freshwater Fisheries

Service/Budget Entity: Freshwater Fisheries Management

Measure: Percent of index Lakes where fish populations 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: The data sources for this measure are from fish collections from at least 45 lakes located around the state. Lakes were chosen for this index to include a wide variety of conditions found in Florida. They range in size from 47 ha to 182,000 ha; range in fertility from oligotrophic to hyper-eutrophic; are located from Walton County in the panhandle to Collier County in South Florida; and range in habitats from sparsely vegetated (<5% lake coverage) to heavily vegetated (>90% lake coverage). Fishery independent monitoring will consist of one sampling period per lake. During each period, all species of fish will be collected by electro fishing from each lake and portions of the St. Johns River along pre-determined transects for estimates of species composition, relative abundances and size structure. Fish are identified to species measured and weighed when possible. If weights are not taken, weights are estimated from standard length-weight regressions for that species. The procedure used to measure this indicator includes the creation of an index which includes the addition of three measured parameter: (1) electro fishing catch rate of all fish by weight, inclusive of sport fish; (2) electro fishing catch rate of sport fish by weight; and (3) number of species collected. A change in index by 25% for each lake will be considered to be significant. Based on this 25% change, the health of the fish population will be classified as either stable or increasing or decreasing.

Validity: The data is valid because it can be supported by a fisheries database maintained by the Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission. Electro fishing catch rates are utilized nationally to provide information about fish populations. The sources of the index incorporate total fish production (catch rates of all fish), management objectives (sport fish catch rates) and diversity (number of species collected). The significant change of 25% threshold was subjectively determined by Florida freshwater fisheries experts based on sampling and natural population variability.

Reliability: The data is reliable because it is supported by a fisheries database maintained by the Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission. The significant change of 25% threshold, subjectively determined by Florida freshwater fisheries experts based on sampling and natural population variability was incorporated to assure repeatability. The data will continue to be complete because of a commitment by the Division of Freshwater Fisheries Management to Florida Lakewatch, administered by the University of Florida.

Office of Policy and Budget – July, 2009

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

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.

Office of Policy and Budget – July, 2009

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

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 Services

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

(http://www.myfwc.com/RECREATION/Saltwater_index.htm) 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 requirements, monofilament recovery and recycling, and fish identification. Web site user sessions are monitored by web usage analytic software. Numbers of user visits 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 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, 2009

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

Measure: Number of fisheries management plans reviewed and analysis completed

Action (check one):

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

The data sources and methodology have been adjusted to include items that should be included in the count for this measure but until now have not been included because they were not issues that appeared on Commission Meeting Agendas. DMFM is also requesting a revision of the title to clarify and reflect actual data elements included with the revised methodology.

Current Title:

Measure: Number of fisheries management plans reviewed and analysis completed.

Requested Title:

Measure: Number of fisheries management issues for which analysis was conducted and/or completed

Data Sources and Methodology:

The Fisheries Management Issue spreadsheet is maintained by the Management Subsection of the Division of Marine Fisheries Management office at 2590 Executive Center Circle East, Tallahassee. The data are organized into three categories.

Items taken before the Commission

Items that are researched by staff and ultimately go before the Commission for deliberation and possible action are included in this category. This category includes items that are noticed on an agenda and presented to the Commission during a regularly scheduled meeting in the form of a review and discussion, consent agenda, draft rule, stock assessment update, and final public hearing. These items could be acted on by the Commission for possible rulemaking and all items in this category appear on the Commission's agendas for their publicly noticed meetings. Items in this category also may or may not be discussed at publicly noticed workshops outside of a regularly scheduled Commission meeting.

Items analyzed for possible FWC action

Items that are in the process of being analyzed or reviewed by staff to determine if they should be taken before the Commission are included in this category. This category includes items that might ultimately appear in the “Items taken before the Commission” category and items that may never appear before the Commission due to the results of the research and analyses done by staff. If the Commission takes up an item, the item will move out of this category and into the “Items taken before the Commission” category. Items in this category consume considerable staff time even though they may or may not appear before the Commission. Items in this category also may or may not be discussed at publicly noticed workshops.

Items researched analyzed for possible South Atlantic Fishery Management Council (SAFMC), Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council (GMFMC), Gulf States Marine Fisheries Commission (GSMFC), Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission (ASMFC), and Highly Migratory Species (HMS Division of National Marine Fisheries Service) federal action that have a direct bearing on FWC management.

The Division of Marine Fisheries Management (DMFM) has a representative on both the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council (SAFMC) and the Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council (GMFMC), which are two of the regional Councils established by the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (reauthorized in 2007). These Councils create and amend federal management plans and recommend management actions to the U.S. Department of Commerce for species that occur in federal waters of the Gulf of Mexico and Atlantic Ocean. DMFM also has a representative on the Gulf States Marine Fisheries Commission (GSMFC) and the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission (ASMFC), which are two federally funded interstate Commissions that coordinate management of fisheries that cross state water boundaries. DMFM also works with the Highly Migratory Species (HMS) Division, which is a special division of the National Marine Fisheries Service that deals with fisheries that range across international boundaries. All of these entities make decisions that ultimately affect the citizens of the State of Florida and may be taken up by our Commission for potential Florida rulemaking. If the Commission takes up an item in this category, the item will move from this category and into the “Items taken before the Commission” category. Items in the current category are researched by staff for deliberation and possible action at each of the meetings of these entities. Items in this category consume considerable staff time even though they may or may not appear before the Commission.

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.

Reliability:

There is a moderate high probability that this measure will be reliable subject to verification of procedures and data. The description of the reporting system structure is documented. Responsible program manager will review and verify all performance data to be submitted. Documentation is to be maintained by responsible staff when maintaining the issue spreadsheet.

Office of Policy and Budget – July, 2009

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

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, workshop participants, number of saltwater products fishers and wholesale dealers who are contacted for purposes of developing economic descriptions of fisheries, number of commercial trap fishery license holders whose traps are collected through the trap retrieval program, 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.

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:

FWRI's Center for Spatial Analysis provides a variety of GIS and remote sensing products and services in response to requests from government, industry, academia and the public. These include: provision of 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; custom GIS applications and tools that help present and analyze the data in a more meaningful and user-friendly manner.

GIS Support and Services – Requests for Information (RFI): The GIS Support and Services data source reflects just Requests for Information (RFI) that involves personal contact between staff and the requestor. The methodology includes face-to-face, phone, mail and email contacts. We do not count user-initiated data and map downloads that are handled entirely by the user in this data source. 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. The estimated revised count for the GIS Support and Services (RFI) is 750.

Internet Map Services: This added data source for the activity reflects Geographic Information System (GIS) web page usage. Many of our GIS Internet Map Services are accessed by non-FWC users, who view, query and download data and information. We feel that recording "Website Service Visits and Downloads" is a valid methodology to track information conveyed to users via GIS Internet Map Services. The estimated annual count for this user initiated service is 179,000.

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. IS&M staff 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*. The estimated annual count is 8.

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.

Office of Policy and Budget – July 2009

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:

Catch and effort information is collected from commercial anglers through a legislatively mandated marine fisheries trip ticket program. Approximately 350,000 tickets from seafood are processed yearly. Catch and effort information from recreational anglers is collected through scientifically valid survey techniques. Anglers are intercepted at docks, piers, bridges, etc. to obtain estimates of catch rates and species composition. Survey models are used to estimate total catch and effort by wave (two month), mode (boat, charter, head, and beach bank) and species.

Biological research on age, growth, genetic identification and reproduction of fishery species or complexes provides the background life history parameters for stock assessments and interpreting the results of fisheries monitoring and anglers' observations. Approximately 25 individual species are being studied at any one time. Biological research also examines the impact of fishing gear on targeted stocks as well as non-targeted by catch.

Estimates of recruitment and relative abundance of selected species are developed through standard, scientifically valid survey monitoring techniques using fisheries independent methodologies. Surveys are conducted in estuarine systems where most of Florida's fisheries species are first recruited. Sampling is designed to target selected fishery species of high importance and all associated environmental and ecological information including non-fishery species collected in conjunction with the target species are enumerated.

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.

Office of Policy and Budget – July 2009

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.

Annual count of the number of information requests completed. This figure is compiled by totaling the following: the number of requests for information that were completed on the InfoRequest system for the section; the number of Monthly Mortality Reports mailed out for both manatees and turtles; 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.

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.

Office of Policy and Budget – July 2009

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, cause respiratory irritation in humans and have been implicated in 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 staff at FWRI in St. Petersburg evaluates water and sediment samples collected from around the state. 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 returned 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 the 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.

Office of Policy and Budget – July 2009

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 reimbursed by FWC as provided in Section 370.0603 (3), Florida Statute. Once rehabilitated, 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 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. Each report is responded to with a returned phone call or e-mail to obtain further details. Acute damage such as illegal removal of mangroves or seagrass damage due to groundings are usually accurately reported; however, cumulative damage or loss such as long-term prop-scarring or seagrass loss due to 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. The need to conserve habitats is reinforced. A page on the FWRI website informs the public of the importance of seagrass habitat.

The decision to investigate the habitat damage or loss is made by Habitat Research staff. The criteria include the location and extent of the damaged area, species and area of seagrass, saltmarsh or seagrass 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. Results of evaluations are provided 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 Law Enforcement, Florida Keys National Marine Sanctuary staff, and other government agencies (primarily County environmental resource officials). Each report is responded to with a returned phone call or e-mail to obtain further details. Major 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 handles smaller anchoring damages.

Damages caused by offshore cable laying operations are usually reported. Calls for potential coral damages with beach renourishment and offshore gas pipelines are also being received. A page on the FWRI website informs the public of our response activities.

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.

Office of Policy and Budget – July 2009

**Associated Activities Contributing to
Performance Measures -
LRPP Exhibit V**

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

Measure Number	Approved Performance Measures for FY 2009-10 (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 2009-10 (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 2009-10 (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 2009-10 (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

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

Measure Number	Approved Performance Measures for FY 2009-10 (Words)		Associated Activities Title
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

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

Measure Number	Approved Performance Measures for FY 2009-10 (Words)		Associated Activities Title
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 2009-10 (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 2009-10 (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	Number of acres of public water bodies managed		Manage Invasive Aquatic Plants in Public Waterways
49	Acres of public conservation lands infested with upland invasive exotic plants that have been managed		Manage Invasive Exotic Upland Plants on Public Conservation Lands

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

Measure Number	Approved Performance Measures for FY 2009-10 (Words)		Associated Activities Title
50	Percent of Angler Satisfaction		Lakes and Rivers Fisheries Management
			Freshwater Fisheries Administration
51	Number of Water bodies Acres Managed to Improve Fishing		Freshwater Fish Stocking
			Freshwater Fisheries Administration
52	Number of Fish Stocked		Lakes and Rivers Fisheries Management
			Freshwater Fisheries Administration
53	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 2009-10 (Words)		Associated Activities Title
54	Number of artificial reefs created and or maintained		ACT 5200 - Artificial Reef Management
55	Percent of fisheries stocks that are increasing or stable		ACT 5000 - Marine Fisheries Management
56	Number of educational and outreach contacts		ACT 5100 - Marine Fisheries Education and Outreach
57	Number of fishery management plans reviewed and analysis completed		ACT 5000 - Marine Fisheries Management
58	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 2009-10 (Words)		Associated Activities Title
59	Number of technical and analytical GIS remote sensing requests completed and GIS oil spill training assistance provided		GIS Technical Support and Services
60	Number of fisheries assessment and data summaries conducted		Fisheries Assessment
61	Number of requests for status of endangered and threatened species and wildlife completed		Imperiled Species and Wildlife Assessment
62	Number of red tide and aquatic health assessments completed		Harmful Algal Bloom & Aquatic Health Monit. & Assess.
63	Number of manatees rehabilitated		Manatee Rehabilitation
64	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 2008-09			
SECTION I: BUDGET		OPERATING		FIXED CAPITAL OUTLAY	
TOTAL ALL FUNDS GENERAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT		258,565,968		28,949,489	
ADJUSTMENTS TO GENERAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT (Supplementals, Vetoes, Budget Amendments, etc.)		45,549,729		-5,946,995	
FINAL BUDGET FOR AGENCY		304,115,697		23,002,494	
SECTION II: ACTIVITIES * MEASURES		Number of Units	(1) Unit Cost	(2) Expenditures (Allocated)	(3) FCO
Executive Direction, Administrative Support and Information Technology (2)					0
Fisheries Assessment * Number of fisheries assessments and data summaries conducted		184,638	104.38	19,271,717	500,000
Imperiled Species And Wildlife Assessments * Number of requests for status of endangered and threatened species and wildlife		93,301	81.24	7,579,887	
Harmful Algal Bloom And Aquatic Health Monitoring And Assessment * Number of red tide and aquatic health assessments completed		400,382	18.53	7,418,084	
Habitat Monitoring And Assessment * Number of requests for assessments or seagrass, saltmarsh, or mangrove, coral, aquatic, and upland habitat		16,786	126.42	2,122,012	
Gis Technical Support And Services * Number of technical and analytical GIS remote sensing requests completed and GIS oil spill training assistance provided		889	4,775.93	4,245,805	
Manatee Rehabilitation * Number of Manatees Rehabilitated		76	15,122.03	1,149,274	
Recreational Licenses And Permits * Number of Recreational Licenses and Permits Issued		2,320,896	1.18	2,733,004	
Commercial Licenses And Permits * Number Commercial fishing and wildlife licenses, permits and tags issued		2,352,409	0.63	1,478,703	
Hunter Safety And Ranges * Number of students graduating from Hunter Safety courses		12,652	145.54	1,841,401	51,717
Public Awareness And Economic Development * Number of rural counties counseled regarding use of nature-based recreation as an economic tool		22	1,856.95	40,853	
Land Acquisition * Acres of fish and wildlife habitat purchased		2,983	226.68	676,198	4,519,250
Conservation Coordination * Number of request from other agencies and the number of agency rules that are processed		727	751.45	546,305	
Uniform Patrol And Investigations * Number of patrol and investigation hours		1,020,042	72.24	73,691,702	
Inspections * Number of inspections		4,920	307.94	1,515,087	
Aviation * Number of flight hours		3,050	871.23	2,657,246	
Boating And Waterways * Number of boating and waterway projects supported		527	12,442.96	6,557,442	7,465,777
Field Services * Number of service/repair hours		32,532	247.74	8,059,512	
Training * Hours of training completed		36,672	74.26	2,723,242	
Manage And Restore Public Lands * Number of acres managed for wildlife		5,784,585	4.57	26,457,256	1,785,000
Game Management - Hunting Opportunities * Number of hunters served		168,990	24.34	4,112,411	
Plan And Coordinate Habitat And Land Use * Number of written technical assists provided		283	8,760.81	2,479,308	
Wildlife Viewing Recreation * Number of Floridians and visitors engaged in wildlife viewing		4,137,660	0.36	1,495,896	
Protect Manatees, Sea Turtles, Panthers And Black Bear * Number of recovery plan actions implemented		53	42,269.79	2,240,299	
Manage And Restore Freshwater And Marine Habitats * Number of water acres where habitat projects have been completed		69,838	114.02	7,962,646	2,000,000
Protect Nongame Fish And Wildlife * Number of native fish and wildlife species with stable or increasing populations		358	14,284.65	5,113,905	
Prevent Introduction Of And Eliminate Undesirable Exotic Species * Number of exotic species with management plans written		6	150,445.67	902,674	
Manage Invasive Aquatic Plants In Public Waterways * Number of acres of public water bodies managed		1,250,000	22.94	28,673,117	
Manage Invasive Exotic Upland Plants On Public Conservation Lands * Number of acres of invasive exotic upland plants managed		266,774	50.55	13,484,947	
Lakes And Rivers Freshwater Fisheries Management * Number of Water Bodies and Acres Managed to Improve Fishing		1,471,885	3.69	5,431,863	
Freshwater Fish Stocking * Number of Fishes Stocked		2,035,324	0.85	1,736,393	
Marine Fisheries Management * Number of Fishery Management Plans Reviewed and Analysis Conducted		38	19,488.97	740,581	
Marine Fisheries Education And Outreach * Number of Educational and Outreach Contacts		1,246,820	0.67	831,237	
Artificial Reef Management * Number of Reefs Created and/or Monitor		134	2,687.42	360,114	1,700,000
Marine Fisheries Commercial Services * Number of Marine Fisheries Service Contacts		216,431	3.20	692,949	
TOTAL				247,023,070	18,021,744
SECTION III: RECONCILIATION TO BUDGET					
PASS THROUGHS					
TRANSFER - STATE AGENCIES					
AID TO LOCAL GOVERNMENTS					
PAYMENT OF PENSIONS, BENEFITS AND CLAIMS					
OTHER				16,637,064	
REVERSIONS				40,455,645	4,980,750
TOTAL BUDGET FOR AGENCY (Total Activities + Pass Throughs + Reversions) - Should equal Section I above. (4)				304,115,779	23,002,494

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	5,776,640	
77100700	1602000000	ACT1225	CONSERVATION STEWARDSHIP: EDUCATE	80,689	
77100700	1602000000	ACT1250	MEDIA RELATION - INFORM AND EDUCATE	1,284,096	
77100700	1602000000	ACT1270	FLORIDA WILDLIFE MAGAZINE	363,082	
77200100	1202000000	ACT2500	LAW ENFORCEMENT ADMINISTRATION	2,689,198	
77350200	1406000000	ACT3550	HABITAT AND SPECIES CONSERVATION	5,441,237	
77300200	1406000000	ACT3900	HUNTING AND GAME MANAGEMENT	307,245	
77400200	1406000000	ACT4500	FRESHWATER FISHERIES ADMINISTRATION	245,567	
77500200	1406000000	ACT5400	MARINE FISHERIES ADMINISTRATION	449,310	

 TOTALS FROM SECTION I AND SECTIONS II + III:

DEPARTMENT: 77	EXPENDITURES	FCO
FINAL BUDGET FOR AGENCY (SECTION I):	304,115,697	23,002,494
TOTAL BUDGET FOR AGENCY (SECTION III):	304,115,779	23,002,494

DIFFERENCE:
(MAY NOT EQUAL DUE TO ROUNDING)

82-
=====

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.