



Florida Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services  
CHARLES H. BRONSON, Commissioner  
The Capitol • Tallahassee, FL 32399-0800  
[www.doacs.state.fl.us](http://www.doacs.state.fl.us)

Please Respond to:

LONG RANGE PROGRAM PLAN

Department of Agriculture & Consumer Services

Tallahassee, Florida  
September 30, 2009

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

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

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

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

Dear Directors:

Pursuant to Chapter 216, Florida Statutes, our Long Range program Plan (LRPP) for the Department of Agriculture & Consumer Services is submitted in the format prescribed in the budget instructions. The information provided electronically and contained herein is a true and accurate presentation of our mission, goals, objectives and measures for the 2010-11 Fiscal Year. This submission has been approved by Commissioner Charles H. Bronson.

Sincerely,

CHARLES H. BRONSON  
COMMISSIONER OF AGRICULTURE



---

**Florida Agriculture and Forest Products**  
Over \$100 Billion for Florida's Economy

State of Florida  
Department of Agriculture  
and Consumer Services

Fiscal Year 2010-11 through  
Fiscal Year 2014-15  
Long Range Program Plan

# AGENCY MISSION STATEMENT

The mission of the Department of  
Agriculture and Consumer Services is  
to:

Safeguard the Public and Support  
Agriculture

# Agency Goals and Objectives

- GOAL #1: Ensure the safety and wholesomeness of foods and other consumer products.**
- Food Safety**  
**OBJECTIVE 1A:** Reduce potential for food borne illnesses associated with processing, storage and handling of foods.
- Dairy**  
**OBJECTIVE 1B:** Maintain the percentage of dairy establishments meeting food safety and sanitation requirements.
- Food Safety**  
**OBJECTIVE 1C:** Decrease the number of food products which are adulterated, misrepresented or otherwise unsafe.
- Food Safety**  
**OBJECTIVE 1D:** Reduce potential health effects from exposure to pesticide and other chemical residues in foods.
- Dairy**  
**OBJECTIVE 1E:** Maintain the percentage of milk and milk products which meet standards.
- GOAL #2: Improve production and sale of Florida's agricultural products.**
- Plant**  
**OBJECTIVE 2A:** Prevent exotic plant pests and diseases from being introduced or established in Florida.
- Animal**  
**OBJECTIVE 2B:** Reduce the number of animals infected with or exposed to dangerous transmissible diseases.
- Marketing**  
**OBJECTIVE 2C:** Increase the percentage of the national agricultural market represented by Florida products.
- Ag. Interdiction Stations**  
**OBJECTIVE 2D:** Maintain the percentage of vehicles carrying agricultural related products that are free of potentially devastating plant and animal pests or diseases.
- Fruits & Vegetables**  
**OBJECTIVE 2E:** Provide quality inspection services to Florida's fruit and vegetable industries at the lowest possible cost.
- Marketing**  
**OBJECTIVE 2F:** Maximize sales generated by tenants of the state farmers markets.
- Aquaculture**  
**Objective 2G:** Ensure that firms comply with environmental requirements.

# Agency Goals and Objectives

**GOAL # 3:** **Preserve and protect the state's agricultural and natural resources.**

**Water Policy**

**OBJECTIVE 3A:** Improve the Quality of Surface and Ground Water Exiting Agricultural Lands.

**Water Policy**

**OBJECTIVE 3B:** Increase the conservation of water by improving irrigation efficiency.

**Wildfire Prevention**

**OBJECTIVE 3C:** Decrease the number of wildfires caused by humans.

**Wildfire Prevention**

**OBJECTIVE 3D:** Increase the number of threatened structures not burned by wildfire.

**Wildfire Prevention**

**OBJECTIVE 3E:** Increase the number of acres not burned by wildfires.

**Land Management**

**OBJECTIVE 3F:** Increase the number of adequately stocked and growing timber producing acres in State Forests.

**GOAL #4:** **Protect consumers from potential health and security risks and unfair and deceptive business practices.**

**Animal Industry**

**OBJECTIVE 4A:** Assist and protect consumers by decreasing the number of reported human/equine disease cases caused by mosquitoes.

**Licensing**

**OBJECTIVE 4B:** Increase the efficiency of the license revocation process.

**Ag Environmental Services**

**OBJECTIVE 4C:** Assist and protect consumers by decreasing the number of pesticide, pest control, fertilizer, feed, and seed licensees and products that are unlawful, unsafe, or unethical.

**Consumer Services**

**OBJECTIVE 4D:** Safeguard consumers by monitoring regulated entities for compliance with consumer protection laws.

**Law Enforcement**

**OBJECTIVE 4E:** Maintain the clearance rate of investigations relating to consumer crimes.

**Standards**

**OBJECTIVE 4F:** Maintain protection to consumers and businesses in commercial transactions by maintaining the accuracy compliance rate for regulated weighing and measuring devices, packages, and businesses with scanners in Florida.

**Ag. Interdiction Stations**

**OBJECTIVE 4G:** Increase the quality of documents captured at Agricultural Interdiction Stations relating to agricultural commodities being transported in this state.

# Agency Service Outcomes and Performance Projections Tables

**GOAL #1:** Ensure the safety and wholesomeness of foods and other consumer products.

**Food Safety**  
**OBJECTIVE 1A:** Reduce potential for food borne illnesses associated with processing, storage and handling of foods.

**OUTCOME:** Percent of food establishments meeting food safety and sanitation requirements.

Baseline/ FY 1999-00	FY 2010-11	FY 2011-12	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15
90.00%	91.00%	90.50%	90.75%	91.00%	91.25%

**Dairy**  
**OBJECTIVE 1B:** Maintain the percentage of dairy establishments meeting food safety and sanitation requirements.

**OUTCOME:** Percent of dairy establishments meeting food safety and sanitation requirements.

Baseline/ FY 1999-00	FY 2010-11	FY 2011-12	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15
83.67%	86.00%	86.00%	86.00%	86.00%	86.00%

**Food Safety**  
**OBJECTIVE 1C:** Decrease the number of food products which are adulterated, misrepresented or otherwise unsafe.

**OUTCOME:** Percent of food products analyzed that meet standards.

Baseline/ FY 1999-00	FY 2010-11	FY 2011-12	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15
91.90%	91.20%	91.50%	91.80%	92.10%	92.40%

**Food Safety**  
**OBJECTIVE 1D:** Reduce potential health effects from exposure to pesticide and other chemical residues in foods.

**OUTCOME:** Percent of produce or other food samples analyzed that meet chemical residue standards.

Baseline/ FY 1999-00	FY 2010-11	FY 2011-12	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15
97.85%	97.80%	97.85%	97.90%	97.95%	98.00%

# Agency Service Outcomes and Performance Projections Tables

**Dairy**

**OBJECTIVE 1E:** Maintain the percentage of milk and milk products which meet standards.

**OUTCOME:** Percent of Florida Milk Regulatory Program samples analyzed that meet standards

Baseline/ FY 1999-00	FY 2010-11	FY 2011-12	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15
91.9%	92.0%	92.0%	92.0%	92.0%	92.0%

**GOAL #2:** Improve production and sale of Florida's agricultural products.

**Plant**

**OBJECTIVE 2A:** Prevent exotic plant pests and diseases from being introduced or established in Florida.

**OUTCOME:** Percent of newly introduced pests and diseases prevented from infesting Florida plants to a level where eradication is biologically or economically unfeasible.

Baseline/ 1996-97	FY 2010-11	FY 2011-12	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15
80.50%	84.50%	85.00%	85.50%	86.00%	86.50%

**Animal**

**OBJECTIVE 2B:** Reduce the number of animals infected with or exposed to dangerous transmissible diseases.

**OUTCOME:** Percent of positive test results from livestock and poultry tested for specific diseases for which monitoring, controlling and eradication activities are established.

Baseline/ 1999-00	FY 2010-11	FY 2011-12	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15
0.00022%	0.43%	0.43%	0.43%	0.43%	0.43%

**Marketing**

**OBJECTIVE 2C:** Increase the percentage of the national agricultural market represented by Florida products.

**OUTCOME:** Florida agricultural products as a percent of the national market.

Baseline/ 1996	FY 2010-11	FY 2011-12	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15
3.22%	2.71%	2.53%	2.56%	2.58%	2.61%

# Agency Service Outcomes and Performance Projections Tables

## Ag. Interdiction Stations

**OBJECTIVE 2D:** Maintain the percentage of vehicles carrying agricultural related products that are free of potentially devastating plant and animal pests or diseases.

**OUTCOME:** Percent of vehicles carrying agricultural related products that are inspected and found to be free of potentially devastating plant and animal pests and diseases.

Baseline/ FY 1998-99	FY 2010-11	FY 2011-12	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15
98.0%	99.9%	99.9%	99.9%	99.9%	99.9%

## Fruits & Vegetables

**OBJECTIVE 2E:** Provide quality inspection services to Florida's fruit and vegetable industries at the lowest possible cost.

**OUTCOME:** Dollar value of fruit and vegetables that are shipped to other states or countries that are subject to mandatory inspection.

Baseline/ FY 1996-97	FY 2010-11	FY 2011-12	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15
\$1,443,648,000	\$1,925,000,000	\$2,000,000,000	\$2,000,000,000	\$2,000,000,000	\$2,000,000,000

## Marketing

**OBJECTIVE 2F:** Maximize sales generated by tenants of the state farmers markets.

**OUTCOME:** Total sales of agricultural and seafood products generated by tenants of state farmers markets.

Baseline/ FY 1996-97	FY 2010-11	FY 2011-12	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15
\$216,771,697	\$250,000,000	\$250,000,000	\$250,000,000	\$250,000,000	\$250,000,000

## Aquaculture

**Objective 2G:** Ensure that firms comply with environmental requirements.

**OUTCOME:** Percent of shellfish facilities in significant compliance with permit and food safety regulations.

Baseline/ FY 1999-00	FY 2010-11	FY 2011-12	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15
80%	85%	85%	85%	85%	85%



# Agency Service Outcomes and Performance Projections Tables

**GOAL #3:**

**Preserve and protect the state's agricultural and natural resources.**

**Water Policy**

**OBJECTIVE 3A:**

Improve the Quality of Surface and Ground Water Exiting Agricultural Lands.

**OUTCOME:**

Number of acres in priority basins or watersheds outside the Northern Everglades and Estuaries Protection Program (NEEPP) area enrolled annually, through Notices of Intent, in Agricultural Water Policy Best Management Practices (BMP) programs.

Baseline/ 2007-08	FY 2010-11	FY 2011-12	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15
200,000	200,000	175,000	150,000	150,000	150,000

**Water Policy**

**OBJECTIVE 3B:**

Increase the conservation of water by improving irrigation efficiency.

**OUTCOME:**

Number of gallons of water potentially conserved annually by agricultural operations pursuant to site-specific recommendations provided by participating Mobile Irrigation Labs during the fiscal year

Baseline/ 1999-00	FY 2010-11	FY 2011-12	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15
4.5 billion	5.5 billion	5.5 billion	5.5 billion	5.5 billion	5.5 billion

**Wildfire Prevention**

**OBJECTIVE 3C:**

Decrease the number of wildfires caused by humans.

**OUTCOME:**

Number/Percent\* of wildfires caused by humans.

\* The Division is seeking to eliminate percent figure from this measure in FY 2010-11.

Baseline/ 1996-97	FY 2010-11	FY 2011-12	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15
4,256/90%	3,220	3,220	3,220	3,220	3,220

**Wildfire Prevention**

**OBJECTIVE 3D:**

Increase the number of threatened structures not burned by wildfire.

**OUTCOME:**

Percent of threatened structures not burned by wildfires.

Baseline/ 1996-97	FY 2010-11	FY 2011-12	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15
94.2%	93.5%	93.8%	93.8%	94.0%	94.0%

# Agency Service Outcomes and Performance Projections Tables

**Wildfire Prevention**

**OBJECTIVE 3E:** Increase the number of acres not burned by wildfires.

**OUTCOME:** Percent of acres of protected forest and wildlands not burned by wildfires.

Baseline/ 1996-97	FY 2010-11	FY 2011-12	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15
99.4%	99.0%	99.0%	99.0%	99.0%	99.0%

**Land Management**

**OBJECTIVE 3F:** Increase the number of adequately stocked and growing timber producing acres in State Forests.

**OUTCOME:** Percent of State Forest timber producing acres adequately stocked and growing.

Baseline/ FY 2000-01	FY 2010-11	FY 2011-12	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15
54%	60%	60%	61%	61%	61%

**GOAL #4:** **Protect consumers from potential health and security risks and unfair and deceptive business practices.**

**Animal Industry**

**OBJECTIVE 4A:** Assist and protect consumers by decreasing the number of reported human/equine disease cases caused by mosquitoes.

**OUTCOME:** Number of reported human/equine disease cases caused by mosquitoes.

Baseline/ 1998- 99	FY 2010-11	FY 2011-12	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15
2/40	8/47	2/49	2/49	2/49	2/49

# Agency Service Outcomes and Performance Projections Tables

**Licensing**

**OBJECTIVE 4B:** Increase the efficiency of the license revocation process.

**OUTCOME:** Percent of license revocations or suspensions initiated within 20 days after receipt of disqualifying information (all license types).

Baseline/ 1996-97	FY 2010-11	FY 2011-12	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15
31%	90%	90%	90%	90%	90%

**Ag Environmental Services**

**OBJECTIVE 4C:** Assist and protect consumers by decreasing the number of pesticide, pest control, fertilizer, feed, and seed licensees and products that are unlawful, unsafe, or unethical.

**OUTCOME:** Percent of feed, seed and fertilizer inspected products in compliance with performance/quality standards.

Baseline/ FY 2000-01	FY 2010-11	FY 2011-12	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15
86.80%	89.0%	89.0%	89.1%	89.2%	89.3%

**OUTCOME:** Percent of commercial pest control businesses and applicators inspected who are in compliance with regulations

Baseline/ FY 2000-01	FY 2010-11	FY 2011-12	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15
82.0%	92.0%	92.0%	92.1%	92.2%	92.3%

**OUTCOME:** Percent of licensed pesticide applicators inspected who are in compliance with regulations.

Baseline/ FY 2000-01	FY 2010-11	FY 2011-12	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15
80.0%	88.0%	88.0%	88.1%	88.2%	88.3%

# Agency Service Outcomes and Performance Projections Tables

**Consumer Services**

**OBJECTIVE 4D:** Safeguard consumers by monitoring regulated entities for compliance with consumer protection laws.

**OUTCOME:** Percent of all regulated entities where an investigation found a violation of consumer protection laws.

Baseline/ FY 2002-03	FY 2010-11	FY 2011-12	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15
4.36%	4.36%	4.36%	4.36%	4.36%	4.36%

**Law Enforcement**

**OBJECTIVE 4E:** Maintain the clearance rate of investigations relating to consumer crimes.

**OUTCOME:** Criminal investigations closure rate.

Baseline/ FY 1998-99	FY 2010-11	FY 2011-12	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15
76%	86.1%	86.1%	86.1%	86.1%	86.1%

**Standards**

**OBJECTIVE 4F:** Maintain protection to consumers and businesses in commercial transactions by maintaining the accuracy compliance rate for regulated weighing and measuring devices, packages, and businesses with scanners in Florida.

**OUTCOME:** Percent of regulated weighing and measuring devices, packages, and business with scanners in compliance with accuracy standards during initial inspection/testing.

Baseline/ 1996-97	FY 2010-11	FY 2011-12	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15
95%	96%	96%	96%	96%	96%

**Ag. Interdiction Stations**

**OBJECTIVE 4G:** Increase the quality of documents captured at Agricultural Interdiction Stations relating to agricultural commodities being transported in this state.

**OUTCOME:** Amount of revenue generated by bills of lading transmitted to Department of Revenue from agricultural interdiction stations.

Baseline/ 1996-97	FY 2010-11	FY 2011-12	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15
\$6,900,897	\$8,844,085	\$8,844,085	\$8,844,085	\$8,844,085	\$8,844,085

**The Florida Department of Agriculture  
And Consumer Services**

**TRENDS AND CONDITIONS STATEMENT**

The Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services was created with its functions, powers and duties outlined under Chapter 570, Florida Statutes. In the course of completing its mission to safeguard the public and support agriculture, the Department touches the lives of Floridians in countless ways – large and small, dramatic and subtle – every day.

We work with farmers to ensure a safe and abundant food supply and market our agricultural commodities to the world. We operate the state’s consumer hotline to help consumers resolve problems ranging from auto repair fraud to telemarketing complaints. We also inspect scales and gasoline pumps to ensure that consumers get their money’s worth. We manage close to a million acres of public lands and protect both rural and suburban property from wildfires. We are also involved in other emergency management operations such as natural disasters, various plant pests and animal diseases.

The Department’s primary responsibilities based on statute are:

- To inquire into the needs of agriculture in the state and make appropriate recommendations to the Governor and the Legislature;
- To perform all regulatory and inspection services relating to agriculture except agricultural education, demonstration, research, and those regulatory functions assigned by law to other state agencies;
- To investigate, conduct hearings, and make recommendations concerning all matters relating to our powers, duties, and functions;
- To cooperate with the United States Department of Agriculture and any other state or federal agency in any manner which may be helpful to agriculture in obtaining and disseminating production statistics and market and trade information concerning demand, supply, prevailing prices, and commercial movements of agricultural products and the extent of products in storage. The Department compiles, publishes, and disseminates information and pertinent data on crops, livestock, poultry, and agricultural products and provides matching funds with other agencies to conduct these services;
- To annually fix inspection and license fees and recording and service charges;
- To foster and encourage the standardizing, grading, inspection, labeling, handling, storage, and marketing of agricultural products;
- To extend in every practicable way, the distribution and sale of Florida agricultural products throughout the markets of the world;
- To promote, in the interest of the producer, the distributor, and the consumer, the economical and efficient distribution of agricultural products of this state;

- To obtain and furnish information relating to shipping routes and shipping methods, avoiding delays in the transportation of agricultural products or providing helpful solutions to other transportation problems connected with the distribution of agricultural products;
- To act as adviser to producers and distributors, to assist them in the economical and efficient distribution of their agricultural products and to encourage cooperative efforts among producers to gain economical and efficient production of agricultural products;
- To foster and encourage cooperation between producers and distributors in the interest of the general public;
- To act as a mediator or arbitrator in any controversy or issue between producers and distributors of any agricultural products concerning the grade or classification of those products;
- To protect the agricultural and horticultural interests of the state;
- To inspect apiaries for diseases adverse to bees and beekeeping and enforce the laws relating to this industry;
- To protect the livestock interests of the state;
- To enforce the state laws and rules relating to:
  - (a) Fruit and vegetable inspection and grading;
  - (b) Pesticide spray, residue inspection, and removal;
  - (c) Registration, labeling, inspection, and analysis of commercial stock feeds and commercial fertilizers;
  - (d) Classification, inspection, and sale of poultry and eggs;
  - (e) Registration, inspection, and analysis of gasoline and oil;
  - (f) Registration, labeling, inspection, and analysis of pesticides;
  - (g) Registration, labeling, inspection, germination testing, and sale of common and certified seeds;
  - (h) Weights, measures, and standards;
  - (i) Foods, as set forth in the Florida Food Safety Act;
  - (j) Inspection and certification of honey;
  - (k) Sale of liquid fuels;
  - (l) Licensing of dealers in agricultural products;

- (m) Administration and enforcement of all regulatory legislation applying to milk and milk products, ice cream, and frozen desserts;
- (n) Recording and inspecting livestock marks and brands; and
- (o) All other regulatory laws relating to agriculture.

As we perform these vital functions, we continually look for ways to introduce innovations, increase our effectiveness and stretch our limited resources to accomplish more with less. The Department continued this process during the development of its Long-Range Program Plan for FY 2010-11 through FY 2014-15.

The Department has established a list of departmental goals designed to assist us in carrying out our mission. Our goals, in priority order, are:

- 1) Ensure the safety and wholesomeness of foods and other consumer products;
- 2) Improve the production and sale of Florida's agricultural products;
- 3) Preserve and protect the state's agricultural and natural resources; and
- 4) Protect consumers from potential health and security risks and unfair and deceptive business practices.

These goals were prioritized based first on the health and safety impact to the public, and then the impact to the state's economy and environment.

The Department is tasked with multiple missions. We are primarily a regulatory agency, here to protect the well being of the general public. However, agriculture is our state's second largest industry, only behind tourism. The public safety and well being of one group is just as important as another. Further, many of our programs and services are inter-linked. It is not always possible to do one without the other.

Often, events occur that cause us to change our focus from one group of activities to another, as demonstrated by events such as September 11, 2001, Bovine Spongiform Encephalopathy – BSE (know as Mad Cow Disease), the devastating hurricanes of 2004 and 2005, Citrus Canker, Citrus Greening, West Nile Virus, food illness outbreaks and wildfires, to name a few.

Many of the functions we perform daily were highlighted by the September 11, 2001, terrorist attacks and remain a focus as we continue to strengthen our domestic security preparedness. Every Division within our agency plays a role in domestic security, from operating command sites and coordinating incident command teams that respond during hurricanes, wildfires and other emergencies, to developing response plans for hazardous material, providing intelligence information to the FBI and FDLE, staffing all interdiction stations that intercept hazardous material and plant and animal pests and diseases, and analyzing food and dairy products for chemical and other contaminants.

The world paradigm now demands that domestic security issues, including the prevention of bio-terrorism, remain a key factor and is considered as we prioritize our activities just as other events (such as the probability of active hurricane seasons) that affect the health and safety of our citizens will be strongly considered. In addition, we will continue to monitor the trends and conditions affecting each area of focus within the Department and use those as a basis for prioritizing activities.

The Department's Fiscal Year (FY) 2010-11 Legislative Budget Request (LBR) will include a relatively small number of new budget issues as revenues required to support these requests remain below normal funding levels due to the ongoing recession. To a lesser extent, other factors impacting the Department's budget request include domestic security funding, the Citrus Health Response Program (CHRP), free trade agreements, World Trade Organization rulings affecting national agriculture policy, marketing of Florida's agricultural products, and preventing the introduction of plant pests and animal diseases.

- As we approach the end of the worst recession since World War II, statewide tax collections, which fund General Revenue appropriations, are forecast to begin rebounding at the beginning of FY 2010-11; total collections however, are estimated to remain billions less than funding levels of recent years. As a consequence of this extended economic downturn, the Legislature implemented budget reductions in the three most recent fiscal years, and have again requested state agencies to submit recurring appropriation reductions in the FY 2010-11 Legislative Budget Request.
- The appropriation and retention of federal funds for domestic security preparedness remains a priority as the Department plays a vital role in securing the state against terrorist threats.
- Despite a monumental effort to eliminate citrus canker, a combination of program delays from legal challenges and the unprecedented hurricane activities, citrus canker spread to the point that eradication was considered no longer feasible. In an effort to protect citrus production and mitigate the impact of these unwanted invaders came the concept of the Citrus Health Response Program (CHRP).
- The CHRP concentrates on the development and implementation of minimum standards for citrus inspection, regulatory oversight, disease management and education and training. The CHRP is a joint effort between the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) and the Florida Department of Agriculture to assist the citrus industry, which provides over 100,000 jobs and contributes over \$9 billion to the State's economy.
- If we are unable to obtain increased federal funding to eradicate Tropical Soda Apple (TSA), it may affect Florida's ability to ship cattle to other states, because the noxious weed is spread by cattle. It can also reduce the size of herds because it displaces other vegetation that is more desirable to cattle. Lack of increased federal funding could affect not only the cattle industry, but the state's economy as a whole. TSA has been found in



- Future world trade agreements, such as the Free Trade Area of the Americas, are currently in negotiation. Those trade agreements that permit below-cost fruits, vegetables and sugar to flood our nation put tremendous pressure on Florida agriculture. The Central America Free Trade Agreement could have a negative impact on sugar since the agreement allowed additional amounts of foreign sugar to come in tariff-free. Also, specifically, if the tariff on orange juice from Brazil is lifted, they could flood our market with orange juice, hurting Florida citrus growers.

The Department is currently involved in the following task forces and studies, as directed by the Legislature:

- Statewide Florida Domestic Security Task Forces
- Cargo Theft Task Force
- Florida Marine Intelligence Unit
- Florida Agricultural Crimes Intelligence Unit
- Florida Intelligence Unit
- Florida Emergency Response Team (HAZMAT)
- Florida Mutual Aid Program
- Food Safety and Security Task Force
- Statewide Invasive Species Task Force coordinated by the Department of Environmental Protection
- Aquaculture Review Council
- Aquaculture Inter-Agency Coordinating Council
- Feed Technical Council
- Fertilizer Technical Council
- Florida Coordination Council on Mosquito Control

- Pest Control Enforcement Advisory
- Pesticide Review Council
- Seed Investigation and Conciliation Council
- Seed Technical Council
- Pest Control Research Advisory Committee
- Pesticide Registration Evaluation Committee
- Subcommittee on Managed Marshes

**OFFICE OF COMMISSIONER AND ADMINISTRATION**

**Office of Agricultural Law Enforcement**

The Bureau of Investigative Services initiates, investigates and resolves, both criminal and civil investigations, as they relate to consumer matters upon which the Department has jurisdiction. Consumer protection issues are increasing as population, demographics and economic trends change.

The Bureau works closely with consumers, the agriculture industry, and other law enforcement agencies investigating criminal cases that involve consumer fraud, timber theft, citrus theft, wildfire arson, livestock and equipment theft and aquacultural crimes. In addition, the Department takes a proactive role in the prevention of consumer fraud, wildfires and other agricultural crimes through education and training. By working with consumers, the citrus industry, the Cattlemen's Association and other entities, the Department assists in statewide efforts to reduce the number of consumer and agriculture-related crimes.

In its goal to protect consumers from potential health risks and unfair and deceptive trade practices, the Bureau of Investigative Services initiated 3,344 criminal investigations during fiscal year 2008-09, with a closure rate of 105%. This closure rate is unusually high due to clearing cases initiated in previous years. We have requested and received an increase to the closure rate based on a review of Actual Performance over the last three years. We have also requested and received an increase to the standard for the number of cases initiated, based on a three-year average. Our 3,344 criminal investigations include state land investigations, which we did not include in our count of investigations initiated prior to fiscal year 2005-06.

One of the objectives of this Bureau is to:

**Objective 4E:** Maintain the clearance rate of investigations relating to consumer crimes.

**Outcome:** Criminal investigations closure rate.

<b>Baseline/ FY 1998-99</b>	<b>FY 2010-11</b>	<b>FY 2011- 2012</b>	<b>FY 2012-13</b>	<b>FY 2013-14</b>	<b>45</b>
76%	86.1%	86.1%	86.1%	86.1%	86.1%

Some of the trends and conditions affecting Investigative Services and its ability to reach closure rate goals include:

- Our continuing involvement in Domestic Security issues, such as our participation in Domestic Security Task Forces and our investigation of bio-hazardous incidents statewide;

- Changing weather conditions, such as extreme rainfall or drought conditions that impact the number and severity of wildfires and the number of arson investigations initiated;
- The increasing number of consumer crimes in Florida, requiring considerable resources due to the complex nature of these crimes;
- Increased efforts to protect state lands and the growing number of citizens and visitors using state lands;
- Increased partnerships within the law enforcement community, such as those created through our designation as administrators of the Florida Marijuana Eradication Program which is overseen by the Federal Drug Enforcement Administration.
- Continual reductions to the base budget due to economic conditions.

Awareness of our Nation's vulnerability has created the need for more effective and efficient law enforcement methods to meet the increased demands. Our goal of maintaining the clearance rate through Fiscal Year 2014-15 despite initiating an increasing number of investigations can be achieved through participation in additional public education, by nurturing partnerships with local, state and federal agencies and by obtaining requested funding.

### **Agricultural Water Policy Coordination**

The Office of Agricultural Water Policy works directly with federal, state, regional, and local government agencies on water resource issues involving agriculture. Specific activities mandated by statute include the development and implementation of agricultural water conservation programs and statewide agricultural Best Management Practices (BMPs). These activities are designed to meet the Federal Clean Water Act Total Maximum Daily Load Program requirements, the Nitrogen Best Management Program, and the Northern Everglades and Estuaries Protection areas.

Trends and Conditions affecting this Service are:

- Based on the Florida Water Plan, agriculture is and will continue to be a significant user of freshwater in Florida.
- All of Florida's water management districts have designated water use caution areas indicating water resource demands exceed the ability to provide adequate supply.
- Water conservation programs, for both urban and agricultural users, have repeatedly proven to be effective methods of easing water resource demands.

- Controlling pollution from non-point source runoff, such as developed areas and agricultural operations, will be the most significant water quality issue facing the state and nation for the next two decades.
- According to the Florida Department of Environmental Protection (FDEP), there may be as many as 700 Florida water bodies that have been degraded below water quality standards due to discharges from non-point sources.

Objective 3A: Improve the quality of surface and ground water exiting agricultural lands.

Outcome: Number of acres in priority basins or watersheds outside the Northern Everglades and Estuaries Protection Program (NEEPP) area enrolled annually, through Notices of Intent, in Agricultural Water Policy Best Management Practices (BMP) programs.

<b>Baseline/ FY 2007-08</b>	<b>FY 2010-11</b>	<b>FY 2011-12</b>	<b>FY 2012-13</b>	<b>FY 2013-14</b>	<b>FY 2014-15</b>
200,000	200,000	175,000	150,000	150,000	150,000

Statewide, the Department is charged with taking the lead in working with the agricultural industry, Florida Department of Environmental Protection and the water management districts to implement water quality and quantity Best management Practices programs for animal, nursery, row crop and other agricultural operations in priority watersheds. The Department also executes cooperative agreements with the water management districts to provide cost-share funds for implementation of key BMPs that producers could not otherwise afford to implement. Through these watershed-based programs, the Department, in partnership with the industry and research community, is working toward a goal of enrolling a minimum of 150,000 new acres annually through 2015. The downward trend of the number of acres to be enrolled by 2015 is based on the estimated number of acres remaining to be enrolled. This acreage will continue to decline in future years as previously enrolled acreage will decrease the remaining land available to be enrolled.

Objective 3B: Increase the conservation of water by improving irrigation efficiency.

Outcome: Number of gallons of water potentially conserved annually by agricultural operations pursuant to site-specific recommendations provided by participating Mobile Irrigation Labs during the fiscal year.

<b>Baseline/ FY 1999-00</b>	<b>FY 2010-11</b>	<b>FY 2011-12</b>	<b>FY 2012- 13</b>	<b>FY 2013-14</b>	<b>FY 2014-15</b>
4.5 billion	5.5 billion	5.5 billion	5.5 billion	5.5 billion	5.5 billion

If appropriated adequate funding, the Department can expand its Water Conservation Program efforts to manage and conserve Florida’s valuable water resources. Program expansion will be

primarily achieved through the implementation of cost-share programs to improve the efficiency of irrigation systems. A key component of program effectiveness will be the expansion of mobile irrigation laboratories statewide and the provision of technical assistance to agricultural producers for the purpose of developing alternative sources of irrigation. As a result of the efforts described above, the Department projects continual savings of 5.5 billion gallons of water annually through FY 2014-15.

### **Division of Licensing**

The Division of Licensing oversees two different licensing programs that serve to enhance public safety and promote the general welfare of Floridians and its many visitors from other states and countries. One program involves the oversight of a group of specialized professions. The other program provides statewide uniform standards for issuing licenses to qualified, law-abiding individuals to carry concealed weapons and firearms for self-defense.

The first licensing program is administered under the authority of Chapter 493, Florida Statutes. In accordance with the provisions of this chapter, the Division regulates the private investigative, recovery, and security professions in the State of Florida. The law grants the Division wide authority that includes licensing and regulatory control over individuals and agencies operating in these professions. In addition, the Division has a hand in defining educational standards and creating the course curriculum guidelines for the training that individuals must complete before they are licensed to work in these professions. The Division's objective is to ensure that only those individuals who have been properly trained and who do not pose a threat to the public are licensed.

Under the authority of section 790.06, Florida Statutes, the Division issues licenses to carry concealed weapons or firearms to qualified individuals for the purpose of lawful self-defense. The Division's statutory responsibilities in administering the provisions of this section of law are twofold. First, the Division is charged with ensuring that only knowledgeable, law-abiding individuals receive licenses. Second, in applying the uniform standards for the issuance of concealed weapon licenses enacted by the Legislature, the Division assures the legislative intent that no honest, law-abiding individual who qualifies for a license is denied his or her right.

In an effort to meet its goal, the Division of Licensing has an objective (4B) to suspend or revoke a license within twenty (20) days after receiving substantiated disqualifying information. Through inter-agency cooperation with the Florida Department of Law Enforcement, the Florida Department of Corrections and the Florida Department of Highway Safety and Motor Vehicles, the Division of Licensing developed on-going reporting mechanisms to assure it has access to timely notification of disqualifying events.

During Fiscal Year 2008-09, the standard of 90% for the Division to suspend or revoke a license within twenty (20) days after receiving substantiated disqualifying information was met.

Objective 4B: Increase the efficiency of the license revocation and suspension process.

Outcome: Percent of license revocations or suspensions initiated within twenty (20) days after receipt of disqualifying information (all license types).

<b>Baseline FY 1996-97</b>	<b>FY 2010-11</b>	<b>FY 2011-12</b>	<b>FY 2012-13</b>	<b>FY 2013-14</b>	<b>FY 2014-15</b>
31%	90%	90%	90%	90%	90%

To better serve applicants, the Division developed and implemented a more streamlined process that allows an individual to apply for a concealed weapon/firearm license and have his/her fingerprints and picture taken at one of the Division's eight regional offices. This new process will be fully operational by the beginning of October 2009. The effect of this new process will cause a reduction in the number of OPS employees needed by the Division in Tallahassee to process applications. The Division is also in the process of implementing a new IVR (interactive voice recognition) enhancement to the existing telephone system as well as a new web-based software application, both of which will allow the applicant to check the status of his/her license application without the need to talk to a person or send email, both of which require personal assistance.

The Division's workload statistics have continued their upward trend. Both licensing programs (Chpt 493 and 790) have experienced unprecedented growth in receipt of new applications, which have more than doubled from 79,386 in Fiscal Year (FY) 2004-2005 to 166,890 just four years later in FY 2008-09. The Division received 295,970 new and renewal applications in FY 2008-2009, up from 191,840 applications the previous fiscal year. As of Fiscal Year End 2008-09, the total number of licensees in both programs has increased to an all-time high of 744,337 from 465,732, in FY 2003-04. These additional 278,605 licensee "accounts" (60% increase) must be maintained, including renewal notifications and applications, law enforcement inquiries on licensees, licensee phone calls/e-mails and many other workload requirements that have created significant additional work, in addition to the tremendous increase in new applications.

The overwhelming majority of the growth of the licensee population is the result of more and more people wanting concealed weapon licenses. One can see the 176% increase in initial applications for the Concealed Weapon Licensing program from FY 2004- 2005 to date. During FY 2008-2009, the Division issued more new concealed weapon licenses – a total of 103,699 – than in any other year since the Division began issuing concealed weapon licenses in 1987.

The Division's Public Inquiry Section, which responds to telephone inquiries from applicants, licensees, and the general public, received 389,431 telephone calls, up from 128,744 calls in fiscal year 2004-2005, a 202% increase in four years. In addition to issuing record numbers of licenses and responding to an ever-increasing number of telephone inquiries, the Division's enforcement and legal branches continued in their efforts to curtail unlicensed and unlawful activities in the regulated professions. Investigators in the Division's Bureau of Regulation and Enforcement (BRE) investigated 1,447 complaints against individuals and agencies, and also

performed 3,983 compliance inspections. These numbers remained relatively unchanged from the previous year.

The Division's Legal Section completed 30,431 administrative actions in fiscal year 2008-2009. These actions include the denial of applications for licensure, the suspension of application processing for concealed weapon/firearm licenses, and the suspension or revocation of existing licenses.

Under the provisions of Section 790.015, Florida Statutes, the Division continues to promote concealed weapon license reciprocity with other states. In accordance with the terms of the reciprocity agreements, thirty-one (31) participating states have extended the privilege of concealed carry to holders of Florida Concealed Weapon/Firearm Licenses. The State of Florida has, in turn, extended that same privilege to the licensees of these states.

### **Forest and Resource Protection Program**

The Florida Division of Forestry has mandates under Chapters 589 and 590, Florida Statutes. Section 589.04, Florida Statutes, states that the Division of Forestry will (1) Promote and encourage forest fire protection, forest environmental education, forest land stewardship, good forest management, tree planting and care, forest recreation, and the proper management of public lands; (2) Provide direction for the multiple use management of forest lands owned by the state and serve as the lead management agency for state-owned land primarily suited for forest resource management; and (3) Begin immediately an aggressive program to reforest and afforest lands over which the Division has forest resource management responsibility. Section 590.02, Florida Statutes, states that the Division shall prevent, detect, suppress, and extinguish wildfires wherever they may occur in Florida and do all things necessary in the exercise of such powers, authority, and duties.

The purpose of the Forest and Resource Protection Program is to preserve and protect Florida's agricultural and natural resources, which support the Department's mission to safeguard the public and support agriculture. This Program includes two Service areas: 1) Land Management and 2) Wildfire Prevention and Management.

#### **Land Management**

Trends for the Service are:

- Florida's ideal climate and vast natural resources make it a unique tourist destination known globally for its beauty and natural settings. Florida's estimated population for 2010 is 19.4 million. Florida has seen continued increases in visitors with 48 million reported in 1998 and 76.8 million in 2004. This increase in visitors can place significant pressure on those public lands devoted to recreation and conservation of natural resources. In particular, the increase in visitation can have a corresponding percent increased demand on State Forests and their respective facilities.



- Recreational interest in resource-based activities such as fishing, hiking, hunting, camping, bicycle riding, nature study and other similar recreational activities has an estimated need for over 210 million people participating in these activities in 2010 according to Florida's Statewide Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plan. The visitors seeking these types of outdoor recreation experiences are a great potential for increased visitation to State Forests. State Forests have a niche in the outdoor recreation market which reflects the personal outdoor values of space, solitude and self-reliance. A priority should be to identify public lands in all parts of Florida that are suitable for timber growth and new or expanded areas for nature-based recreation uses and develop strategies to preserve our ability to provide for such uses as Florida's population increases and becomes increasingly urban.
- Trail-related recreational activities, such as hunting, camping, horseback riding, hiking, biking, off-highway vehicle riding, fishing and nature observation are among the fastest growing outdoor activities requiring appropriate management strategies.
- The public has an increasing concern for listed endangered flora and fauna and State Forests are managed in a manner that provides habitat for these species.
- Continued public demand for wood products is not expected to diminish. The long-term demand for all wood products is projected to increase nationally through 2040. The opportunity exists to meet a portion of this demand through managed timber harvests on State Forests as this Division has the expertise and structure to sell timber products from State Forest lands.
- Since 1985, the number of State Forests has grown from 4 to 35, encompassing 1,043,860 acres as of June 30, 2009. In FY 2010-11 the Division is planning to acquire or be lead manager on additional acreage. The Division has the professional management structure to take on additional responsibilities, with additional employees. However, these new acquisitions often have a low stocking level of timber and some may not be suited for the economic production of native timber species. Where possible, the Division strives to plant native tree species best suited to the site..
- Droughts, wildfires, hurricanes, tornados, insect infestations and invasive species have weakened and killed many acres of adequately stocked State Forest timberlands in recent years. The Division actively strives to restore such sites to native forest communities as soon as possible.

Existing conditions for the Service are:

- Resource Management Funding (External threat) – As resource management funding is reduced and as additional acreage is received through CARL and Florida Forever acquisitions, additional funding for resource management activities must continue and increase in order to provide multiple-use benefits. Many times, recently acquired lands

- Urban Development, Accelerating Land Prices (External threat) - A threat to forested areas is urban development. Professional forestry expertise is needed by local governments to address conservation of green space and tree canopy issues. These local governments often lack the benefit of professional forestry expertise to make informed decisions about forestry, silviculture, canopy and species replacement issues – the Division assists with this need where necessary.
- Forest Ownership Fragmentation (External threat) - Over the past thirty years, ownership fragmentation has been increasing, resulting in a larger number of landowners on smaller parcels of forestland. Consequently, the demand for technical assistance to these new forest landowners will continue to increase in order to provide effective land management. Marketing the benefits from management, utilization and multiple use forest management are tasks for which the Division can provide assistance to landowners.

Land Management has one main objective which was developed and selected based on the Division’s statutory mandate and the historical commitment of the Division and Department as identified in previous planning documents.

Objective 3F: Increase the number of adequately stocked and growing timber producing acres in State Forests.

Outcome: Percent of State Forest timber producing acres adequately stocked and growing.

<b>Baseline/ 2000-01</b>	<b>FY 2010-11</b>	<b>FY 2011-12</b>	<b>FY 2012-13</b>	<b>FY 2013-14</b>	<b>FY 2014-15</b>
54%	60%	60%	61%	61%	61%

Determining the percent of acres adequately stocked and growing is a complex process involving new land acquisitions, natural disasters, timber harvesting, natural regeneration, acres planted, the amount of land management funding that is available and changes in State Forest land use designation (i.e., establishing new recreation areas, trails and utility corridors). The goal is to have the acres of State Forest adequately stocked and growing at 61% in FY 2014-15 (The baseline was established in FY 2000-01 at 54% or 250,183 acres adequately stocked and growing). While we achieved 60% of State Forests adequately stocked and growing in FY 2008-09, this level was reduced by the impacts of the wildfires that occurred at Tiger Bay and Withlacoochee State Forests in the Spring of 2009, and the acquisition of non-forested land. The ability to achieve this goal will be contingent upon continued or increases in land management funding, focus on reforestation, seedling availability, adequate staff, and the impact of natural

disasters. Based on land acquisition projections, reforesting multiple areas on State Forests throughout the year will be needed to achieve this goal. Professionals are in place to deal with the challenges; however, additional skilled workforce may be needed to accomplish this goal.

The Florida Division of Forestry will address the objective to increase the number of timber producing acres adequately stocked and growing through budget issues and management strategies. Some of the management strategies to address the objective include: 1. process improvement, 2. a total fire management program including prescribed burning, 3. reforestation and 4. continued implementation of multiple-use strategies for all State Forests.

### **Wildfire Prevention and Management**

Trends for the Service are:

- Florida experienced drought conditions from 1998 through 2001 and again in 2006-07 and through the middle of 2008. Climatic data supports the statement that the two warmest and driest decades in the century were the 1980's and 1990's. Both decades experienced spikes in wildfire occurrence.
- Weather forecasts for the coming years indicate we will experience dry conditions for the first part of 2009 and then, after July of 2009, hotter and wetter conditions will prevail. Dry conditions equate to long-term control problems for wildfires. Increased fuels resulting from hurricane damage continue to present control problems for any wildfires that occur in these areas, resulting in more time spent on these wildfires.
- Wildfires are getting nationwide attention. Additional federal funds available to rural communities to enhance wildfire suppression capabilities and to agencies for hazardous fuel reduction projects are leveling off and have been reduced in some cases.
- Florida's population now exceeds 18 million people and is expected to grow, placing more people in the wildland urban interface, putting more people and property in proximity of lands with higher wildfire potential.
- Wildlands are being fragmented due to population growth and development, making prescribed burning more difficult as smoke impacts on highways and in communities are less tolerated.
- State government seems to be downsizing and the professional and technical educational needs of employees are increasing in order to keep pace with advances in technology and training requirements.

Existing conditions within the Service are:

- The cost of training Forest Rangers is increasing. Rangers currently need 600 hours of initial training with continuing education and mandatory training throughout their careers. The number of hours is going to increase by 40 hours due to rule changes made by the Division of State Fire Marshal's office.
- The Division of Forestry staffing and equipment levels have decreased while the population living and recreating in wildland areas continues to grow.
- Turnover for Forest Rangers compromises our ability to fight wildfires. Once trained and experienced, some staff will seek better compensation, which can be found within city, county and federal fire services.
- Hurricane damage and excessive drought from Fiscal Year 06-07 through Fiscal Year 08-09 has further limited prescribed burning opportunities, leaving high hazardous fuel levels with the potential for catastrophic fires to occur. There has been an increase in the accumulated vegetative growth receptive to wildfire. Three Gyrotracs and nine Posi-tracs (mulching machinery) have been placed in service to assist with vegetation removal where conditions are not acceptable for prescribed burning.
- The aircraft firefighting fleet consists of six helicopters and twenty-two fixed wing airplanes. Dependability and reliability are a priority, so the replacement and technical upgrades of the helicopters and the fixed-wing detection fleet must be addressed on a consistent schedule due to the varying degrees of aging aircraft and risk assessment review.
- A meteorologist, new weather technology programs and the use of weather data specific to fire detection, control and suppression assists the public and burn managers with managing smoke impacts from their fires. Special assistance and information is made available to firefighters and Forestry Field Units throughout Florida on a weekly and monthly basis; 24-hour monitoring occurs throughout the year.
- More Wildfire Mitigation Specialist positions are needed to provide public education regarding fire prevention and to analyze the hazards and risks associated with communities in the wildland interface.
- Wildfire Management Teams were established to work with the Wildfire Mitigation Specialists to identify high wildfire risk areas within the wildland urban interface. Those areas are then treated to reduce the fuels and consequently the wildfire risk.
- An update to the Statewide Wildland Fire Risk Assessment is in progress to develop a wildfire potential risk index for the wildlands in Florida reflecting the changes resulting from the Hurricanes of 2004 and 2005. This will be a useful tool for government and community leaders, planners and fire management personnel, to focus mitigation efforts on the highest wildfire potential areas in Florida. This tool will be available to the general public via the internet.

- The aging and increasingly unreliable emergency equipment (including primary firefighting vehicles such as dozers, tractors, plows, etc.) poses a significant safety hazard to firefighters, and limits the effectiveness of wildland firefighting capability.
- Fuel for Division of Forestry vehicles continues to rise which impacts our ability to fulfill our mission as dollars historically spent for other purposes are now going for fuel. The Division uses approximately 1 million gallons of fuel per year for all vehicles. The majority of wildfire suppression vehicles use diesel, approximately 650,000 gallons of Division fuel usage is diesel. In the Spring of 2001 diesel fuel was approx. \$1.10 per gallon, in June of 2008 a gallon of diesel cost approx. \$4.40. Fuel costs are lower now than in June 2008, however there is significant uncertainty that these prices will remain consistent.

The Wildfire Prevention and Management Services area has three objectives related to the Department’s goal to preserve and protect the state’s agricultural and natural resources.

Objective 3C: Decrease the number of wildfires caused by humans.

Outcome: Number of wildfires caused by humans.

<b>Baseline/ FY 1996-97</b>	<b>FY 2010-11</b>	<b>FY 2011-12</b>	<b>FY 2012-13</b>	<b>FY 2013-14</b>	<b>FY 2014-15</b>
4,256/90%	3,220	3,220	3,220	3,220	3,220

The five-year goal for this outcome measure is to maintain the number of wildfires caused by humans through FY 2014-15 (The Division is seeking to eliminate the percent figure from this measure because the number of fires can decrease, while the percent can increase in the same year). Maintaining a constant number of wildfires caused by humans will be a significant achievement considering the growing number of people moving into Florida’s wildland areas. Additional budget and personnel will be needed to conduct an enhanced statewide wildfire prevention campaign, including the deployment of fire prevention teams, the establishment of Wildfire Mitigation Specialists and implementation of additional wildfire prevention campaign initiatives in each of the fifteen Forestry Field Units in Florida, to achieve the desired goal of no more than 3,220 human-caused fires annually.

Objective 3D: Increase the number of threatened structures not burned by wildfires.

Outcome: Percent of threatened structures not burned by wildfire.

<b>Baseline/ FY 1996-97</b>	<b>FY 2010-11</b>	<b>FY 2011-12</b>	<b>FY 2012-13</b>	<b>FY 2013-14</b>	<b>FY 2014-15</b>
94.2%	93.5%	93.8%	93.8%	94.0%	94.0%

The five-year goal for this outcome measure is to reduce the number of homes lost to wildfires in Florida. This will be achieved by incrementally increasing the percent of structures not burned by wildfires each year, from 93.5% in FY 2010-11 to 94% in FY 2013-14 and FY 2014-15. A 0.5% percentage point increase during this five year period will mean that only 6% of structures threatened by wildfire will actually burn. Achieving this goal will require an enhanced statewide fire management program that includes the implementation of Firewise Communities, Community Wildfire Protection Plans and fire mitigation programs and suppression strategies. Ideally, 100% of structures threatened by wildfires can be protected from burning. However, the number of structures located in the wildland urban interface is increasing which means there are more vulnerable structures needing protection because they are in the proximity of lands with higher wildfire potential. Additional budget and resources will be needed for personnel and equipment (especially the helicopter program) that can provide quicker initial attack response to wildfires.

Objective 3E: Increase the number of acres not burned by wildfires.

Outcome: Percent of acres of protected forest and wildlands not burned by wildfire.

<b>Baseline/ FY 1996-97</b>	<b>FY 2010-11</b>	<b>FY 2011-12</b>	<b>FY 2012-13</b>	<b>FY 2013-14</b>	<b>FY 2014-15</b>
99.4%	99.0%	99.0%	99.0%	99.0%	99.0%

The five-year goal for this outcome measure is to increase the percent of acres not burned to 99.0% in FY 2010-11 and maintain this level through FY 2014-15. The percent for FY 2010-11 has been set at 99.0%, as it is anticipated that this will be the highest percent that can be achieved given the recent fire history, funding and suppression resource levels, and demographics of Florida. As the wildland-urban interface increases due to urbanization, the protection of wildland acres will require more time and effort due to increased complexity. To maintain 99.0% through FY 2014-15, additional funds are needed for firefighters, fire suppression equipment, (including helicopter fleet), fuel, training and fire prevention activities, as well as continued favorable fire weather conditions.

Additionally, the Division of Forestry will attempt to reach the objective targets set for FY 2014-15 through a systematic and detailed plan to provide fire readiness and response. A combination of requested budget issues and continued Division internal strategies will be used to meet the objectives.

Other strategies include:

- Collaborator/partner relations through greater coordination of the Statewide Unified Command;
- An interagency fire incident command structure to ensure the highest level of cooperation between public agencies, allowing full utilization of existing resources;

- Woods Arson Task Forces to address woods arson problems;
- Implementing process improvements to pre-position both air and ground suppression resources for quick response to all new wildfire starts;
- Continued implementation of an aggressive fire prevention awareness campaigns such as Firewise Community Workshops and Community Wildfire Protection Plans to keep fire prevention in the forefront of the public;
- Implementation of burn restrictions and/or burning bans that directly impact the number of human-caused fires;
- Deployment and use of Fire Prevention Strike Teams to address high incidence of human caused fires in specific areas;
- Better utilization of fire weather and fire behavior technologies; and
- Continued training of Volunteer and Structural Fire Departments in basic wildfire suppression through the inclusion of courses as a part of the minimum standards for each group.

The combination of added resources, plus the aggressive utilization of these new and existing resources, was successful in preventing greater numbers of acres and homes from being burned and a lower number of fires than in some years. Therefore, by recognizing the positive effects these efforts have made, and continuing to provide the personnel and funds for vehicle, equipment, facility and aircraft replacement and renovation, the Legislature will enable the Division to make even greater progress toward protecting people, property and resources in Florida.

## **FOOD SAFETY AND QUALITY**

### **Dairy Facilities Compliance and Enforcement**

The Division of Dairy Industry's primary focus is to assure Florida consumers that dairy products are wholesome and are produced, processed, and sold wholesale under sanitary conditions. The Division conducts inspections of and collects samples at permitted in-state dairy establishments. It also collects samples at in-state distribution points for permitted out-of-state dairy establishments. The Division also analyzes all samples collected. Laboratory analysis is an important component of the Department's Food Safety and Quality Program, and is usually necessary to identify or measure food adulterants.

The trends and conditions affecting this Service are:

- The public expects milk and milk products to be nutritious, safe, palatable and properly labeled.
- Increases in the percentage of consumer dairy products found to be meeting product standards and the percentage of dairy establishments meeting sanitation requirements indicates the public’s exposure to potential hazards associated with dairy products is being reduced.
- The number of dairy samples collected for FY 2008-09 was 8,273. The number of analyses performed on those samples was 47,114. Both numbers are down from FY 2007-08 due to changes in our performance measures.
- Compliance with sanitation requirements can be monitored through inspections of Florida’s dairy establishments. The Bureau of Dairy Inspection currently has 12 inspectors conducting inspections and collecting in-state and out-of-state samples at Florida dairy establishments.
- There are fewer dairy establishments that require inspection. However, the establishments that remain in business are larger and, in the case of processing establishments, more complex.

During the last fourteen years, the Dairy Division has voluntarily undertaken a major initiative to improve its operating efficiency. It has reduced its workforce from 41 FTEs to 25 FTEs. The Division has been able to absorb this reduction due to the loss of dairy establishments from economic pressures and by having the remaining inspectors cover larger territories.

Objective 1B: Maintain the percentage of dairy establishments meeting food safety and sanitation requirements.

Outcome: Percent of dairy establishments meeting food safety and sanitation requirements.

<b>Baseline/ FY 1999-00</b>	<b>FY2010-11</b>	<b>FY2011-12</b>	<b>FY2012-13</b>	<b>FY2013-14</b>	<b>FY2014-15</b>
83.67%	86.0%	86.0%	86.0%	86.0%	86.0%

Objective 1E: Maintain the percentage of milk and milk products that meet standards.

Outcome: Percent of Florida Milk Regulatory Program samples analyzed that meet standards.

<b>Baseline/ FY 1999-00</b>	<b>FY2010-11</b>	<b>FY2011-12</b>	<b>FY2012-13</b>	<b>FY2013-14</b>	<b>FY2014-15</b>
91.9%	92.0%	92.0%	92.0%	92.0%	92.0%



Our strategies for obtaining the above projections are as follows:

- Enforce the routine inspection and sampling requirements of Florida regulations. Provide programs to solve violations of standards.
- Report drug contamination results and follow-up to resolve the drug contamination as required by Appendix N of the Pasteurized Milk Ordinance.
- Collect random samples of dairy products taken at least semi-annually to determine possible contamination by animal drug compounds and pathogenic bacteria.
- Monitor plant records on products from each processing plant at least annually for compliance with Vitamin A and D standards and take action on those items that do not meet the regulatory limits.
- Enforce all licensing and permitting standards and regulations for both Florida processors and those out of state facilities shipping product into Florida.
- Improve laboratory efficiency through replacement of obsolete and non-repairable analytical instruments and equipment.
- Maintain Division fleet through regular replacement of vehicles as they become eligible for replacement.

### **Food Safety Inspection and Enforcement**

The activities conducted by the Food Safety Inspection and Enforcement Service/Division of Food Safety directly address the first Agency goal, “*Ensure safety and wholesomeness of food and other consumer products.*” The Division’s regulatory responsibility is to assure the safety, wholesomeness, and proper representation of foods held or offered for sale in food processing and storage establishments and retail food stores, including those with ancillary food service operations. Prevention of and response preparedness to terrorist actions which threaten the safety of the food supply is becoming a significant component of this responsibility.

National trends and conditions include:

- The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC), in its most recent estimates, states that food borne pathogens annually cause 76 million illnesses, 325,000 hospitalizations, and 5,200 deaths, with an estimated annual cost between 5.6 and 9.4 billion dollars.
- More than 200 diseases are transmitted through foods, but some food borne pathogens of greatest current concern (*Escherichia coli* 0157:H7, *Listeria monocytogenes*, *Campylobacter* and *Cyclospora*) have been recognized as causes of illness only within the

- Recent widespread national outbreaks involving fresh produce, including the large outbreak of *Salmonella* Saintpaul in jalapeno peppers, *Salmonella* Litchfield in melons, *E. coli* O157:H7 in spinach, as well as *Salmonella* Typhimurium in peanuts and *Salmonella* Tennessee in peanut butter, demonstrate a need to focus on the product, agent and areas of greatest concern and maintain efficient and effective information sharing networks between federal, state, local and industry partners. Also evident in detection of these outbreaks was the role of DNA fingerprinting through the national PulseNet system.
- 2008 data reported by the Foodborne Diseases Active Surveillance Network (FoodNet), a collaborative project of CDC, the USDA, FDA and 10 state sites present findings that the incidence of most common foodborne illnesses has changed very little over the past three years. *Campylobacter*, *Cryptosporidium*, *Listeria*, Shiga toxin-producing *Escherichia coli* (STEC) O157, *Salmonella*, *Shigella*, *Vibrio*, and *Yersinia* did not change significantly when compared to the previous three years (2005-2007).
- The U.S. has been shown to be vulnerable as a terrorist target and the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) continues to have serious concerns about “agroterrorism”. Food is widely recognized as a likely vehicle for future attacks, and has been used in past terrorist events in this country. A joint program, the Strategic Partnership Program Agroterrorism (SPPA) has been initiated between the DHS, FBI, FDA, USDA, states and industry to conduct food defense and safety vulnerability assessments. Federal funding is becoming available to the States for food protection and domestic security preparedness, including laboratory testing, through cooperative agreements. Federal agencies are working with state and food industry organizations to increase food defense awareness. ([www.cfsan.fda.gov/alert](http://www.cfsan.fda.gov/alert))
- A number of agents could contaminate food, ranging from microbial agents typically seen in unintentional outbreaks of food borne illness, to pathogenic organisms not normally associated with food consumption, to organisms that have been genetically modified to be more lethal, to biologically derived toxins, to highly toxic chemical agents. Melamine in wheat and protein glutens is an example of intentional, undetected contamination of the food supply. A significant incident involving melamine in baby formula occurred during the past year.
- The Division was heavily involved in assisting the FDA with the largest food recall in U.S. history. The Castleberry’s Chili recall encompassed millions of cans processed under more than 90 different varieties of product potentially contaminated with *Clostridium botulinum*. Division of Food Safety inspectors launched an unprecedented

effort to track down and remove thousands of pounds of the potentially dangerous product from more than 2500 retail stores and distributors throughout Florida. In addition, the Division worked with FDA on the recent contamination of jalapeno peppers with Salmonella, performing testing for the pathogen as well as performing DNA fingerprinting for uploading into the PulseNet database to be used for additional outbreak detections and to help solve the puzzle of the source of the outbreak.

- The FDA has indicated an increase in import entries from almost 6 million entries in 2003, to an estimated 9 million entries in 2007. According to the USDA Economic Research Service, approximately 15 percent of the overall US food supply by volume is imported, but in certain food categories (fresh fruits and vegetables, for example), that number reaches almost 60 percent. While all entries are now electronically scanned, the percentage of physical examination of imports remains unchanged from the U.S. General Accounting Office (GAO) 1998 report of only 1.7%. Only 0.5% is tested for pathogens. FDA has received added resources for Homeland Security, and inspections at ports have been increased. In addition, the type of imported foods is changing from primarily unprocessed food ingredients to be used in the domestic preparation of FDA covered products, to increasing proportions of foods such as ready-to-eat products, fresh produce and seafood.
- The presence of antibiotics in foods has become an increasing concern as studies indicate the presence of antibiotic resistant pathogens. Multiple countries are considering bans on the use of antibiotics in poultry and other livestock while some Asian imports of seafood and honey have been found to be adulterated with antibiotics. The FDA continues to detain seafood such as Tilapia, shrimp, frog legs and eel from multiple Asian countries including China, Vietnam and Malaysia after repeated testing turned up contamination with drugs (chloramphenicol, fluoroquinolones, malachite green, gentian violet, nitrofurans) that have not been approved in the United States for use in farmed seafood. FDA also continues to detain honey imported from Asia for fluoroquinolones and chloramphenicol. The Chemical Residue laboratory has methodology to screen for fluoroquinolones and chloramphenicol in seafood and honey and is developing a multi-residue method for veterinary drug contaminants.
- Improvements in technology have led to an awareness of a disturbing trend in the seafood industry for misbranding of product resulting in economic fraud. State and federal agencies have recently identified firms that have substituted less expensive, imported farm-raised fish for more desirable, higher-priced wild caught fish such as grouper or snapper. According to GAO, over 80% of seafood consumed by Americans is imported. In addition, the presence of antibiotic residues in these fish elevates the concern to more than solely economic fraud. The Food Safety laboratories are working with a group of international scientists through the AOAC International to develop standardized methods for the detection of seafood adulteration.
- There is an increasing interest in consumption of raw and minimally processed, as well as “natural” foods, some of which are considered potentially hazardous foods, and represent

- There is increased recognition and evolving efforts to develop and/or expand information sharing networks between agencies to improve capabilities for early identification of food borne illness outbreaks or incidents of food terrorism. Commitment to these efforts has been bolstered by recent large scale outbreaks and subsequent multi-agency, international trace back investigations. During the recent *Salmonella* Saintpaul outbreak, the Division worked with FDA to perform testing for the pathogen as well as DNA fingerprinting for uploading into the PulseNet database to be used for additional outbreak detection and to help solve the puzzle of the source of the outbreak. The Division also collaborated with FDA on assignments to inspect retail and wholesale firms and collect samples at those locations. As a result of this joint effort, our inspectors conducted 33 state retail inspection and 10 consignees assigned by FDA. During the investigation, the Division conducted laboratory analysis on 64 tomatoes collected between April and July of 2008 from FDACS permitted firms in Florida using the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) Microbiological Data Program (MDP) methods. In addition, our FERN laboratory tested 69 samples of cilantro, jalapeño and Serrano peppers, and detected 4 non-Saintpaul *Salmonella* isolates. Inspection staff worked with industry to remove these products with non-outbreak related serovars from store shelves, and supplied distributor and manufacturer information to FDA for trace back investigation.
- August 3, 2009 marked the twelfth anniversary of The Food Quality Protection Act which has resulted in lower pesticide residue tolerances, the introduction of new pesticide chemicals, and the increased potential for unapproved uses. The EPA announced that nearly 4,000 food tolerances have already been modified or revoked and there are plans to limit thousands more of pesticide uses in an effort to assure the public safety and health.

Florida trends and conditions include:

- For the first time in 63 years, since the end of World War II, Florida's population has declined by approximately 58,000. Despite this small decline, the current population is approximately 18.3 million according to the U.S. Census Bureau.
- The number of senior citizens and other immunocompromised populations typically at higher risk of susceptibility for food borne diseases and illness continues to increase. By 2025, it is estimated that 20 percent of the US population will be age 60 or older, as compared to 1980 with 15 percent.
- An estimated 70% of the country's imported perishable foods pass through Florida's ports. We accept food imports from over 150 countries. Florida's increasingly culturally diverse population has sparked demand for more of the indigenous ethnic foods from a multitude of native lands. Many of these foods and the methods of importing and

- Due to the concern of potential terrorist presence in the state, there is an increased demand for training of food inspectors and in qualified laboratory testing capability. Ongoing efforts to mitigate these risks include mandatory training for all field inspection staff in areas of food defense, food security and awareness (ALERT), and national incident management systems.
- There is a continuing increase in popularity of ready-to-eat foods, especially fresh cut produce available year-round, with the majority of retail food stores offering food preparation services for carry out consumption with no further cooking. Increasingly common are new developments for processing and packaging food, such as sous vide and cook-chill methods, which eliminate some of the tasks which had usually taken place in the home or restaurant, but require more complex and stringent control measures during processing. High risk packaging such as vacuum packaging is now being utilized more frequently in food establishments to increase the shelf life and aesthetic appearance of the product. A major organism of concern with this packaging type is *Clostridium botulinum*.
- Florida's warm, moist climate encourages plant diseases and pests, and mandates pesticide use for commercial crop production.
- Florida citizens continue to express heightened concerns of health risks to diabetics, allergen-sensitive individuals, and other diet conscious citizens over improper labeling and false nutritional claims. With the down turn in the economy, economic fraud in the form of undisclosed substitution of lower quality products involving seafood, honey and syrup products remains a priority.
- DACS Food Safety Laboratories are part of the Food Emergency Response Network (FERN), a select group of national laboratories developing capacity to detect chemical and microbiological food contaminants, and to respond to terrorist food security threats. In addition, the Food Safety Laboratories are a member of the Laboratory Response Network (LRN), an integrated network of state and local public health, federal, military, and international laboratories that can respond to bioterrorism, chemical terrorism and other public health emergencies.
- DACS Food Safety Laboratories, as one of the few Agriculture laboratories, participates as an active member of PulseNet, a national system for detection of outbreaks of food borne diseases using DNA fingerprinting.
- New evidence of hazardous food items, such as illegal imports, high-risk products, and banned herbal items, sold by internet, undercover vendors and other un-permitted businesses in Florida. These items include raw milk, ephedra, unapproved and misbranded dietary supplements, unpasteurized cheeses and antibiotic/pesticide

- Collection of food safety information on firm conditions and product testing is automated to provide rapid evaluation and facilitate data sharing with other agencies, but significant IT updates and maintenance are necessary for continued program viability.

The Agency has established and prioritized objectives related to the overall goal, *Ensure the Safety and Wholesomeness of Food and Other Consumer Products*. Three objectives are linked to activities conducted by the Division of Food Safety.

Objective 1A: Reduce potential for food borne illnesses associated with processing, storage and handling of foods.

Outcome: Percent of food establishments meeting food safety and sanitation requirements.

This outcome has been designated as the overall primary indicator of progress for the Food Safety Inspection and Enforcement Service based on the fact that essentially all Floridians face potential health impact from poor sanitation in food establishments.

The percent of food establishments meeting standards throughout the year was 91.07% in FY 2008-09: an increase from FY 2007-08. There has been a renewed inspection emphasis on maintaining proper temperature of potentially hazardous foods and personal hygiene of employees resulting in an increase of violations noted. A “risk based” inspection process that focuses on the highest risk factors, as defined by CDC and FDA and which directly contribute to a food borne illness, has been implemented on a limited basis throughout the state. While risk based inspections are more labor intensive and time consuming, they achieve a higher quality of analysis of food service and food processing activities. An increase in the number and severity of violations may also be attributable to risk based inspections.

The Division was selected as one of only six states for the first-ever Rapid Response Team (RRT) cooperative agreement. The RRT will develop, implement, exercise and integrate an all-hazards food and food-borne illness response capability to more rapidly react to potential threats to our food supply. The RRT, which is designed to operate in conjunction with other food and feed agencies within state programs, other state RRTs, FDA district offices, and state emergency operations centers, is another tool to enhance response capabilities.

The RRTs will respond to all food hazard incidents in the farm-to-table continuum of food production and delivery by using incident command structure response protocols, a formalized crisis management system. Each recipient was awarded up to \$500,000 to exercise its response team, conduct a program assessment, purchase additional equipment and supplies, fund personnel, train, and share information and data as appropriate. As part of this cooperative agreement, DACS will update its electronic inspection system to implement a fully risk-based inspection program.

The Department feels that it is essential to continue efforts to increase inspection frequency, particularly for any firms where significant sanitation deficiencies have been found. A policy of increasing inspections for firms with serious violations, implemented in FY 2004-05, is still in operation. Sanitation violations correlate to a greater risk to the public through food pathogens. Education, training and inspection emphasis on risk factors and diligent follow-up on non-complying establishments are expected to produce further progress. The Division continues to emphasize strict enforcement of food code and other sanitation requirements, charging for re-inspections in facilities not meeting standards, and assessing administrative fines based on repeat violations.

While the difference in this measure between FY 2007-08 and FY 2008-09 is only a minimal increase, it is likely that this measure may decline in the future as new inspection techniques are implemented, such as risk based inspections, and particularly if hurricane activity reoccurs to the degree of previous years. The Department is expecting its previous projections in the percent of establishments meeting requirements to increase slightly, with a compliance of 91.25% anticipated by FY 2014-15 as indicated in the following Table:

<b>Baseline/ FY 1999-00</b>	<b>FY 2010-11</b>	<b>FY 2011-12</b>	<b>FY 2012-13</b>	<b>FY 2013-14</b>	<b>FY 2014-15</b>
90.0%	91.0%	90.5%	90.75%	91.0%	91.25%

Future resources will be needed to achieve these results because, despite a current trend of slower growth, it is anticipated that additional food establishments will open. Regulatory inspections are essential to protect public health and safety and to better monitor the security of our food supply. Corresponding updates in Food Safety IT programs and equipment are needed to accommodate the evolution of risk-based inspections and to maintain uniformity with our federal partners and proficiency with national inspection standards.

Needs to accomplish the projected outcome in FY 2009-10 and future years include:

- An upgrade of Information Technology resources is needed to maintain program equivalency and uniformity with our federal partners and the capacity for management of sanitation inspection and compliance activity records. This will also enhance division capability to share information for security and health monitoring with other state or federal agencies.

- Adequate field personnel to conduct inspections at food establishments as necessary to attain food safety and sanitation compliance.

Objective 1C: Decrease the number of food products that are adulterated, misrepresented or otherwise unsafe.

Outcome: Percent of food products analyzed that meet standards.

A single supermarket may have as many as 80,000 different food products. Additionally, an estimated 18,000 new food products are marketed each year, and analytical resources must be targeted on different product populations each year. Surveillance sampling is directed toward suspected problem foods, so the outcome does not necessarily reflect the overall marketplace. Because of the great variety of foods in the marketplace, progress toward this objective is projected to reflect year-to-year variations rather than a consistent trend. The value for this outcome was 92.30% for FY 2008-09, compared to 89.52% for FY 2007-08

This measure is based on testing of a wide variety of products during each year, but it does not necessarily represent the overall percentage of food products on the market that do not meet standards. Targeted sampling better contributes to the objective of decreasing the number of food products that are adulterated or otherwise unsafe. Since the population of products tested changes each year, often depending on new or changing trends, there will be normal variation up or down within an overall trend of increased safety of foods. This outcome should still be interpreted as an indication of safeness for consumers for the overall food supply.

With introduction of new technology into our Food laboratory (i.e. TEMPO, DNA sequencing), and a concentrated effort to improve methods, along with emphasis on quality assurance due to our accreditation to ISO 17025 standards, our laboratory should show increased detection of a variety of food adulterants. In addition, an increased targeted testing of produce and soft cheeses for pathogens and of products for nutritional claims and labeling this year, two important issues within our state, demonstrated detection of pathogens and unfounded nutritional claims.

Food product sampling in future years will continue to be directed toward products/brands with greater likelihood on non-compliance. An overall annual increase in the “percent of food products analyzed that meet standards” is projected to reach 92.4% by FY 2014-15, as indicated below:

<b>Baseline/ FY 1999-00</b>	<b>FY 2010-11</b>	<b>FY 2011-12</b>	<b>FY 2012-13</b>	<b>FY 2013-14</b>	<b>FY 2014-15</b>
91.9%	91.2%	91.5%	91.8%	92.1%	92.4%

The Department has the capability to test for over 600 different food claims, components or contaminants, and performed over 47,000 analyses in FY 2008-09. Future resources will be needed to deal with new food types and analyses, improve methods for identification of pathogens, determine methods for newly emerging pathogens, increase sensitivity of detection, and expand the current scope of testing. New technologies are being introduced to rapidly detect



highly pathogenic organisms and to confirm linkages to illnesses through genetic fingerprints to definitively associate a specific commodity or facility with a food borne illnesses. Viruses are also beginning to play a major role as the cause of large food illness outbreaks. Hepatitis A on green onions in several states and Norovirus outbreaks are recent examples.

Improvements which upgraded capability to meet Biological Safety Level 3 standards for safe handling of biological agents enabled the Food Laboratory to become part of the LRN and the FERN for testing biological organisms and toxins in foods. In addition, capability in the food chemistry section of the Food Laboratory is being utilized in state and national plans for response to chemical terrorism in foods. Expertise in new technologies will be critical in responding to any terrorist threats in foods. Other analytical equipment must be maintained and periodically upgraded for effectiveness. Accreditation to the ISO 17025 standard requires specific monitoring of equipment, personnel, and methods. Some future needs may be funded by federal grant sources, but it is appropriate to request funding for specific Domestic Security needs due to the public benefit of this function.

Needs to accomplish the projected outcome in FY 2009-10 and future years include:

- Increases in analysis capacity to meet new demands such as addressing emerging pathogens, food bioterrorism threats and molecular fingerprinting for rapid confirmation of relationships of foods to illness outbreaks.
- Periodic equipment replacement or technology upgrades to maintain capacity and address analysis needs to better identify products not meeting standards.
- Continued retention and recruitment of skilled personnel and equipment to identify food borne pathogens.

Objective 1D: Reduce potential health effects from exposure to pesticide or other chemical residues in foods.

Outcome: Percent of produce or other food samples analyzed that meet chemical residue standards.

Chemical residue regulatory monitoring is a major component of Florida's food safety program. Pesticide residues on food continues to be a chief concern for many, with the health effects generally chronic (long-term), rather than immediate. In addition, this activity clearly contributes to the reputation and marketability of Florida-grown crops because of the active surveillance to identify possible residue problems very early in the distribution process. Requirements for prior testing and certification of exported produce such as grapefruit to Japan, emphasizes Florida industry's need for this data. Even though different types of produce are tested annually, in recent years the percentage of products that meet EPA's pesticide residue standards has improved to a somewhat consistent level.

The Department's residue testing activities are expanding to cover a wider variety of chemical residues of concern. For example, illegal residues of Chloramphenicol, a potentially toxic antibiotic, have been found in several imported food products. Fluoroquinolones, another class of antibiotics, have been reported to be illegally used in other imported foods. Such broad use is of major health concern because microbial resistance can be developed through the added exposure.

A compliance rate of 99.01% of samples was found in FY 2008-09, a 1.11 percentage point increase from FY 2007-08. Trends toward more testing of imported products and expanding the number of analyses targeted suggest that compliance levels may not significantly improve in coming years. Products tested which meet chemical residue standards are projected to improve to 98.00% or above by FY 2014-15.

<b>Baseline/ FY 1999-00</b>	<b>FY 2010-11</b>	<b>FY 2011-12</b>	<b>FY 2012-13</b>	<b>FY 2013-14</b>	<b>FY 2014-15</b>
97.85%	97.8%	97.85%	97.9%	97.95%	98.00%

Changing agriculture patterns and increases in imported fruits and vegetables make it desirable that surveillance include more imported foods and that laboratory methodology be expanded to monitor pesticides with special approval for use on Florida crops, and to detect other toxins and chemicals that present health risks to Floridians. The specialized capabilities used in pesticide residue analysis are being expanded to include multiple veterinary drug and toxic organic chemicals. In addition, this capability is being utilized in state and national plans for response to chemical terrorism in foods.

Another new dimension under this objective is the identification of chemical terrorist agents in foods. The Chemical Residue Laboratory is an active member of the national Food Emergency Response Network (FERN), working with FDA and USDA in development of analysis capability and capacity to respond to chemical terrorism threats in our foods or crop production.

The Chemical Residue Program no longer receives General Revenue funds. Legislation passed in 2009 increased the fees assessed for registration of each registered brand of pesticide containing an active ingredient with food tolerance limits as established by EPA. The fiscal impact is that revenues collected from the supplemental registration fee may also be used by the department for testing pesticides for food safety. Therefore, despite significant budgetary constraints and the possibility of loss of program functions funding for this program will continue. Benefits provided by this program include diminished chronic exposure to pesticides, veterinary drugs, and other chemical residues in the food supply, and particularly in the diet of children, as well as removal from sale of products with toxic residues.

Needs to accomplish the projected outcome in FY 2009-10 and future years include:

- Improved salaries for scientists to enable the attraction and retention of qualified laboratory scientists.

- Added resources to analyze new compounds, including antibiotic residues, and to expand analysis capacity to include more foods.
- Periodic equipment replacement or upgrades to maintain capacity and address emerging analysis needs.
- Facility enhancements and equipment for safe and secure testing of foods for select chemical agents.

## **CONSUMER PROTECTION**

### **Agricultural Environmental Services**

The Division of Agricultural Environmental Services regulates pesticides, fertilizer, seed, feed, mosquito control and pest control in the state and examines licenses and certifies pesticide applicators and businesses. It also provides technical and scientific expertise for development of chemical management practices and operates state-of-the-art analytical laboratories that support regulatory, scientific, and inspection programs for pesticides, fertilizers, feed and seed.

Given the current period of limited resources and public expectations of government efficiency and accountability, the Division will continue to operate efficiently and prioritize activities for maximum public protection. Without increasing resources, the Division's pest control, mosquito control and pesticide program capabilities may be unable to fully meet increasing consumer demands for protection against fraud and product mislabeling and misuse, and unfunded inspection program additions imposed by federal agencies.

- The Department enforces the Florida Agricultural Worker Safety Act (FAWSA) as well as the federal Worker Protection Standard (WPS). With the passage of FAWSA in 2004, the Division's WPS enforcement and inspection activities increased; the average number of complaints received between 1994 and 2004 was 9, and in 2005, the number of complaints received was 70. In 2006, the number of complaints received was 40 and the number of inspections was 1,129. In 2008, the number of inspections was 1,160 and the number of complaints was 4. The Division will continue to make enforcement of FAWSA a high priority.
- A major emphasis for the Division continues to be the development and implementation of pesticide-specific management techniques and compliance with safe use requirements to prevent the migration of residues to ground water, surface water, and air. The number of pesticide registrants has declined as pesticide manufacturing companies merge and restructure, however the number of products remains relatively stable. Novel chemistries and new products will continue to emerge and federal initiatives such as the pesticide re-registration program for soil fumigants, pesticide registration review program and endangered species protection program will require Florida-specific

- In January 2009, the United States 6<sup>th</sup> Circuit Court of Appeals (“The Court”) vacated the USEPA’s 2006 rule that exempted pesticide applicators that make applications to, on, or near water from having to obtain a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit. As a result of this decision, persons applying pesticides to, on or near water bodies would need to obtain an NPDES permit prior to use (the full scope of applications potentially subject to the permitting requirement has not been established). The permitting requirement is expected to significantly affect pesticide applicators, pesticide regulators, and NPDES permitting agencies, at a minimum. In April, “the Court” granted a two-year stay on this mandate to allow federal and state programs to prepare permitting programs. Since the Courts’s decision, staff of the Division have worked at both the national and state level to promote a constructive dialogue on how to move forward with a permitting system that protects water resources while minimizing disruptions to vital pest control operations. In Florida, the Division is working closely with the FDACS Office of Agricultural Water Policy, the Department of Environmental Protection and Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission to develop a cooperative approach.
- Even with the availability of label directions and specific management techniques to provide for the proper use of pesticides, some pesticide applicators do not follow the label directions or the guidelines provided. The resulting improper pesticide use may cause or contribute to health effects, unnecessary exposures and environmental contamination that can have a potential negative impact on natural flora and fauna. Therefore, the objective of the Department’s Division of Agricultural Environmental Services over the next five years continues to be the reduction of the percentage of applicators who apply pesticides improperly.
- The fertilizer program continues as one of the most modern programs in the nation. Official samples of commercial fertilizer and agricultural liming materials are collected and analyzed to ensure they meet the standards established in Chapter 576, Florida Statutes. This program serves as a model for new fertilizer analytical methodologies. The laboratory has developed and implemented new methodologies to meet the evolving needs of the Florida consumer in the areas of nutrient availability in controlled-release fertilizers and micro-nutrient solubility, and will continue to research new methodologies to meet the ever-changing materials used in fertilizers. In 2008, the laboratory obtained accreditation from the “National Environmental Laboratory Accreditation Program for its environmental analyses in support of development of best management practices to sustain water quality from nutrient inputs. This accreditation further affirms the laboratory’s dedication to quality analytical work and ensures the reliability of the laboratory’s analytical work for the Florida consumer.

- The Urban Turf Fertilizer Rule is in effect and staff is actively involved in implementation. The fertilizer program is conducting increased sampling and analysis, as well as fertilizer label review, to ensure compliance with this rule. It is anticipated that current turf nutrient management studies may necessitate revisions to the existing Urban Turf Rule in regards to single applications of nitrogen. Because of developing new technology of controlled release fertilizer materials, subsequent proposed increases to single application limits of controlled release nitrogen will require additional research to validate the environmental impacts from runoff and leaching resulting from added nutrient loading.
- In feeds and feed products, the regulation of feed is becoming increasingly complex as market patterns have changed and new products are introduced. Bovine Spongiform Encephalopathy (BSE), widely referred to as "mad cow disease," continues to be the most critical feed-related issue. The disease was first identified in 1986 in the United Kingdom, but it was not detected in the United States until December 2003, when BSE was diagnosed in a single dairy cow in Washington State that had been imported from Canada. Subsequently, two additional cows, one in Texas and another in Alabama, were confirmed to have BSE in 2005 and 2006. In each case, swift government intervention prevented the infected cattle from entering the animal feed or human food markets. Additionally, recent separate incidents involving pet food products contaminated with aflatoxin and melamine resulted in multiple pet illnesses and deaths and nationwide pet food recalls. These contamination events underscore the importance of maintaining strict pet food safety and enforcement guidelines.
- Mosquito-borne disease transmission in Florida continues to pose a constant threat to the residents of this state. Keeping disease cases in humans and animals at the lowest possible levels remains a Department priority. Recent years have had very low numbers of arboviruses such as the West Nile Virus, with only 3 human and 75 reported equine cases in FY 08-09 (compared with 26 human and 86 equine cases of vector born disease in FY 05-06). The Department continues to be a partner in the state's Arbovirus Response Plan in cooperation with the Department of Health which has proven effective in mitigating the spread of arboviruses. The Department also provides emergency mosquito control services in the wake of hurricanes and disasters.
- As noted in previous statements, changes to the Structural Pest Control Law, Chapter 482, Florida Statutes, the addition of Law Enforcement personnel (Ag Law) and dedicated efforts to provide investigative training to field inspectors have resulted in improved enforcement capabilities within the Structural Pest Control Enforcement Section and increased numbers of enforcement actions. We anticipate that this trend will continue as further refinements in investigative skills and the addition of Law Enforcement personnel are provided to address compliance of illegal pest control operators, fumigation, and preventative treatment for new construction.

Objective 4A: Assist and protect consumers by decreasing the number of reported human/equine disease cases caused by mosquitoes.

Outcome: Number of reported human/equine disease cases caused by mosquitoes.

<b>Baseline/ FY 1998-99</b>	<b>FY 2010-11</b>	<b>FY 2011-12</b>	<b>FY 2012-13</b>	<b>FY 2013-14</b>	<b>FY 2014-15</b>
2/40	8/47	2/49	2/49	2/49	2/49

The Division expects to meet the projected goal of no more than 2 human and 49 equine disease cases caused by mosquitoes by FY 2012-2013. With the introduction of West Nile Virus (WNV) in Florida in 2001 and expansion in 2002, the total number of human and equine disease cases increased. As of FY 2007-2008, the number of cases appears to have stabilized, but the potential for periodic outbreaks with higher case numbers exists. Continued efforts to educate the public to avoid mosquito bites and to support mosquito control efforts at the local level are critically important in preventing large numbers of cases in the future. As of the end of FY08/09, 3 human and 75 equine arbovirus cases were confirmed in the State.

Objective 4C: Assist and protect consumers by decreasing the number of pesticide, pest control, fertilizer, feed and seed licensees and products that are unlawful, unsafe or unethical.

Outcome: Percent of feed, seed, and fertilizer inspected products in compliance with performance/quality standards.

<b>Baseline/ FY 2000-01</b>	<b>FY 2010-11</b>	<b>FY 2011-12</b>	<b>FY 2012-13</b>	<b>FY2013-14</b>	<b>FY 2014-15</b>
86.8%	89.0%	89.0%	89.1%	89.2%	89.3%

Outcome: Percent of commercial pest control businesses and applicators who are in compliance with regulations.

<b>Baseline/ FY 2000-01</b>	<b>FY 2010-11</b>	<b>FY 2011-12</b>	<b>FY 20012-13</b>	<b>FY 2013-14</b>	<b>FY 2014-15</b>
82%	92.0%	92.0%	92.1%	92.2%	92.3%

Outcome: Percent of licensed pesticide applicators inspected who are in compliance with regulations.

<b>Baseline/ FY 2000-01</b>	<b>FY 2010-11</b>	<b>FY 2011-12</b>	<b>FY 2012-13</b>	<b>FY2013-14</b>	<b>FY 2014-15</b>
76%	88.0%	88.0%	88.1%	88.2%	88.3%

The Division has shifted compliance efforts to risk-based enforcement strategies that focus limited resources on regulated activities and entities with the highest risk of non-compliance. This shift has and will result in a temporary decrease in the reported rate of compliance. We do expect however, that compliance will improve in out-years as the risk based system encounters and corrects non-compliance in the regulated community.

### **Consumer Protection Services**

The primary mission of the Division of Consumer Services is to protect consumers from unfair and deceptive business practices. The stated objective for the Division is:

Objective 4D: Safeguard consumers by monitoring regulated entities for compliance with consumer protection laws.

Outcome: Percent of all regulated entities where an investigation found a violation of consumer protection laws.

<b>Baseline/ 2002-03</b>	<b>FY 2010-11</b>	<b>FY 2011-12</b>	<b>FY 2012-13</b>	<b>FY 2013-14</b>	<b>FY 2014-15</b>
4.36%	4.36%	4.36%	4.36%	4.36%	4.36%

Since FY 2002-03, investigators have continued to aggressively pursue violations of regulated entities. Because regulations are being stringently enforced, it is anticipated that the entities will continue to stay in compliance to avoid violations. As a result, the Division had an 18% overall increase in registrations throughout all program areas in FY 2008-09 compared to five years ago. The performance measure “Percent of all regulated entities where an investigation found a violation of Consumer Protection Laws” was 3.47% in FY 08-09. Due to an increase in regulated entities and because of stringent enforcement, repeat violations have decreased.

The Division of Consumer Services administers the Florida Do Not Call (DNC) law, and enforces the provisions of the law. Due to the Federal DNC list being launched in June 2003 at no cost to consumers, the number of Florida DNC subscriptions was expected to decrease markedly. Performance standards were reduced to 66,545 in FY 2004-05 for the anticipated reductions. While there was an initial drop in FY 2003-04, subscriptions have remained at approximately 100,000.

Electronic filing (E-Commerce) applications continue to grow in the Division of Consumer Services. For FY 08-09, the following program areas renewed/filed using electronic applications: Motor Vehicle Repair – 1,026, Game Promotions – 1,329, Do Not Call (Subscribers) – 1,527, Do Not Call (List) – 359, Telemarketing (Salesperson) – 1,307 and Sellers of Travel (Independent Sales Agents) – 115. The implementation of electronic filing and online registration for each regulatory program will continue based on the funding provided.

## **Standards and Petroleum Quality Inspection**

The Division of Standards has diverse regulatory responsibilities that assure consumer protection and safety for the citizens of Florida. In particular, the Division provides regulatory oversight for transactions involving weighing and measuring (Chapter 531, Florida Statutes), for the quality, quantity, and pricing of petroleum products (Chapters 501, Part V., 525, 526 Florida Statutes), for the safe distribution and storage of Liquefied Petroleum (LP) Gas (Chapter 527, Florida Statutes) and the inspection of amusement rides at temporary events (fairs, carnivals and festivals), and permanent amusement parks (Chapter 616.242 Florida Statutes). The Division of Standards has four bureaus to handle these distinct responsibilities: the Bureau of Weights and Measures, the Bureau of Petroleum Inspection, the Bureau of LP Gas Inspection, and the Bureau of Fair Rides Inspection. Also, the Division of Standards conducts investigations of complaints alleging violations of Florida's Motor Fuel Marketing Practices Act (Section 526.301 – 526.3135, Florida Statutes), which are generated by competitors. These complaints are ordinarily filed by businesses against businesses alleging the sale of motor fuel below cost. The Division of Standards also investigates complaints filed by consumers alleging price gouging in the sale of petroleum products and LP gas during a declared state of emergency (Section 501.160, Florida Statutes).

The major trends and conditions for these regulatory areas are:

- Training and continuing education continue to be in the forefront in the LP Gas industry, and this is anticipated to continue over the next five years. Increases in training requirements, i.e., number of continuing education units and expanded categories requiring training are anticipated. These increased requirements are driven by new technical areas in the industry, security issues, increased federal requirements for hazmat training, and a basic need within the industry to engage in on-going training to refresh licensees' knowledge of technical and legal requirements, as well as to introduce them to new equipment within the industry. The Bureau of LP Gas Inspection approves vendor training and conducts training classes for industry personnel. Continuing education requirements are mandated by statute, generating an on-going need for industry training. Increased funding for industry-targeted training is being provided by national programs, and growth is anticipated in the next few years through the state and national marketing assessment programs.
- Issuance of LP Gas licenses to the industry has more than doubled over the past decade. Nearly 13,000 licenses and over 800 qualifier/master qualifier certificates were processed during FY 08-09 and 932 examinations were administered. License numbers have continued to increase over the past year, primarily due to an increase in the number of cylinder exchange operators. License growth is expected to continue for this licensing category. In addition, depending upon the number and severity of storms that may arise during the 2009 Hurricane Season, an increase in licenses related to generators could also be realized. The trend for major multi-state marketers with multiple locations to close



- The Bureau of LP Gas Inspection in conjunction with the LP Gas industry and the Division of Marketing is continuing to promote product and safety awareness through advertising campaigns supported by funds available from industry check-off programs. Funding is also utilized to provide training and educational opportunities for industry members as well as to statewide code enforcement officials. A new program objective is to provide LP gas emergency response training materials to fire safety and hazardous materials officials and to increase communication with these officials. LP Gas safety for consumers during hurricane season will be a featured topic in future safety campaigns.
- The majority of accidents reported to the Bureau of LP Gas Inspection continue to occur at consumer/residential locations. Not all reported accidents are directly caused by LP gas, however. Other causes include lightning strikes, natural gas (not regulated by the bureau), and motorized vehicles. In accidents caused by these other factors, if LP gas is present it can sometimes act as a secondary factor and result in enhanced damage. In FY 2008-09, the total number of reported accidents was 52 of which 29 were LP-gas related. For FY 2007-08, 70 accidents were reported, 44 of which were LP-gas related and in FY 2006-07, 55 total accidents were reported with 42 LP-gas related. Since FY 2005-06, when the number of LP-gas related accidents reached 53, the number of accidents attributable to LP-gas have declined. Continued educational efforts for consumers will address problem areas and should continue to aid in reducing the number of accidents involving consumers and consumer locations.
- Amusement ride inspections have trended slightly downward for the last three fiscal years. The reasons for this are related primarily to economic conditions and rising fuel costs. The number of inspections should remain stable at around 10,000 per year for the foreseeable future. New amusement rides, such as simulators and super-rides, are becoming more difficult to inspect due to the growth of computer controls and overall ride complexity. This growing complexity has increased ride inspection times and has highlighted the need for ride inspectors' training. The Department's amusement ride inspection program is effective and, by reputation, is the most comprehensive program of its kind among the states.
- 2009 legislation established requirements for businesses to obtain Weighing and Measuring Device Permits from the Department. The permits are projected to yield \$1.9 million in revenues, replacing all general revenues that previously funded the Weights and Measures program. The new permitting requirements have expanded the scope of responsibilities for the weights and measures program to include invoicing and issuing the appropriate permits for 18,000 current businesses with devices, as well as all new businesses that use weighing or measuring devices. This has significantly increased the administrative and clerical workload and will impact the workload of the field staff with enforcement and fee collection duties as well.

- The state has approximately 205,261 petroleum pumps distributed across 9,094 retail stations. New stations built today are typically in the range between 36 and 72 pumps. Further, the types of petroleum pumps have become increasingly more complex and diverse, as compared to traditional mechanical pumps. This results in additional checks that are made by inspectors to ensure compliance with adopted quality, performance, and accuracy standards.
- By the end of 2010, all gasoline sold in this state is required to contain nine to ten percent ethanol, with certain exceptions. As a result, the number of tests conducted in the petroleum inspection laboratories is expected to increase with the continued emergence of these blends and other new alternative fuels into the motor fuel marketplace. The increasing presence of such products will continue to shape and change the testing program to ensure maximum consumer protection when purchasing these fuels.
- As a result of two consecutive previous highly-active hurricane seasons beginning in 2004, the number of annual price gouging complaints received by the Division reached an all-time high of 3,350 for the 2005 hurricane season and reached 2,420 for the 2008 season. Price gouging investigations were not prevalent in the Division's workload during years prior to 2004. However, with this dramatic increase in the number of price gouging complaints received by the Division, they now potentially will be a significant part of the Division's annual workload.
- With motor fuel prices reaching and surpassing the \$5.00 per gallon mark last year the response from consumers increased significantly. The increase was believed to have resulted from the rapid spike in the price of motor fuel. This also resulted in an increase in consumer reaction and increased awareness to different pump behavior that may have been previously unnoticeable at lower prices. This increase significantly impacted the workload on the field inspection program and may affect the duration in which complete facility inspections can be performed. The consumer effects from this past year still persists to a large degree today, despite motor fuel prices being significantly less than \$4.00 per gallon.
- As a result of alternate generate power requirements adopted into law in 2006, the petroleum inspection program began inspecting affected facilities to ensure the required wiring and equipment had been installed by qualified personnel and that required portable alternate electricity generation equipment was being maintained by affected corporations. This aspect of the inspection program is now a significant part of the Division's regular workload and will continue to be a significant part of the regular workload.
- New measuring devices, including petroleum pumps, scales, liquid meters, etc., are controlled with sophisticated electronic components enabling the devices to be manipulated more easily to perpetrate fraud. The Division monitors these devices closely.

- The population of scales and non-petroleum measuring devices has experienced unprecedented growth, a trend expected to continue for at least the next five years. The number of regulated commercial devices has increased from 44,000 to over 65,000 in the last twenty years. The program is also responsible for assuring the accuracy of electronic pricing systems (scanners), and the number of businesses in the state utilizing such systems is increasing at a similar rate.
- Along with the testing of national brands, standard packaged commodities, the Weights and Measures Program has assumed the additional responsibility of testing random-pack food packages from another division. Random-pack food packages are typically those found in the meat, produce and delicatessen sections of grocery stores that are weighed and labeled in the store rather than packaged in standard size packages at centrally located packing plants. These additional duties add to the complexity and time required to conduct inspections in food establishments and could result in a reduction of the number of devices and businesses the program is able to inspect annually.

Objective 4F: Maintain protection to consumers and businesses in commercial transactions by maintaining the accuracy compliance rates for regulated weighing and measuring devices, packages, and businesses with scanners in Florida.

Outcome: Percent of regulated weighing and measuring devices, packages, and businesses with scanners in compliance with accuracy standards during initial inspections/testing

<b>Baseline/ 1996-97</b>	<b>FY 2010-11</b>	<b>FY 2011-12</b>	<b>FY 2012-13</b>	<b>FY 2013-14</b>	<b>FY 2014-15</b>
95%	96%	96%	96%	96%	96%

The high accuracy compliance rate achieved each year for the listed outcome provides assurance that consumers are protected and businesses have a competitive environment in transactions involving weighing and measuring. Despite the large increase in demand described in the trends and conditions, the Division feels that it can maintain the 96% compliance rate through FY 2012/2013 using the current funding level with small adjustments for inflation. The Division has consistently found, over the past 10 years, innovative techniques and equipment to enhance its efficiency and effectiveness in all of its programs. The Division is currently implementing and devising new strategies to handle the increased future demand.

- The number of complaints alleging violations of Florida’s Motor Fuel Marketing Practices Act usually increases when there is an increase in the price of motor fuel at the wholesale level. Such increases reduce business profits and make it more difficult for a business to price its motor fuel competitively in the local market. Motor fuel supply, demand and pricing cannot be predicted with any assurance; therefore, it is difficult to foresee the trend of complaints which will be generated in this area.

- Price gouging complaints are common when Florida is in a declared state of emergency, such as when hurricanes or wildfires threaten the state. The trend for these complaints cannot be predicted due to the unique conditions which must be present before these complaints can be filed.

## **AGRICULTURAL ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT**

### **Fruit and Vegetable Inspection and Enforcement**

The Division of Fruit and Vegetables inspects and certifies all fresh and processed shipments of vegetables, fruit, and nuts, as may be assigned in connection with regulations issued under federal and state marketing orders. It inspects fresh produce not covered by regulation on a request basis. It inspects all fresh tomato packing houses and farms to ensure compliance with food safety regulations. It licenses all citrus dealers and registers all agents of licensed fruit dealers, packing houses, processing plants, and field boxes used in harvesting fruits and vegetables, in accordance with F.S. 601. It also maintains testing equipment and facilities at processing plants and packing houses and develops and conducts methods for maturity and load evaluation procedures and equipment.

Trends and conditions that affect the Division's services include:

- **Natural Resources** – The demand for water continues to increase as the population grows. The demand for prime agricultural land gives way to housing development resulting in further erosion of the agriculture industry. Florida's subtropical climate provides a natural environment that lends itself to the continuing development of land areas that otherwise may be used for food production.
- **Weather Conditions** – Sub freezing temperatures during the past twenty-five years forced the citrus grower of Florida to move vast acreages into the southern tier of the state which reduced the chances of crop losses in future years. Today, Florida's sub tropical climate continues to provide warm winters for the various crops. Hurricanes in 2004 and 2005 impacted Florida's citrus crop with several years of reduced crops.. .
- **State and Federal Marketing Orders** – The enforcement of rules and regulations remain the top priority of the Division. This is accomplished through the tireless efforts of many well trained inspectors who spend many hours in packing houses, processing plants, shipping points, terminal markets, and growing crop fields.
- **Diseases and Quarantines** – The U.S. Department of Agriculture has released an interim rule banning the shipment of Fresh Florida Citrus to Five Citrus producing states and five citrus producing territories because of Citrus Canker. It is unclear what the effect of the quarantine will have on shipments to domestic and international markets.

- Market Demand – Officials of the European Union are still planning to accept Florida Citrus from groves that are certified as Canker free. In Japan, Canker is not an import issue because the disease is endemic there. Increased sales of citrus are expected as Grapefruit exports to Japan have risen. Interest from China and other Far Eastern countries continue to grow for citrus juices, as these countries become more economically sound.

Objective 2E: Provide quality inspection services to Florida’s fruit and vegetable industries at the lowest possible cost.

Outcome: Dollar value of fruit and vegetables that are shipped to other states or countries that are subject to mandatory inspection.

<b>Baseline/ FY 1996-97</b>	<b>FY 2010-11</b>	<b>FY2011-12</b>	<b>FY 2012-13</b>	<b>FY 2013-14</b>	<b>FY2014-15</b>
\$1,443,648,000	\$1,925,000,000	\$2,000,000,000	\$2,000,000,000	\$2,000,000,000	\$2,000,000,000

In order to meet our projected outcome, we have set a baseline that takes into consideration the impact that low market demand or adverse weather conditions would have on our outcome. Since our inspections are mandatory, the demand will always equal the standard. However, the fiscal impact can be felt if the number of tons of fruit and vegetables that require inspection falls dramatically. The overhead costs are relatively consistent regardless of whether we reach our projections.

Our objective of providing quality inspection services to Florida’s fruit and vegetable industries at the lowest possible cost remains, regardless of uncontrollable external factors and shifting market conditions.

### **Agricultural Products Marketing**

The Division of Marketing and Development stimulates, encourages, and fosters the production and consumption of Florida-grown and produced agricultural products. We do that by conducting activities that create a better understanding of products and markets, and more efficient cooperation among producers, buyers, food editors, and the consuming public. The Division is also charged with operating the State Farmers Market system of 13 markets.

Conditions and trends currently impacting Florida’s agricultural growers and distributors include:

- Increasing difficulty retaining Florida’s place in the national and world market place because of the formation of global marketing agreements and the subsequent impact these agreements have on tariffs and other factors.

- Higher labor costs for Florida growers, and very restrictive growing regulations that exceed those of many of its foreign competitors.
- Governmentally funded marketing campaigns in several leading agricultural states (New York, New Jersey, California, Texas and North Carolina to name a few) that threaten to further siphon market share from Florida growers.
- Aging, deteriorating and storm-damaged infrastructure at the regionally located state markets.
- Tenants eager to participate in taking whatever steps necessary to keep the markets operating and viable to the local economy.
- A commitment to restructuring individual markets to meet local demand.

The Division of Marketing and Development assists the Department in its goal to improve the production and sale of Florida's agricultural products. Many factors must be considered, however, when measuring the effects and value of marketing, advertising and promotional initiatives. Variables such as weather, over and/or under production, pests and disease, wholesale margins, trade barriers, foreign (often subsidized) competition, and the overall global economy all contribute to production volumes and total sales. While the Division's outcome measure of "Florida agricultural products as a percent of the national market" accurately reflects and compares Florida's position to the national composite, it should not be used to gauge or measure the overall effectiveness of marketing initiatives. Nor can the national market comparisons be used to speculate regarding economic performance of the state's agricultural industry without marketing, advertising and promotional initiatives.

Sustained and extensive marketing retail campaigns in Canada have resulted in more than 300,000 individual store ads occurring between 2003 and 2008 with retail stores. In the same time period, Florida exports of fruits and vegetables to Canada have expanded from \$268 million dollars to more than \$428 million dollars—60% increase.

Traced directly to aggressive and innovative marketing initiatives by the Department, many retailers reported higher profits with Florida commodities for an eighth straight year in 2009. Data collected directly from supermarkets graphically show the positive results of the Department's marketing campaigns on behalf of the state's growers in fiscal 2009 (more than 11,700 supermarkets in over three dozen chains, stretching from Florida to New York to Illinois and as far out as Alaska, Canada, South Korea, the Caribbean and Central America) produced 413,000 individual store ads featuring Florida agricultural products.

Overall, more than \$790 million in farm gate cash receipts are directly attributable to the retail sales campaigns conducted from 2000-2009 averaging nearly \$80M per year. This uninterrupted commitment has established solid partnerships with more than 30 retail partners globally and resulted in producing more than 26,741 jobs in Florida in this same period and an estimated \$106 million in indirect tax contributions.

With continued efforts and fiscal support, Florida farmers will remain highly competitive and a viable part of the State's economy far into the future supporting more than 763 thousand jobs and over \$100 billion in total economic impact per a University of Florida, IFAS study.

Objective 2C: Improve production and sale of Florida's agricultural products.

Outcome: Florida agricultural products as a percent of the national market.

(Note: This data is received in a preliminary form in May or June each year, and final numbers are provided in November or December. The projections below are based upon data received from the USDA in August 2009 for Calendar Year 2008 – the latest data available).

Baseline/ 1996	FY 2010-11	FY 2011-12	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15
3.22%	2.71%	2.53%	2.56%	2.58%	2.61%

The proficiency of the state farmers' market program is measured by the value of the commodities sold by tenants of the 13 facilities statewide.

Objective 2F: Maximize sales generated by tenants of state farmers' markets.

Estimates are generally based upon average sales over previous years. Such an assessment would show an average of more than \$584 million a year in sales generated through the markets over the past three years. However, that number could be skewed because sales over the past years at Suwannee Valley Market alone (mainly on the strength of one tenant) has averaged \$319 million; 55% of the total system sales. Because the loss of the one tenant could create such a dramatic decline in sales, we have removed data from Suwannee from our formula for calculating the performance measure for subsequent years. We requested and were approved a goal of \$250,000,000 in sales for FY 09-10 at the markets, and with no significant increase in budget for the bureau, we recommend that the standard for the measure continue at that level for the future years covered by this report.

Outcome: Total sales of agricultural and seafood products generated by tenants of the state farmers' markets.

Baseline / FY 1996 - 97	FY 2010-11	FY 2011-12	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15
\$ 216,771,697	\$ 250,000,000	\$ 250,000,000	\$ 250,000,000	\$ 250,000,000	\$250,000,000

The Department aims to reach its five-year goals through:

- Continuation of its aggressive, highly visible “Fresh From Florida” marketing strategy that identifies Florida products and touts why they should be favored over their competitors. Campaigns under this banner are key components of marketing initiatives by agricultural entities nationwide. During the past decade more than 90 billion impressions have been generated worldwide fostering familiarity and penetration of the “Fresh from Florida” logo which has led many businesses and partners to incorporating the logo in extended advertising campaigns, promotions, packaging, etc., at no cost to the department which had an estimated advertising value of over \$29 million in the last decade.
- Examining the results of some defined campaigns in targeted markets and specific stores can be documented; in one recent example in South Korea, Florida product on ad with the Fresh from Florida logo and sampling, experienced a sales increase over the previous year of more than 900%.
- The Department has documented increased farmgate cash receipts for many commodities, for instance, \$120 million dollars in Florida strawberry cash receipts from 2003 to 2008. During the same period, marketing efforts generated increased levels of individual store ads; 5,800 ISAs in 2003 to more than 24,000 in 2008. Florida watermelon sales expanded from \$62 million dollars in 2003 to \$140M in 2008 with a similar expansion of individual store ads—2,300 (03) to 11,000 (08). Both commodity groups gained direct support from industry as well, of more than \$100,000 in the same period.
- Marketing campaigns conducted on behalf of Florida’s agriculture industry produced approximately \$143 million dollars in new Florida Farm Gate Cash Receipts in fiscal 2009. These increases will create over 4,800 jobs and some \$16 million dollars in local and state tax revenues in a recovering economy. Still, favorable weather, prudent international trade strategies on the federal level, and repetitive exposure of Florida’s marketing messages are all necessary for the state to retain its position as a national agricultural leader.
- Maintaining state farmers market venues that allow the healthy flow of sales of Florida commodities that boost the local and state economies. Tenants of the system of markets have reported more than \$3.09 billion in sales over the past five years.

In addition to its pure marketing initiatives, the Division of Marketing and Development also administers the state’s cooperative food distribution program, protects the state’s growers by conducting a licensing and bonding program directed toward those who purchase Florida grown commodities from growers, and provide vital crop information to growers and governmental entities via a joint State-Federal statistical service.

Reaching our five-year projections is not only based on the conditions noted above, but also on our ability to consistently receive funds to conduct marketing campaigns that can compete with other states and countries.



## Aquaculture

The Division of Aquaculture has been designated as the lead agency to coordinate and develop aquaculture in the state. This role is accomplished via numerous projects, farmer certification, best management practices in lieu of environmental permits, compliance with Best Management Practices (BMPs), aquaculture lease management, shellfish safety and inspection, licensing, permitting assistance, and annual production of the Florida aquaculture plan.

Trends and conditions affecting the Division include:

- The public continues to expect that shellfish products are safe and wholesome.
- Water quality is continually under pressure to be degraded as coastal areas continue to become developed.
- Compliance with sanitation requirements in shellfish processing facilities has remained at a constant level for several years. Continuing education and enforcement for noncompliance will tend to increase compliance with sanitation requirements.
- Although additional aquaculture leases have been established, the recent hurricanes reduced the total number of shellfish processing facilities, which has resulted in a smaller, more stable, number of processing establishments subject to inspection.
- Naturally occurring marine pathogens (species of *Vibrio* bacteria) are posing an emerging threat to the public health and the shellfish industries.

Objective 2G: Ensure that firms comply with environmental requirements.

Outcome: Percent of shellfish facilities in significant compliance with permit and food safety regulations.

<b>Baseline/ FY 199-2000</b>	<b>FY 2010-11</b>	<b>FY 2011-12</b>	<b>FY 2012-13</b>	<b>FY 2013-14</b>	<b>FY 2014-15</b>
80%	80%	80%	80%	80%	80%

Our strategies for obtaining the above projections are as follows:

- Continue to inform high-risk individuals, continue to inform medical caretakers and support groups of the types of individuals who are at high risk and continue to provide education to the public.
- Continue to monitor shellfish illnesses and report the number of illnesses as the Department of Health provides that information, continue to monitor shellfish-landings (shellfish harvested) and report the amount harvested as the Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission provides that information.

- Continue to sample and test shellfish waters on a routine basis, continue to develop predictive management plans to close harvest areas when conditions warrant.
- Continue to implement the *Vibrio vulnificus* Risk Reduction Plan to reduce the risk of illness from naturally occurring marine bacteria.
- Continue to assist the Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission with law enforcement activities on the water to assure harvesting is conducted from waters approved for harvest.
- Continue to inspect shellfish processing facilities to determine levels of compliance with permits and food safety regulations, continue to take appropriate enforcement actions for shellfish processing facilities that are determined to be out of compliance with permits and food safety regulations.
- Continue to implement regulations to provide an incentive for shellfish processing facilities to comply with permits and food safety regulations.
- Continue to train and educate the shellfish processing industry on compliance with permits and food safety regulations.
- Continue to work with the United States Food and Drug Administration in their annual evaluation of the Florida shellfish sanitation program to determine the level of compliance.
- Continue to upgrade the portable computer inspection system for shellfish processing plant inspections.

During the past three years, the Division of Aquaculture has accomplished all of the above strategies for obtaining the outcome measures. It is the intention of the Division of Aquaculture to continue these strategies.

### **Agricultural Interdiction Stations**

The Office of Agricultural Law Enforcement operates 23 agricultural inspection stations at which agricultural vehicle inspections are conducted every day, around the clock, in order to protect Florida's food supply and agricultural industry from devastating plant and animal pests and diseases. Twenty-two of the stations are located on all paved highways crossing the natural boundary of the Suwannee and St. Marys rivers in order to optimize our ability to protect Florida's borders, safeguard the public's food supply, and enforce state and federal marketing orders that directly affect Florida's agriculture industry. The twenty-third station is located at mile marker one on Interstate 10 in Escambia County.

The Agricultural Interdiction Stations support the efforts of the Divisions of Plant Industry, Animal Industry, Fruits and Vegetables, Forestry, Marketing & Development, Food Safety, Standards and Consumer Services by providing enforcement of the rules and regulations of the Department. These interdiction stations also provide assistance to local, state and federal agencies in matters of public safety and domestic security. Without this cooperative effort, the enforcement of many of the laws, rules and regulations would be impossible. This is the reason that the Bureau of Uniform Services places such a high priority on the effectiveness of its inspection/interdiction process.

Agricultural Interdiction Stations contribute to the goal of protecting consumers from potential health risks, domestic security breaches, and unfair and deceptive business practices. One of our objectives is to:

Objective 2D: Maintain the percent of vehicles carrying agricultural related products that are free of potentially devastating plant and animal pests or diseases.

Outcome: Percent of vehicles carrying agricultural related products that are inspected and found to be free of potentially devastating plant and animal pests and diseases.

<b>Baseline/ FY 1998-99</b>	<b>FY 2010-11</b>	<b>FY 2011-12</b>	<b>FY 2012-13</b>	<b>FY 2013-14</b>	<b>FY 2014-15</b>
<b>98%</b>	<b>99.9%</b>	<b>99.9%</b>	<b>99.9%</b>	<b>99.9%</b>	<b>99.9%</b>

Maintaining the above standard is based upon the continuation of funding and future approvals of requested budget issues to accommodate growth, improve and maintain facilities and meet new challenges that may occur throughout the next five years. Diversified and professional training will be provided and, through the automation of operations and the electronic transmission of data, an increase in the productive time of personnel will be experienced.

With the additional funding requested for the restructure of the inspection ramps and the renovation of certain inspection stations, the Bureau can develop and implement methods to speed up the inspection process. This will assist us in meeting the current traffic flow, while increasing the efficiency of the operation and improving safety conditions for our officers and the public.

In addition to conducting inspections, our officers capture and transmit bills of lading to the Florida Department of Revenue under a long-standing cooperative agreement between the two Departments. Agricultural officers capture and electronically transmit bills of lading to the Department of Revenue, where revenue officers work these bills to detect and collect unpaid taxes. Since the inception of this program in 1993, more than \$169 million in unpaid taxes have been collected and deposited into the state treasury at no additional expense to the state.

One of our objectives is to:

Objective 4G: Increase the quality of documents captured at Agricultural Interdiction Stations relating to agricultural commodities being transported in this state.

Outcome: Amount of revenue generated by Bills of Lading transmitted to the Department of Revenue from Agricultural Interdiction Stations.

<b>Baseline/ FY 1996-97</b>	<b>FY 2010-11</b>	<b>FY 2011-12</b>	<b>FY 2012-13</b>	<b>FY 2013-14</b>	<b>FY 2014-15</b>
\$6,900,897	\$ \$8,844,085	\$8,844,085	\$8,844,085	\$8,844,085	\$8,844,085

Current trends and conditions impacting Agricultural Interdiction Station goals include:

- Modifications in Federal marketing orders and agricultural trade policies, population growth, continual advances in agricultural science and marketing promotions will continue to alter and impact the flow of fruits, vegetables and horticultural and aquaculture products into and out of this state and country.
- Severe weather, such as drought conditions or excessive rainfall and hurricanes, threaten all aspects of the agricultural industry, including the growth and health of our products, as well as the flow of these products into and out of the state and country.
- Awareness of Domestic Security threats and the availability of funding, such as that used to maintain our Vehicle and Cargo Inspection System (VACIS) units is critical to surface border control for the interdiction of materials that could be used as weapons of mass destruction.
- Ongoing concerns over healthier diets have continued to increase consumers' demand for fresh fruits and vegetables in the United States. Free and foreign trade agreements also must be factored in as they may lead to an increase in the importation and shipment of these types of products through Florida, resulting in a commensurate increase in the number of agricultural inspections to be performed.
- Continual reductions to our base budget and our staff impact our ability to have adequate staffing at all locations.

In addition, filling positions and retaining experienced veteran officers is paramount to protecting consumers from potential health risks, domestic security breaches, and unfair and deceptive business practices. Our ability to compete with other state and local law enforcement agencies in the hiring process by offering comparable salaries and incentives is the key.

## **Animal Pest and Disease Control**

The Division of Animal Industry with its Bureau of Animal Disease Control and Bureau of Diagnostic Laboratories serves the citizens of Florida by carrying out animal disease surveillance activities for and preventing, controlling and eradicating certain serious infectious or communicable diseases of livestock and other domestic animals. By enforcing Florida's animal health regulations (Chapter 585, Parts I and II, Florida Statutes), the Division focuses on the goals and objectives of protecting the state from serious animal pests and diseases that may threaten economic and public health, thereby providing enhanced value for the quality of life for Florida's citizens, animals and visitors. The rapid global mobility of people and animals and the state's location as an international travel center requires constant surveillance of the threat from the introduction of destructive diseases from other states or foreign countries.

The Division of Animal Industry has primary responsibility for prevention, surveillance, and control of dangerous transmissible diseases. These are diseases that seriously threaten animal and public health and the economy of Florida. More than 270 reports are received of suspect cases of these diseases each year. These cases must be investigated, characterized, and diagnosed and if found to be present, controlled to prevent further spread. Steps are taken to prevent the entry of such diseases but constant disease surveillance must be made to detect any introduced or emerging animal disease posing a significant threat to the animals or people of Florida.

In Fiscal Year 2008-09, Division staff tested 504,047 animals. The percentage of the state livestock and poultry infected with specific diseases was approximately 0.21%. The control of disease is necessary for public health and economic stability as Florida's livestock industry accounts for annual sales in excess of \$1.3 billion.

The Division also serves as the lead agency for animal and agricultural issues under Florida's Comprehensive Emergency Management Plan. Planning and response and coordination efforts are an important responsibility of the Division for emergencies ranging from natural disasters to potentially devastating animal disease outbreaks. In addition, the Division coordinates with public health officials to control and eradicate many diseases such as rabies, bovine tuberculosis, brucellosis, equine encephalitis, and psittacosis.

The result (Outcome) directly affects the general economic health of Florida. Therefore, the objective of this Division is to reduce the number of animals infected with, or exposed to, dangerous transmissible diseases. These diseases are transmissible to animal populations and many are transmissible to humans. This objective will be continually challenged by new and emerging issues/diseases that require the continuance of current activities that include testing and investigation for disease surveillance, vaccinating animals, and instituting control measures to prevent or eliminate disease.

Current trends and conditions include:

- Global trade, changing dynamics of animal populations, increased risk factors (agro-terrorism) and new animal species require increased knowledge, new technologies and

science. Inspection activities must be modified, updated and proactive to include animal disease surveillance and management. Personnel are needed to conduct epidemiological investigations of suspected diseased animals, carry out diagnostic testing, and implement disease control measures. Good examples are the outbreak of the Asian strain (H5N1) avian influenza in a number of countries and the threat that this zoonotic disease could be introduced into the United States by migratory birds, the rapid spread of West Nile Virus in Florida and throughout the United States, and the spread of Chronic Wasting Disease in the deer (Cervidae) population in the United States. Other cases involved finding Bovine Spongiform Encephalopathy (BSE) in a neighboring state, the first case of canine influenza detected in Florida's canine population, psittacosis in a very large pet bird population, Equine Herpes Virus (Neurological Form), and the outbreak of Equine Piroplasmiasis in 2008. Division staff spent over 3,000 man hours monitoring and testing exposed Florida horses for Contagious Equine Metritis when the disease was identified in horses from other states. All Florida horses tested were negative as of June 2009. Current disease control and eradication programs include tuberculosis in cattle; brucellosis in cattle and swine; pseudorabies in swine; equine infectious anemia, piroplasmiasis, and encephalitis in horses; and avian influenza in poultry. The Division also participates in the National Poultry Improvement Plan, which certifies that poultry and turkeys are free of certain diseases. Commercial egg producing flocks are monitored for salmonella. The Division also administers programs that ensure all livestock entering the state meet specific health requirements. This includes examining livestock shipments to review health documents, issuing import permits, and imposing necessary quarantine measures on diseased animals and on livestock movement violations. The development of the Equine Interstate Passport Card and Negative EIA Test Verification Card are examples of utilizing new technology to ensure more accurate identification of horses moving both interstate and intrastate.

The Division works cooperatively with other divisions and state agencies to monitor equine arboviral diseases such as Eastern Equine Encephalitis (EEE) and West Nile Virus (WNV), that present a threat to public and animal health every year. These diseases can infect humans, birds, mosquitoes, horses and some other mammals. People who contract WNV usually have mild or no symptoms but if the virus enters the brain it can cause death. Wild birds serve as the reservoir for these diseases which are transmitted by mosquitoes to horses and people.

In 2001, the presence of WNV in Florida was confirmed when a dead crow was found to be positive for the virus in Jefferson County. Since then, an extensive surveillance program has been implemented that involves the monitoring of mosquito pools, sentinel chickens, and horses. The Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services, in conjunction with the Department of Health, the Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission, and local health and mosquito control agencies, have developed an arbovirus plan that provides a tiered prevention, control, and response program. The appearance of dead birds in an area may be an early warning sign that the virus is present and should be reported to the Florida Department of Health by contacting the local county health office. Eastern Equine Encephalitis has been particularly prevalent in 2009 with more than 60 horses confirmed infected with a near 100% mortality rate.

Equine Piroplasmiasis, a deadly disease of horses, was detected in Florida in the fall of 2008 and the Division responded by investigating and tracing exposed horses, carrying out surveillance of horses and tick vectors and quarantining positive horses. Without effective treatment for this disease, the Department also assisted owners in the euthanasia of positive animals to eradicate this disease over a six-month period.

The Department continues to work with federal and state partners to conduct surveillance and to prevent the introduction of avian influenza from foreign sources. Avian influenza is a serious concern for commercial poultry producers in Florida. Certain strains of the influenza virus can be fatal to both humans and birds. With recent agricultural and public health concerns, surveillance for the highly pathogenic H5N1 Asian strain has been intense for both domestic and wild birds in Florida. Highly Pathogenic Avian Influenza H5N1 (Asian strain) has never been detected in the western hemisphere. The Division of Animal Industry regularly collects samples from commercial poultry, exhibition or backyard flocks, live bird markets, and county fairs. Testing for Avian Influenza occurs in two diagnostic centers in the state, and the division has 35 authorized agents trained to collect samples. The Division has worked with the Department of Health and Fish and Wildlife Commission to put on numerous training and test exercises both for the public and animal health emergency responders throughout the state.

In early 2009, human outbreaks of Novel H1N1 influenza occurred in Mexico and spread quickly to the United States and other countries. This flu virus contains genetic material from birds, swine, and people and the Division developed plans and capabilities to detect and respond to this virus in swine that might represent a threat to public or animal health.

The Division's program activities take into consideration the changing face of animal industries in Florida and throughout the United States. Government and industry are faced with challenging learning curves in veterinary medicine and disease risk analysis for unfamiliar species, with few or no precedents. The Department recognizes the need to include these emerging animal industries with traditional livestock industries so they can coordinate and respond to a greater range of issues. The Division's Cervidae Herd Health Plan program works cooperatively with the captive cervidae industry to increase surveillance activities for diseases, such as Epizootic Hemorrhagic Disease (EHD) and Bluetongue, that have the potential to infect several species of traditional livestock.

- Due to its extensive coastline, hospitable climate, and importation of an increasing number of non-native animal species, Florida occupies a critical position in the nation's agricultural picture. The importation of animals and animal products poses a constant threat of the introduction of diseases, and the continued threat of terrorism raises concerns about the state's vulnerability to deliberately introduced foreign animal diseases. New testing technologies are required to increase capabilities and address the broad range of new/emerging disease threats.

The Bureau of Diagnostic Laboratories provides diagnostic services to veterinarians and others who take care of livestock and animal populations. Laboratory staff work in the main facility located in Kissimmee and a satellite laboratory in Live Oak. The laboratories also provide diagnostic services to evolving industries (e.g., aquaculture,

exotic birds, and exhibition animals) and assist some wildlife rehabilitation programs. The laboratories exchange information with other states to learn of disease problems that could affect Florida's livestock population. By examining routine blood, tissue, and other samples taken from animals, the laboratory monitors for the possible occurrence of foreign or exotic animal diseases. Among other tests, the Kissimmee Diagnostic Laboratory (KDL) is approved by the National Animal Health Laboratory Network (NAHLN) to conduct testing for avian influenza, exotic Newcastle disease, classical swine fever, foot and mouth disease, chronic wasting disease, scrapie and novel H1N1 influenza virus. The Live Oak Laboratory also serves as the state/federal brucellosis laboratory. KDL is accredited by the American Association of Veterinary Laboratory Diagnosticians (AAVLD) and is a core laboratory in the NAHLN under the United States Department of Agriculture.

Work on the new Necropsy and Shipping/Receiving project at the Kissimmee Laboratory has just culminated with the completion of the Necropsy Laboratory in July 2009, following the Shipping/Receiving facility which was completed in August 2008. This two phase project included approximately 10 acres of site work and encompassed the design and production for land clearing, infrastructure, storm water runoff management, security fencing and landscaping. The 1,485 square foot shipping/receiving center is a state of the art bio-containment facility designed for receiving and processing shipments into and out of the laboratory complex. The new 3,180 square foot necropsy suite is a bio-safety level 2-plus facility complete with a customized wastewater decontamination system, a bio-safety cabinet, an extensive monorail system for handling animal carcasses, a large capacity cooler for storage, two large animal necropsy tables, and a new incinerator with a 2,400 pound load capacity. The Necropsy suite project was funded by the Florida Legislature on July 1, 2008 at a cost of \$3,388,150.00 and was completed in 11 months. The new Necropsy laboratory was operational on August 4, 2009 while the Shipping/Receiving facility began operation on August 15, 2008. The Division is pursuing funding for completion of the final phase of the KDL campus replacement. This project is estimated to cost approximately \$35,000,000.

- Events of 9/11 drastically and forever changed the way we look at the introduction of animal diseases and the management of animal diseases. The Division must continue to modify its current methods for disease surveillance and testing for an even larger number of disease possibilities. Terrorist activities and potential agro-terrorism in the United States emphasize the necessity of having a strong, active animal disease monitoring program in place with an open line of communication with public officials. Rather than perceiving disease control and eradication programs as obstacles, the public is demanding that more be done to protect the nation's animal-origin food supply. These needs, as perceived by the producer, the consumer, and associated animal industries, will influence the overall acceptability and effectiveness of future disease control and eradication programs.
- To enhance the Division's limited resources and to address the issues and concerns of the citizens of Florida during any disaster, the Division developed the State Agricultural



The Division, in cooperation with the University of Florida, College of Veterinary Medicine and the Florida Veterinary Medical Association (FVMA), developed and leads the Florida Veterinary Corps (The Corps). The Corps was established to enlist veterinarians and veterinary technicians who are willing to volunteer their services in responding to animal emergencies in Florida. With over 50 members to date, the Corp is still growing. The Division of Animal Industry and the College of Veterinary Medicine provide training in the national Incident Management System, foreign animal and zoonotic diseases and other emergency-related courses to members through on-site and online courses.

The Division coordinated the publishing of an Organizing Pet-Friendly Evacuation Shelter Best Practices for Florida – Training Guide. This guide was delivered to each county Director of Emergency Management to provide assistance to them as they meet the federal requirement of addressing animals (pets) in their county plans.

Many other pamphlets, brochures and videos have been produced to increase the knowledge level on all fronts of animal disease, natural and man-made (bio-terrorism) disasters. The Division conducts a biennial 3-day Agriculture (pets included) Disaster Response Training conference that is attended by over 200 persons from all around Florida as well as across the country. The Division and its SART partners plan and participate in numerous exercises annually covering subjects such as hazardous chemical spills, radiological exposure and foreign animal disease outbreaks. The introduction of a neurologic form of Equine Herpes Virus at the onset of the 2007 horse show season in Florida introduced a highly fatal disease into the state. Rapid response, utilizing an emergency incident command post, required more than 4,000 staff hours to control and eliminate this outbreak. For more information, visit the SART Web site at [www.flsart.org](http://www.flsart.org).

- A major initiative of the Florida Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services and the U.S. Department of Agriculture over the next few years is the development of a premises and animal identification system and the implementation of a state and national animal tracking system. The goal of this program is to be able to trace any animal found to be affected with a serious disease that might significantly affect animal or human health, back through commerce to its premises of birth. This would enable emergency responders to identify exposed or at risk animals and more quickly and effectively control and contain disease outbreaks. This capability is also important in maintaining our domestic and international markets.

There are approximately 7,700 premises registered in the state of Florida; this includes over 85% of our cattle population at this time. In addition, a number of projects were

carried out with producers to strengthen our identification and tracking capabilities. This major initiative will be a multi-year effort, but one recognized by the Department and the USDA to be critical in responding to emergency animal diseases.

- The Division administers programs to monitor companion animal health issues within the state and ensures compliance with existing rules and legislation affecting companion and small animals. Efforts have continued and expanded to include monitoring of compliance with interstate and intrastate small animal movement requirements, health certification by accredited veterinarians in Florida, consumer protection and assistance, and rule development/legislative support. A tracking system was instituted to address consumer complaints involving health certification and the sale of small animals (dogs and cats), covered by Chapter 828.29 F.S., the Pet Lemon Law and Chapter 585.145 F.S., relating to the control of animal diseases as well as Departmental rules. The number of complaints received and the number of cases referred to other agencies, including the Office of Agricultural Law Enforcement approximates 300 per year.
- The successful eradication of bovine brucellosis was officially recognized in Florida in 2001 after many years of effort. This disease has not been eradicated from all parts of the United States and it is imperative that safeguards are maintained to prevent its introduction and that surveillance is adequate to rapidly detect any disease should it occur. Brucellosis vaccination has been reduced considerably with the attainment of Florida’s disease free status and can be expected to continue to decrease with recognition that this threat has been minimized. At this time most vaccination is voluntary and remains an option at producer cost but is expected to continue to decrease in the future.

Objective 2B: Reduce the number of animals infected with or exposed to dangerous transmissible diseases.

Outcome: Percent of positive test results from livestock and poultry tested for specific diseases for which monitoring, controlling and eradicating activities are established

Baseline/ 1999-00	FY 2010-11	FY 2011-12	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15
0.00022%	0.43%	0.43%	0.43%	0.43%	0.43%

The Division has been successful in effectively controlling and eradicating animal diseases including food-borne zoonotic diseases in livestock (equidae, cattle, swine, goats, sheep, cervidae, domestic fowl and ratites) through state mandated programs. Many diseases and pests have been eradicated over the years (i.e. bovine tuberculosis, screwworm, cattle fever tick, hog cholera, equine piroplasmiasis, and various poultry diseases). Florida attained its bovine brucellosis-free status June 13, 2001 and achieved brucellosis and pseudorabies free status in our

commercial swine during FY 2004-05. Continued State and federal support to conduct critical surveillance and inspection activities must continue in order to maintain these objectives.

The dynamics of the animal industry in Florida are changing rapidly. Although we have been successful in preventing diseases, we have to modify our processes, systems, procedures, methodology and policies in order to maintain a disease-free status. If Florida is to continue to be successful in its efforts to eradicate, control and prevent animal disease, adequate staffing and funding (both state and federal) must continue. Any loss of personnel or operational dollars will result in a drastic reduction in the protection being provided to the public of Florida. If we are to maintain a disease free status, we will have to address the increasing potential for the accidental or intentional introduction of animal diseases. Deviation from projected needs will directly impact our ability to adjust to continual change in trends and conditions.

Achieving the established outcome is essential in meeting the demands of providing a safe, affordable, quality assured, and abundant food supply, public protection and a healthy animal population.

### **Plant Pest and Disease Control**

The main goal of the Division of Plant Industry has always been to protect Florida's commercially produced and native plants from exotic plant pests and diseases. Plant pests, diseases and noxious weeds spread to new areas through the movement of plants and plant products. This primarily occurs through the movement of cargo and the traveling public who often carry illegal produce and other agricultural products in baggage. Further, Florida is a center for international trade and tourism with 14 deep-water ports and 8 international airports. In addition to USDA and the Department of Homeland Security's Customs and Border Protection (DHS)/CBP port inspections, the Division provides follow-up inspections of cargo at its destination, inspects domestic imports, monitors an extensive insect-trapping network, and conducts various survey programs. When new exotic pests are found, they must be properly identified, and an eradication program conducted, if biologically and economically feasible. If not, control strategies are developed that will ideally include the use of biological control agents. The Division also provides protection to the state's honeybee industry.

Trends and conditions within the Division include the following:

- Florida's climate, location, and plant diversity are favorable to agriculture, and constitute the State's unique environment. Unfortunately, these factors are also very favorable to exotic plant pest and disease introduction and establishment.
- Over the past several decades, exotic pest and disease introduction has been an ever-increasing problem as a result of increasing trade, travel and the commercial smuggling of illegal agricultural products.

- Agricultural Quarantine Inspections within USDA have been transferred to the Department of Homeland Security’s Customs and Border Protection, with inspection emphasis shifting from the detection of agricultural pests and diseases to U.S. Customs’ priorities.

Objective 2A: Prevent exotic plant pests and diseases from being introduced or established in Florida.

Outcome: Percent of newly introduced pests and diseases prevented from infesting Florida plants to a level where eradication is biologically or economically unfeasible.

<b>Baseline/ FY 1996-97</b>	<b>FY2010-11</b>	<b>FY2011-12</b>	<b>FY2012-13</b>	<b>FY2013-14</b>	<b>FY2014-15</b>
80.5%	84.5%	85.0%	85.5%	86.0%	86.5%

Normally, through plant inspections, surveys and control measures we have been able to prevent approximately 84% of newly introduced plant pests from becoming established in the state, and by concentrating on increasing inspections and facilitating the inspection of incoming shipments of plants, we hope to increase this percentage by 2 percentage points over a five-year period. Certainly, the ideal situation would be to prevent the introduction of any new plant pests, but considering the climate and the world trade issues, it is unlikely that this can be achieved. Improving the measure by 2 percentage points would assist the Department, the agricultural industry, and state and federal research institutions in managing new plant pests and diseases.

Performance Measures and  
Standards – LRPP  
Exhibit II

## LRPP Exhibit II - Performance Measures and Standards

Department: Agriculture and Consumer Services	Department No.: 42
---	--------------------

Program: Office of the Commissioner and Division of Administration	Code: 42010000
Service/Budget Entity: Agricultural Law Enforcement	Code: 42010100

**NOTE: Approved primary service outcomes must be listed first.**

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2009-10 (Words)	Approved <b>Prior</b> Year Standard <b>FY 2008-09</b> (Numbers)	Prior Year Actual <b>FY 2008-09</b> (Numbers)	Approved Standards for <b>FY 2009-10</b> (Numbers)	Requested <b>FY 2010-11</b> Standard (Numbers)
Criminal investigations closure rate	80%	105%	86.1%	86.1%
Number of law enforcement investigations initiated	1,995	3,344	2,622	2,622

## LRPP Exhibit II - Performance Measures and Standards

Department: Agriculture and Consumer Services	Department No.: 42
---	--------------------

Program: Office of the Commissioner and Division of Administration	Code: 42010000
Service/Budget Entity: Agricultural Water Policy Coordination	Code: 42010200

**NOTE: Approved primary service outcomes must be listed first.**

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2009-10 (Words)	Approved Prior Year Standard <b>FY 2008-09</b> (Numbers)	Prior Year Actual <b>FY 2008-09</b> (Numbers)	Approved Standards for <b>FY 2009-10</b> (Numbers)	Requested <b>FY 2010-11</b> Standard (Numbers)
Number of acres in priority basins or watersheds outside the Northern Everglades and Estuaries Protection Program (NEEPP) area enrolled annually, through Notices of Intent, in Agricultural Water Policy Best Management Practices (BMP) programs	200,000	45,658	200,000	200,000
Number of water policy assists provided to agricultural interests	480	559	480	480
Number of acres in the Northern Everglades and Estuaries Protection Program area enrolled annually, through Notices of Intent, in Agricultural Water Policy Best Management Practices programs	140,000	40,898	140,000	140,000
Number of gallons of water potentially conserved annually by agricultural operations pursuant to site-specific recommendations provided by participating Mobile Irrigation Labs during the fiscal year	5.5 B	3.14 B	5.5 B	5.5 B

## LRPP Exhibit II - Performance Measures and Standards

Department: Agriculture and Consumer Services	Department No.: 42
---	--------------------

Program: Office of the Commissioner and Division of Administration	Code: 42010000
Service/Budget Entity: Executive Direction and Support Services	Code: 42010300

**NOTE: Approved primary service outcomes must be listed first.**

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2009-10 (Words)	Approved Prior Year Standard <b>FY 2008-09</b> (Numbers)	Prior Year Actual <b>FY 2008-09</b> (Numbers)	Approved Standards for <b>FY 2009-10</b> (Numbers)	Requested <b>FY 2010-11</b> Standard (Numbers)
Administrative cost as a percent of total agency costs	4.75%	4.96%	4.75%	4.75%
Administrative positions as a percent of total agency positions	5.03%	4.94%	5.03%	5.03%



## LRPP Exhibit II - Performance Measures and Standards

Department: Agriculture and Consumer Services	Department No.: 42
---	--------------------

Program: Office of the Commissioner and Division of Administration	Code: 42010000
Service/Budget Entity: Division of Licensing	Code: 42010400

**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 license revocations or suspensions initiated within 20 days after receipt of disqualifying information (all license types)	90%	90%	90%	90%
Percent of security, investigative, and recovery licenses issued within 90 days after receipt of an application	90%	97%	90%	90%
Percent/number of concealed weapon/firearm licenses issued within 90-day statutory timeframe without fingerprint results	5%/1,400	.2%/226	5%/1,400	5%/1,400
Number of default concealed weapon/firearm licensees with prior criminal histories	200	43	200	200
Percent of security, investigative, and recovery investigations completed within 60 days	95%	92%	95%	95%
Percent of security, investigative, and recovery inspections completed within 30 days	95%	98%	95%	95%
Average cost of concealed weapon/firearm applications processed	\$50	\$18	\$50	\$50
Average cost of security, investigative, and recovery applications processed	\$52	\$30	\$52	\$52
Average cost of security, investigative, and recovery investigations	\$1,800	\$1,962	\$1,800	\$1,800
Average cost of security, investigative, and recovery compliance inspections	\$285	\$305	\$285	\$285
Average cost of administrative actions (revocation, fine, probation, and compliance letters)	\$315	\$329	\$315	\$315
Number of investigations performed (security, investigative, recovery complaint and agency-generated investigations)	1,550	1,447	1,550	1,550
Number of compliance inspections performed (security, investigative, and recovery, licensee/new agency and random inspections)	2,500	3,983	2,500	2,500

## LRPP Exhibit II - Performance Measures and Standards

Department: Agriculture and Consumer Services	Department No.: 42
---	--------------------

Program: Forest and Resource Protection	Code: 42110000
Service/Budget Entity: Land Management	Code: 42110100

**NOTE: Approved primary service outcomes must be listed first.**

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2009-10 (Words)	Approved Prior Year Standard <b>FY 2008-09</b> (Numbers)	Prior Year Actual <b>FY 2008-09</b> (Numbers)	Approved Standards for <b>FY 2009-10</b> (Numbers)	Requested <b>FY 2010-11</b> Standard (Numbers)
Percent of state forest timber producing acres adequately stocked and growing	60%	60%	60%	60%
Number of acres of state forests managed by the Department	1,033,795	1,043,860	1,045,000	1,045,000
Number of hours spent providing forest-related technical assists to non-industrial private landowners	32,000	36,437	32,000	32,000
Number of hours spent providing forest-related technical assists to public land management agencies	9,000	16,949	9,000	9,000
Number of state forest visitors served	650,000	984,892	650,000	650,000

## LRPP Exhibit II - Performance Measures and Standards

Department: Agriculture and Consumer Services	Department No.: 42
---	--------------------

Program: Forest and Resource Protection	Code: 42110000
Service/Budget Entity: Wildfire Prevention and Management	Code: 42110200

**NOTE: Approved primary service outcomes must be listed first.**

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2009-10 (Words)	Approved Prior Year Standard <b>FY 2008-09</b> (Numbers)	Prior Year Actual <b>FY 2008-09</b> (Numbers)	Approved Standards for <b>FY 2009-10</b> (Numbers)	Requested <b>FY 2010-11</b> Standard (Numbers)
Percent of acres of protected forest and wild lands not burned by wildfires	98.80%	99.66%	98.80%	99.00%
Percent of threatened structures not burned by wildfires	93.50%	92.62%	93.50%	93.50%
Number/Percent of wildfires caused by humans	3,220/80%	2,710/84%	3,220/80%	3,220/80%
Number of wildfires suppressed	4,025	3,140	4,025	4,025
Number of acres authorized to be burned through prescribed burning	2,000,000	2,291,107	2,000,000	2,000,000
Number of acres of forest land protected from wildfires	21,632,261	21,632,261	26,329,082	26,329,082
Number of person-hours spent responding to emergency incidents other than wildfires	3,000	15,888	3,000	3,000

## LRPP Exhibit II - Performance Measures and Standards

Department: Agriculture and Consumer Services	Department No.: 42
---	--------------------

Program: Agriculture Management Information System	Code: 42120000
Service/Budget Entity: Information Technology	Code: 42120100

**NOTE: Approved primary service outcomes must be listed first.**

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2009-10 (Words)	Approved <b>Prior</b> Year Standard <b>FY 2008-09</b> (Numbers)	Prior Year Actual <b>FY 2008-09</b> (Numbers)	Approved Standards for <b>FY 2009-10</b> (Numbers)	Requested <b>FY 2010-11</b> Standard (Numbers)
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

## LRPP Exhibit II - Performance Measures and Standards

Department: Agriculture and Consumer Services	Department No.: 42
---	--------------------

Program: Food Safety and Quality	Code: 42150000
Service/Budget Entity: Dairy Facilities Compliance and Enforcement	Code: 42150100

**NOTE: Approved primary service outcomes must be listed first.**

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2009-10 (Words)	Approved Prior Year Standard <b>FY 2008-09</b> (Numbers)	Prior Year Actual <b>FY 2008-09</b> (Numbers)	Approved Standards for <b>FY 2009-10</b> (Numbers)	Requested <b>FY 2010-11</b> Standard (Numbers)
Percent of Florida Milk Regulatory Program samples analyzed that meet standards	93.30%	91.97%	93.30%	93.30%
Percent of dairy establishments meeting food safety and sanitation requirements	86%	86.90%	86%	86%
Number of analyses conducted on Florida Milk Regulatory Program samples	56,000	47,114	47,500	47,500
Number of dairy establishment inspections	1,800	1,643	1,550	1,550

## LRPP Exhibit II - Performance Measures and Standards

Department: Agriculture and Consumer Services	Department No.: 42
---	--------------------

Program: Food Safety and Quality	Code: 42150000
Service/Budget Entity: Food Safety Inspection and Enforcement	Code: 42150200

**NOTE: Approved primary service outcomes must be listed first.**

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2009-10 (Words)	Approved Prior Year Standard <b>FY 2008-09</b> (Numbers)	Prior Year Actual <b>FY 2008-09</b> (Numbers)	Approved Standards for <b>FY 2009-10</b> (Numbers)	Requested <b>FY 2010-11</b> Standard (Numbers)
Percent of food establishments meeting food safety and sanitation requirements	91%	91.07%	91%	91%
Percent of food products analyzed that meet standards	91.2%	92.30%	91.2%	91.2%
Percent of produce or other food samples analyzed that meet chemical residue standards	97.8%	99.01%	97.8%	97.8%
Number of inspections of food establishments and water vending machines	80,900	83,231	80,900	80,900
Number of food analyses conducted	43,955	47,478	43,955	43,955
Number of chemical residue analyses conducted	218,880	429,322	218,880	218,880

## LRPP Exhibit II - Performance Measures and Standards

Department: Agriculture and Consumer Services	Department No.: 42
---	--------------------

Program: Consumer Protection	Code: 42160000
Service/Budget Entity: Agricultural Environmental Services	Code: 42160100

**NOTE: Approved primary service outcomes must be listed first.**

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2009-10 (Words)	Approved Prior Year Standard <b>FY 2008-09</b> (Numbers)	Prior Year Actual <b>FY 2008-09</b> (Numbers)	Approved Standards for <b>FY 2009-10</b> (Numbers)	Requested <b>FY 2010-11</b> Standard (Numbers)
Percent of feed, seed and fertilizer inspected products in compliance with performance/quality standards	89%	88.0%	89%	89%
Percent of pesticide ingredients evaluated and/or managed that are in compliance with regulations	91%	90.6%	91%	91%
Percent of commercial pest control businesses and applicators inspected who are in compliance with regulations	92%	90.0%	92%	92%
Percent of licensed pesticide applicators inspected who are in compliance with regulations	88%	85%	88%	88%
Number of reported human/equine disease cases caused by mosquitoes	101/173	3/75	8/47	8/47
Number of pest control, feed, seed, fertilizer, and pesticide inspections conducted	18,848	18,902	17,523	17,523
Number of people served by mosquito control activities	14,979,291	17,467,431	17,166,973	17,166,973
Number of pesticide products registered	12,479	15,287	14,258	14,258
Number of pesticide sample determinations made in the pesticide laboratory	53,462	104,069	75,824	75,824
Number of pest control businesses and applicators licensed	43,032	35,950	52,600	52,600
Number of fertilizer sample determinations	175,342	146,821	178,049	178,049
Number of official seed sample determinations performed	63,548	62,087	47,208	47,208

## LRPP Exhibit II - Performance Measures and Standards

Department: Agriculture and Consumer Services	Department No.: 42
---	--------------------

Program: Consumer Protection	Code: 42160000
Service/Budget Entity: Consumer Protection	Code: 42160200

**NOTE: Approved primary service outcomes must be listed first.**

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2009-10 (Words)	Approved Prior Year Standard <b>FY 2008-09</b> (Numbers)	Prior Year Actual <b>FY 2008-09</b> (Numbers)	Approved Standards for <b>FY 2009-10</b> (Numbers)	Requested <b>FY 2010-11</b> Standard (Numbers)
Percent of all regulated entities where an investigation found a violation of consumer protection laws	4.36%	3.47%	4.36%	4.36%
Number of lemon law assists made to consumers	26,500	13,432	26,500	26,500
Number of complaints investigated/processed by the Division of Consumer Services	37,500	47,776	37,500	37,500
Number of no sales solicitation calls processed	66,545	95,157	66,545	66,545
Number of regulated entities licensed by Division of Consumer Services	42,130	63,270	42,130	42,130
Number of assists provided to consumers by the call center	318,350	518,412	318,350	318,350



## LRPP Exhibit II - Performance Measures and Standards

Department: Agriculture and Consumer Services	Department No.: 42
---	--------------------

Program: Consumer Protection	Code: 42160000
Service/Budget Entity: Standards and Petroleum Quality Inspection	Code: 42160300

**NOTE: Approved primary service outcomes must be listed first.**

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2009-10 (Words)	Approved Prior Year Standard <b>FY 2008-09</b> (Numbers)	Prior Year Actual <b>FY 2008-09</b> (Numbers)	Approved Standards for <b>FY 2009-10</b> (Numbers)	Requested <b>FY 2010-11</b> Standard (Numbers)
Percent of regulated weighing and measuring devices, packages, and businesses with scanners in compliance with accuracy standards during initial inspection/testing	96%	96%	96%	96%
Percent of LP Gas facilities found in compliance with safety requirements on first inspection	21%	37%	21%	21%
Percent of amusement attractions found in full compliance with safety requirements on first inspections	41%	42%	41%	41%
Percent of petroleum products meeting quality standards	98.0%	97.3%	98.0%	98.0%
Number of LP Gas facility inspections and re-inspections conducted	6,500	10,706	6,500	6,500
Number of petroleum field inspections conducted	255,000	223,885	255,000	255,000
Number of petroleum tests performed	110,000	143,670	190,000	190,000
Number of amusement ride safety inspections conducted	10,000	9,820	10,000	10,000

## LRPP Exhibit II - Performance Measures and Standards

Department: Agriculture and Consumer Services	Department No.: 42
---	--------------------

Program: Agricultural Economic Development	Code: 42170000
Service/Budget Entity: Fruit & Vegetables Inspection & Enforcement	Code: 42170100

**NOTE: Approved primary service outcomes must be listed first.**

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2009-10 (Words)	Approved Prior Year Standard <b>FY 2008-09</b> (Numbers)	Prior Year Actual <b>FY 2008-09</b> (Numbers)	Approved Standards for <b>FY 2009-10</b> (Numbers)	Requested <b>FY 2010-11</b> Standard (Numbers)
Dollar value of fruit and vegetables that are shipped to other states or countries that are subject to mandatory inspection (**)	\$1,925,000,000	\$2,044,765,000	\$1,925,000,000	\$1,925,000,000
Number of tons of fruits and vegetables inspected	9,000,000	9,325,458	9,000,000	9,000,000

(\*\*) The FY 2008-09 Actual Number for the first measure reflects the Actual Amount for FY 2007-08. This data is provided by the Federal National Agricultural Statistics Service (NASS) and is not available until the beginning of October, 2009.

## LRPP Exhibit II - Performance Measures and Standards

Department: Agriculture and Consumer Services	Department No.: 42
---	--------------------

Program: Agricultural Economic Development	Code: 42170000
Service/Budget Entity: Agricultural Products Marketing	Code: 42170200

**NOTE: Approved primary service outcomes must be listed first.**

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2009-10 (Words)	Approved Prior Year Standard <b>FY 2008-09</b> (Numbers)	Prior Year Actual <b>FY 2008-09</b> (Numbers)	Approved Standards for <b>FY 2009-10</b> (Numbers)	Requested <b>FY 2010-11</b> Standard (Numbers)
Florida agricultural products as a percent of the national market	2.71%	2.46%	2.71%	2.71%
Total sales of agricultural and seafood products generated by tenants of state farmers markets	\$250 million	\$521,204,810	\$250 million	\$250 million
Percent of available square feet of State Farmers' Markets leased	95%	79%	90%	90%
Number of buyers reached with agricultural promotion campaign messages	3.65 billion	13.78 billion	3.65 billion	3.65 billion
Number of marketing assists provided to producers and businesses	61,163	614,508	61,163	61,163
Pounds of federal commodities and recovered food distributed	70,000,000	98,592,031	70,000,000	70,000,000
Number of leased square feet at State Farmers' Markets	2,000,000	1,575,080	1,800,000	1,800,000

## LRPP Exhibit II - Performance Measures and Standards

Department: Agriculture and Consumer Services	Department No.: 42
---	--------------------

Program: Agricultural Economic Development	Code: 42170000
Service/Budget Entity: Aquaculture	Code: 42170300

**NOTE: Approved primary service outcomes must be listed first.**

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2009-10 (Words)	Approved Prior Year Standard <b>FY 2008-09</b> (Numbers)	Prior Year Actual <b>FY 2008-09</b> (Numbers)	Approved Standards for <b>FY 2009-10</b> (Numbers)	Requested <b>FY 2010-11</b> Standard (Numbers)
Percent of shellfish facilities in significant compliance with permit and food safety regulations	80%	97.3%	80%	80%
Number of shellfish processing plant inspections and HACCP (Hazard Analysis Critical Control Point) records reviews	375	401	750	750
Number of shellfish processing plants inspected	100	105	This measure has been deleted for FY 2009-10.	
Number of acres tested	1,445,833	1,451,990	1,445,833	1,445,833
Number of aquaculture leases	688	540	688	688
Number of bushels of processed shell and live oysters deposited to restore habitat on public oyster reefs	366,760	433,678	366,760	366,760

## LRPP Exhibit II - Performance Measures and Standards

Department: Agriculture and Consumer Services	Department No.: 42
---	--------------------

Program: Agricultural Economic Development	Code: 42170000
Service/Budget Entity: Agricultural Interdiction Stations	Code: 42170400

**NOTE: Approved primary service outcomes must be listed first.**

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2009-10 (Words)	Approved Prior Year Standard <b>FY 2008-09</b> (Numbers)	Prior Year Actual <b>FY 2008-09</b> (Numbers)	Approved Standards for <b>FY 2009-10</b> (Numbers)	Requested <b>FY 2010-11</b> Standard (Numbers)
Percent of vehicles carrying agricultural related products that are inspected and found to be free of potentially devastating plant and animal pests and diseases	99.4%	99.9%	99.9%	99.9%
Amount of revenue generated by Bills of Lading transmitted to the Department of Revenue from Agricultural Interdiction Stations	\$9,096,760	\$7,332,131	\$8,844,085	\$7,765,813
Number of vehicles inspected at agricultural interdiction stations	11,708,770	9,466,834	8,027,411	10,027,474
Number of vehicles inspected at agricultural interdiction stations transporting agricultural or regulated commodities	2,517,386	1,880,221	1,607,642	1,992,349
Number of Bills of Lading transmitted to the Department of Revenue from Agricultural Interdiction Stations	57,472	48,336	45,978	51,195

## LRPP Exhibit II - Performance Measures and Standards

Department: Agriculture and Consumer Services	Department No.: 42
---	--------------------

Program: Agricultural Economic Development	Code: 42170000
Service/Budget Entity: Animal Pest and Disease Control	Code: 42170500

**NOTE: Approved primary service outcomes must be listed first.**

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2009-10 (Words)	Approved Prior Year Standard <b>FY 2008-09</b> (Numbers)	Prior Year Actual <b>FY 2008-09</b> (Numbers)	Approved Standards for <b>FY 2009-10</b> (Numbers)	Requested <b>FY 2010-11</b> Standard (Numbers)
Percentage of positive test results from livestock and poultry tested for specific diseases for which monitoring, controlling and eradication activities are established	0.43%	0.21%	0.43%	0.43%
Number of animal site inspections performed	16,500	17,677	16,500	16,500
Number of tests and/or vaccinations performed on animals	522,416	504,047	522,416	522,416
Number of reports of suspected or positive dangerous, transmissible diseases received by the state veterinarian	282	269	282	282
Number of employee hours spent on animal and agricultural emergency activities	16,952	10,334	16,952	16,952

## LRPP Exhibit II - Performance Measures and Standards

Department: Agriculture and Consumer Services	Department No.: 42
---	--------------------

Program: Agricultural Economic Development	Code: 42170000
Service/Budget Entity: Plant Pest and Disease Control	Code: 42170600

**NOTE: Approved primary service outcomes must be listed first.**

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2009-10 (Words)	Approved <b>Prior</b> Year Standard <b>FY 2008-09</b> (Numbers)	Prior Year Actual <b>FY 2008-09</b> (Numbers)	Approved Standards for <b>FY 2009-10</b> (Numbers)	Requested <b>FY 2010-11</b> Standard (Numbers)
Percent of newly introduced pests and diseases prevented from infesting Florida plants to a level where eradication is biologically or economically unfeasible	83%	95.7%	83%	83%
Number of plant, fruit fly trap, and honeybee inspections performed	1,000,000	787,544	700,000	700,000
Number of commercial citrus acres surveyed for citrus diseases	100,000	139,611	100,000	100,000
Number of sterile med flies released	3.4 B	4.2 B	3.4 B	3.4 B
Number of plant, soil, insect, and other organism samples processed for identification or diagnosis	300,000	306,714	300,000	300,000
Number of cartons of citrus certified as fly-free for export	10,014,270	6,195,442	10,014,270	10,014,270

Assessment of Performance  
for Approved Performance  
Measures – LRPP  
Exhibit III



## LRPP Exhibit III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT

**Department:** Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services  
**Program:** Office of the Commissioner and Division of Administration  
**Service/Budget Entity:** Office of Agricultural Water Policy  
**Measure:** Number of Gallons of Water Potentially Conserved Annually

**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
5.5B	3.1B	(2.4B)	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:** The level of achievement reflected for the approved standard was impacted by two factors: (1) varying amounts of rainfall from year to year that affect the amount of irrigation water used and conserved and (2) insufficient doc stamp collections that prevented full utilization of the appropriation and funding of all previously funded Mobile Irrigation Laboratories.

**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:** Management will continue to employ all available resources and strategies to achieve the approved standard; although rainfall patterns and conditions are uncontrollable and unpredictable from year to year.

## LRPP Exhibit III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT

**Department:** Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services  
**Program:** Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services  
**Service/Budget Entity:** Office of Agricultural Water Policy  
**Measure: Action:** Number of acres in priority basins or watersheds outside the Northern Everglades and Estuaries Protection Program area enrolled annually

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <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
200,000	45,658	(154,342)	77%

**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:** For fiscal year 2008-09, the Office of Agricultural Water Policy experienced a 66% reduction in doc stamp collections for this program. The referenced reduction required that the Office significantly reduce its activities; i.e. prompting the cancellation of contractual service agreements and limiting staff support activities associated with the recruitment of producers and enrollment of agricultural lands in Florida Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services "Best Management Practices" programs. The latter actions therefore negatively affected the number of acres ultimately enrolled for the year.

**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:** Management will continue to employ all available resources and strategies to achieve the approved standard.

## LRPP Exhibit III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT

**Department:** Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services

**Program:** Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services

**Service/Budget Entity:** Office of Agricultural Water Policy

**Measure: Action:** Number of acres in the Northern Everglades and Estuaries Protection Program area enrolled annually

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <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
140,000	40,898	99,102	71%

**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:** For fiscal year 2008-09, the Office of Agricultural Water Policy received \$3,000,000 for the Northern Everglades and Estuaries Protection program. The appropriated amount was 70% less than what was requested. Because of the reduced appropriation for the referenced fiscal year, staff activities pertaining to the recruitment of producers and the enrollment of agricultural lands in Florida Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services "Best Management Practices" programs were significantly curtailed. Consequently, an acceptable level of achievement was not attained.

**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:** Management will continue to employ all available resources and strategies to achieve the approved standard.

## LRPP Exhibit III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT

**Department:** Agriculture and Consumer Services  
**Program:** Office of the Commissioner and Administration  
**Service/Budget Entity:** Executive Direction and Support Services  
**Measure:** Administrative cost as a percent of total agency costs

**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
4.75%	4.96%	.21% Over	4% Over

**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:**

Agency-wide decreases in trust fund revenues due to recession resulted in lower program expenditures and budget cuts, which resulted in lower total agency costs and a slightly higher proportion of administrative costs.

**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:** We will continue to monitor the standard annually and prepare a budget amendment as necessary to modify the standard.

## LRPP Exhibit III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT

**Department:** Agriculture and Consumer Services  
**Program:** Office of the Commissioner and Division of Administration  
**Service:** Division of Licensing  
**Measure:** Percent Security, Investigative and Recovery Investigations Completed within 60 Days (GAA Measure)

**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
95%	92%	3% Under	3%

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

**Explanation:** Limited personnel resources was the contributing factor for the Bureau of Regulation and Enforcement not reaching this performance measure during fiscal year 2008-09. Because of medical reasons, one investigator supervisor and one investigator needed to work occasionally in the office rather than in the field performing investigations. Furthermore, two investigator supervisors spent significant time conducting informal hearings and were unable to leave the offices to perform investigations. Additionally, the last quarter of FY2008-09, all investigator supervisors were responsible for the time-consuming duty of acquiring additional office space and interviewing and hiring OPS personnel to effect the implementation of the new more streamlined process that allows an individual to apply for a concealed weapon/firearm license and have his/her fingerprints and picture taken at one of the Division's eight regional offices. This new process will be fully operational by the beginning of October 2009. As a result of this additional Regional Office service, it is imperative for the supervisor to now stay in the office to direct the activities of, and provide the necessary guidance to, the FTE and OPS support personnel. Accordingly, the supervisor will no longer be able to routinely leave the office to conduct compliance and complaint investigations.

**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 |   |

Current Laws Are Working Against The Agency Mission

**Explanation:**

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

Training

Technology

Personnel

Other (Identify)

**Recommendations:** The division is requesting additional investigators for fiscal year 2010-2011.

*Office of Policy and Budget – July 2008*

## LRPP Exhibit III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT

**Department:** Agriculture and Consumer Services  
**Program:** Office of the Commissioner and Division of Administration  
**Service:** Division of Licensing  
**Measure:** Average cost of security, investigative, and recovery investigation

**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
\$1800	\$1,962	\$162 over	9%

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

**Explanation:** Limited personnel resources was the contributing factor for the Bureau of Regulation and Enforcement not reaching this performance measure during fiscal year 2008-09. Because of medical reasons, one investigator supervisor and one investigator needed to work occasionally in the office rather than in the field performing investigations. Furthermore, two investigator supervisors spent significant time conducting informal hearings and were unable to leave the offices to perform investigations. Additionally, the last quarter of FY2008-09, all investigator supervisors were responsible for the time-consuming duty of acquiring additional office space and interviewing and hiring OPS personnel to effect the implementation of the new more streamlined process that allows an individual to apply for a concealed weapon/firearm license and have his/her fingerprints and picture taken at one of the Division's eight regional offices. This new process will be fully operational by the beginning of October 2009. As a result of this additional Regional Office service, it is imperative for the supervisor to now stay in the office to direct the activities of, and provide the necessary guidance to, the FTE and OPS support personnel. Accordingly, the supervisor will no longer be able to routinely leave the office to conduct compliance and complaint investigations.

**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)       |

- This Program/Service Cannot Fix The Problem
- Current Laws Are Working Against The Agency Mission

**Explanation:**

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

- Training
- Personnel
- Technology
- Other (Identify)

**Recommendations:** The division is requesting additional investigators for fiscal year 2010-2011.



## LRPP Exhibit III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT

**Department:** Agriculture and Consumer Services  
**Program:** Office of the Commissioner and Division of Administration  
**Service:** Division of Licensing  
**Measure:** Average cost of security, investigative, and recovery compliance 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
\$285	\$305	\$20 over	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 type="checkbox"/> Other (Identify)  |

**Explanation:** Limited personnel resources was the contributing factor for the Bureau of Regulation and Enforcement not reaching this performance measure during fiscal year 2008-09. Because of medical reasons, one investigator supervisor and one investigator needed to work occasionally in the office rather than in the field performing investigations. Furthermore, two investigator supervisors spent significant time conducting informal hearings and were unable to leave the offices to perform investigations. Additionally, the last quarter of FY2008-09, all investigator supervisors were responsible for the time-consuming duty of acquiring additional office space and interviewing and hiring OPS personnel to effect the implementation of the new more streamlined process that allows an individual to apply for a concealed weapon/firearm license and have his/her fingerprints and picture taken at one of the Division's eight regional offices. This new process will be fully operational by the beginning of October 2009. As a result of this additional Regional Office service, it is imperative for the supervisor to now stay in the office to direct the activities of, and provide the necessary guidance to, the FTE and OPS support personnel. Accordingly, the supervisor will no longer be able to routinely leave the office to conduct compliance and complaint investigations.

**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)       |

- This Program/Service Cannot Fix The Problem
- Current Laws Are Working Against The Agency Mission

**Explanation:**

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

- Training
- Personnel
- Technology
- Other (Identify)

**Recommendations:** The division is requesting additional investigators for fiscal year 2010-2011.

## LRPP Exhibit III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT

**Department:** Agriculture and Consumer Services  
**Program:** Office of the Commissioner and Division of Administration  
**Service:** Division of Licensing  
**Measure:** Average cost of administrative actions (revocations, fine, probation, and compliance letters)

**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
\$315	\$329	\$14 over	4.4%

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

**Explanation:** Limited personnel resources was the contributing factor for the Compliance Section not reaching this performance measure during fiscal year 2008-09.

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

**Recommendations:** The Division is requesting additional support staff in fiscal year 2010-2011. The Division is in the process of hiring a Senior Attorney.

## LRPP Exhibit III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT

**Department:** Agriculture and Consumer Services  
**Program:** Office of the Commissioner and Division of Administration  
**Service:** Division of Licensing  
**Measure:** Number of investigations performed (security, investigative and recovery complaint and agency-generated 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
1550	1447	103 Under	7.1%

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

**Explanation:** Limited personnel resources was the contributing factor for the Bureau of Regulation and Enforcement not reaching this performance measure during fiscal year 2008-09. Because of medical reasons, one investigator supervisor and one investigator needed to work occasionally in the office rather than in the field performing investigations. Furthermore, two investigator supervisors spent significant time conducting informal hearings and were unable to leave the offices to perform investigations. Additionally, the last quarter of FY2008-09, all investigator supervisors were responsible for the time-consuming duty of acquiring additional office space and interviewing and hiring OPS personnel to effect the implementation of the new more streamlined process that allows an individual to apply for a concealed weapon/firearm license and have his/her fingerprints and picture taken at one of the Division's eight regional offices. This new process will be fully operational by the beginning of October 2009. As a result of this additional Regional Office service, it is imperative for the supervisor to now stay in the office to direct the activities of, and provide the necessary guidance to, the FTE and OPS support personnel. Accordingly, the supervisor will no longer be able to routinely leave the office to conduct compliance and complaint investigations.

**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)       |

- This Program/Service Cannot Fix The Problem
- Current Laws Are Working Against The Agency Mission

**Explanation:**

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

- Training
- Personnel
- Technology
- Other (Identify)

**Recommendations:** The division is requesting additional investigators for fiscal year 2010-2011.

## LRPP Exhibit III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT

Department: Agriculture & Consumer Services

Program: Forest and Resource Protection

Service/Budget Entity: Wildfire Prevention & Management

Measure: Percent of threatened structures not burned by wildfires

**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
93.5%	92.62%	-0.88	1%

**Factors Accounting for the Difference:**

**Internal Factors** (check all that apply):

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

**Explanation:**

The Division of Forestry staffing and equipment levels have decreased while the population living and recreating in wildland areas continues to grow. Response times for wildland fires can increase due to aged equipment and/or the availability of staff to respond with suppression equipment. If the response time increases, the likelihood of a wildland fire burning a structure increases, especially in those area that have seen an increase in the number of structures in the wildland urban interface areas. Weather factors which affect the number of fire starts also impacts the number of structures threatened.

**External Factors** (check all that apply):

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Resources Unavailable                               | <input type="checkbox"/> Technological Problems      |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Legal/Legislative Change                            | <input type="checkbox"/> Natural Disaster            |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Target Population Change                 | <input 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:**

An increasing population and demand for homes and recreation in wildland areas increases the potential for wildfires. The potential for structures to burn as a result of wildfires increases when the number of structures located in wildland-urban interface areas has increased. An increasing population also affects wildland fire response time because the increase in traffic can slow suppression equipment from arriving on the scene of a wildfire.

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

Training

Technology

Personnel

Other (Identify)

**Recommendations:**

The Division continues to train citizens and personnel through fire prevention efforts such as Community Wildfire Protection Plans and Firewise principles to reduce the number of wildfires which have the potential to burn structures. Restricting the issuing of Burning Authorizations is also an important tool because this can keep humans from burning when the potential for wildfire outbreak is high. Weather factors are hard to predict and their influence on wildfires will continue to impact the number of wildfires. The Division will continue to submit requests for new equipment and replacement equipment (including aviation). It continues to obtain grant funds to purchase equipment and provide training for volunteer and structural fire departments so they are better prepared to respond and cooperate with the Division on wildfires.

## LRPP Exhibit III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT

**Department:** Agriculture & Consumer Services  
**Program:** Forest and Resource Protection  
**Service/Budget Entity:** Wildfire Prevention & Management  
**Measure:** Number/Percent of wildfires caused by humans

**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
3220/ 80%	2710/ 84%	-510/ +4%	-16%/ +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:**

An aggressive fire prevention campaign continues to be implemented for a population that continues to grow which results in more people living and recreating in wildland areas. However, while the population living and recreating in wildland areas continues to grow, the Division of Forestry staffing and state prevention funding levels have decreased. The number of wildfires occurring in Florida caused by humans in Fiscal Year 2008-09 increased from the previous fiscal year (2,710 versus 1,952) and the percentage increased as well, from 62% to 84%. However, the number of wildfires caused by humans was lower than the approved 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 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:**

An increasing population and demand for homes and recreation in wildland areas increases the potential for human-caused wildfires. Besides arson, people can cause wildfires by trying to burn at unfavorable times.



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

Training

Technology

Personnel

Other (Identify)

**Recommendations:**

The Division continues to train citizens and personnel in fire prevention to reduce the number of wildfires caused by humans. Restricting the issuing of Burning Authorizations is also an important tool because this can keep humans from burning when the potential for wildfire outbreak is high. Weather factors are hard to predict and their influence on wildfires will continue to impact the number of wildfires and those caused by humans. The Division plans to amend the measure to eliminate the percent figure from the measure because the number of wildfires can decrease and the percent can increase in the same year.

## LRPP Exhibit III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT

**Department:** Agriculture & Consumer Services  
**Program:** Forest and Resource Protection  
**Service/Budget Entity:** Wildfire Prevention and Management  
**Measure:** Number of wildfires suppressed

**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
4025	3140	-885	-22%

**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:**

Late spring lightning storms were accompanied by adequate rainfall and resulted in fewer ignitions. This rainfall also helped to reduce the potential for debris burns and other authorized burns to escape; resulting in fewer wildfires. This rainfall was statewide in coverage eliminating critical wildfire conditions.

**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:**

Rainfall deficits for calendar year 2009 continued to increase as drought conditions stretched across most of the state. These dry conditions were eliminated by the onset of the heavy seasonal rains which reduced wildfire potential. Lightning-caused wildfires decreased due to the wet conditions.

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

Training

Technology

Personnel

Other (Identify)

**Recommendations:**

The Division continues to train citizens and personnel in fire prevention to reduce the number of wildfires caused by humans. Restricting the issuing of Burning Authorizations is also an important tool because this can keep humans from burning when the potential for wildfire outbreak is high. This past wildfire season the Division restricted authorizations and the number of wildfires declined. Weather factors are hard to predict and their influence on wildfires continues to impact the number of wildfires and those caused by humans.

## LRPP Exhibit III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT

**Department:** Agriculture and Consumer Services

**Program:** Food Safety and Quality

**Service/Budget Entity:** Dairy Facility Compliance and Enforcement

**Measure:** Number of Dairy Establishment 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
1,800	1,643	157 Under	8.7% Under

**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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Target Population Change                 | <input type="checkbox"/> Other (Identify)       |
| <input type="checkbox"/> This Program/Service Cannot Fix The Problem         |   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Current Laws Are Working Against The Agency Mission |   |

**Explanation:**

The continued decline in the number of dairy establishments, particularly farms, has reduced the number of inspections. Since June 30, 2004, the number of dairy farms is down 24.3%.

06/30/09 – 143 permitted dairy farms

06/30/04 – 189 permitted dairy farms

**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-Requested Adjustment |

**Recommendations:**

Management requested and received approval to reduce the standard for this performance measure to 1,550 for FY 2009-2010.

*Office of Policy and Budget – July 2009*

## LRPP Exhibit III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT

**Department:** Agriculture and Consumer Services  
**Program:** Food Safety and Quality  
**Service/Budget Entity:** Dairy Facility Compliance and Enforcement  
**Measure:** Number of Analyses Conducted on Florida Milk Regulatory Program Samples

**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
56,000	47,114	8,886 Under	15.9% Under

**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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Target Population Change                 | <input type="checkbox"/> Other (Identify)       |
| <input type="checkbox"/> This Program/Service Cannot Fix The Problem         |   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Current Laws Are Working Against The Agency Mission |   |

**Explanation:**

The continued decline in the number of dairy establishments (especially farms) has reduced the number of samples collected therefore reducing the number of analyses conducted.

**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-Requested Adjustment |

**Recommendations:**

Management requested and received approval to reduce the standard for this performance measure to 47,500 for FY 2009-2010.

## LRPP Exhibit III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT

**Department:** Agriculture and Consumer Services  
**Program:** Food Safety and Quality  
**Service/Budget Entity:** Dairy Facility Compliance and Enforcement  
**Measure:** Percent of Florida Milk Regulatory Program Samples Analyzed That Meet Standards

**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
93.3%	91.97%	1.33 points under	1.42% under

**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 – IG Audit |
| <input type="checkbox"/> This Program/Service Cannot Fix The Problem         |  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Current Laws Are Working Against The Agency Mission |  |

**Explanation:**

The Department's Inspector General conducted an audit of this measure in August 2008. This audit triggered a re-write of the procedures used to count the eligible analyses for this measure.

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

- |                                    |  |
|------------------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Training  | <input type="checkbox"/> Technology                          |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Personnel | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other-Request Adjustment |

**Recommendations:**

Management will submit a request to adjust the standard for this performance measure.





## LRPP Exhibit III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT

**Department:** Agriculture and Consumer Services  
**Program:** Consumer Protection  
**Service/Budget Entity:** Agricultural Environmental Services  
**Measure:** Number of fertilizer sample determinations.

**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
175,342	146,821	28,521	16.3%

**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:**

The reduction can be attributed to a decrease in the tonnage of fertilizer used in Florida, from approximately 1,310,000 tons in FY 07-08 to approximately 1,057,000 in FY 08-09.

**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:**

No management actions are necessary. We have requested a revised standard for FY 2010-2011.

## LRPP Exhibit III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT

**Department:**     Agriculture and Consumer Services      
**Program:**     Consumer Protection      
**Service/Budget Entity:**     Agricultural Environmental Services      
**Measure:**     Number of official seed sample determinations performed.    

**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
63,548	62,087	1,461	2.2%

**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 number of seed sample determinations in FY 08-09 is actually an increase in the number from actual results in FY 07-08 of 54,771.

**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:**

No management actions are necessary. We have requested a revised standard for FY 2010-2011.

## LRPP Exhibit III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT

**Department:**     Agriculture and Consumer Services      
**Program:**     Consumer Protection      
**Service/Budget Entity:**     Agricultural Environmental Services      
**Measure:** Percent of pesticide ingredients evaluated and/or managed that are in compliance with regulations.

**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
91%	90.6%	0.4	0.44%

**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 90.6 % compliance rate results from a decrease in the number of pesticide ingredients evaluated (199 in FY 07-08 to 180 in FY 08-09) while the number of ingredients not in compliance remained the same (17).

**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:**

No management actions are necessary. We have requested a revised standard for FY 2010-2011.

## LRPP Exhibit III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT

**Department:**     Agriculture and Consumer Services      
**Program:**     Consumer Protection      
**Service/Budget Entity:**     Agricultural Environmental Services      
**Measure:**     Percent of licensed pesticide applicators inspected who are in compliance with regulations.    

**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
88%	85%	3	3.4%

**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:**

The 85 % compliance rate results from a continued emphasis on risk based enforcement which will increase the likelihood that out of compliance applicators will be inspected.

**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:**

No management actions are necessary. We have requested a revised standard for FY 2010-2011.

## LRPP Exhibit III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT

**Department:**     Agriculture and Consumer Services      
**Program:**     Consumer Protection      
**Service/Budget Entity:**     Agricultural Environmental Services      
**Measure:**     Percent of commercial pest control businesses and applicators inspected who are in compliance with regulations    

**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
92%	90.0%	2	2.2%

**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 90.0% compliance rate is due to continued emphasis on risk based enforcement, which increases inspection of operators and applicators who will be out of compliance.

**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:**

No management actions are necessary. We have requested an adjustment in standards for the 2010-2011 FY.

## LRPP Exhibit III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT

**Department:**     Agriculture and Consumer Services      
**Program:**     Consumer Protection      
**Service/Budget Entity:**     Agricultural Environmental Services      
**Measure:**     Number of pest control businesses and applicators licensed.    

**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
43,032	35,950	7,082	16.5%

**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:**

The number of licenses reported from the data base was discovered to be over counting as a result of an audit. A corrected data base query was instituted resulting in the lower number reported for FY 08-09.

**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:**

No management actions are necessary. We have requested a revised standard for FY 2010-2011.

## LRPP Exhibit III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT

**Department:**     Agriculture and Consumer Services      
**Program:**     Consumer Protection      
**Service/Budget Entity:**     Agricultural Environmental Services      
**Measure:**     Percent of feed, seed, and fertilizer inspected products in compliance with performance/quality standards    

**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
89%	88%	1	1.1%

**Factors Accounting for the Difference:**

**Internal Factors** (check all that apply):

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

**Explanation:**

The 88 % compliance rate is actually an improvement over the actual results for FY 07-08 (87.7%), due to a decrease in the amount of fertilizer samples that were deficient (from 22.7% to 22.0%).

**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:**

No management actions are necessary. We have requested a revised standard for FY 2010-2011.

## LRPP Exhibit III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT

**Department:** Agriculture & Consumer Services

**Program:** Consumer Protection

**Service/Budget Entity:** Consumer Protection

**Measure:** Number of Lemon Law Assists Made to Consumers

**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
26,500	13,432	(13,068)	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 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:**

The two factors that affect the Lemon Law Program are the number of new car sales/leases within the State and the performance levels of new cars. New car sales/leases have decreased over the last four years. Both factors are unpredictable from year to year.

**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:** Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services  
**Program:** Consumer Protection  
**Service/Budget Entity:** Standards/Fair Rides Inspections  
**Measure:** Number of amusement rides safety inspections conducted

**Action:**

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

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
10,000	9,820	-180	-.03

**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                            | X 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 reduction of safety inspections is a direct result of the reduced number of amusement companies that were in operation in the state for FY 08-09. Due to the recent economic down turn, there were several events that were cancelled, and with the high cost of fuel last year, several companies did not enter the state with rides this year, and also there was the consolidation of 3 to 4 small companies into one large amusement company, which reduced the number of operations.

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

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

**Recommendations:**

Reduction of the performance standards if economic conditions do not improve.

## LRPP Exhibit III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT

**Department:** Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services  
**Program:** Consumer Protection  
**Service/Budget Entity:** Standards and Petroleum Quality Inspections  
**Measure:** Percentage of Petroleum Products Meeting Quality Standards  
**(GAA Outcome)**

**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
98%	97.3%	-0.7%	-0.7%

**Factors Accounting for the Difference:**

**Internal Factors** (check all that apply):

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

**Explanation:** A major shift to blend gasoline products with ethanol continued to take place during fiscal year 08/09, resulting in an abnormally high number of product identity and labeling violations. Combined with this, hiring freezes, position losses (2), and vacancies in the laboratories and field operations units throughout the 08/09 fiscal year led to a reduction in the number of samples able to be collected and analyzed; thus reducing the amount of fuel quality testing able to be conducted by the laboratories.

**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:** A major shift to blend gasoline products with ethanol continued to take place during fiscal year 08/09, driven by the provisions of s. 526.203, F.S., requiring all gasoline to be blended with 9-10% ethanol by December 31, 2010. Many terminals began blending gasoline with ethanol well ahead of this date, which resulted in a rapid expansion of such products on the market in Florida. Ultimately, this translated to an abnormally high number of product identification and labeling violations during the transition period, which still persists today.

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

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

**Recommendations:** Significant efforts have been made to work with the industry to remedy the product identification and labeling violations that contributed to the decrease of this performance measure. Such efforts have shown an increase in compliance in this area; however, violations still persist at levels that need improvement. Further, efforts have been made to provide as much coverage as possible in the short term, until remaining vacancies can be filled; however, with the loss of two positions permanently, inspection and laboratory coverage in the petroleum inspection program have been permanently lessened and it is possible that lasting effects may be observed with this performance measure.

## LRPP Exhibit III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT

**Department:** Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services  
**Program:** Consumer Protection  
**Service/Budget Entity:** Standards and Petroleum Quality Inspections  
**Measure:** Number of petroleum field inspections conducted (GAA Output)

**Action:**

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

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
255,000	223,885	- 31,115	-12.2%

**Factors Accounting for the Difference:**

**Internal Factors** (check all that apply):

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| X Personnel Factors                                  | X 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):

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| X 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:** During fiscal year 08/09, four petroleum inspector positions were vacant for the year due to budgeting issues and two other such positions involved employees unable to perform work duties for the vast majority of this time for approved reasons. As a result, the workload anticipated to be carried by these positions was unable to be performed, leading to an overall decrease in the number of petroleum inspections conducted during this time period.

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

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

**Recommendations:** Filling the above referenced positions to the extent possible should alleviate future deficiencies in this area.

## LRPP Exhibit III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT

**Department: Agriculture and Consumer Services**  
**Program: Agriculture Economic Development**  
**Service/Budget Entity: Agricultural Products Marketing**  
**Measure: Florida Agriculture Products as a Percent of the National Market**

**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
2.71%	2.46%	.25%	9%

**Factors Accounting for the Difference:**

**Internal Factors** (check all that apply):

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

**Explanation:**

**External Factors** (check all that apply):

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

**Explanation:** This measure provides insight into where Florida fits into the national picture as it relates to sales of agricultural products at the farm level. Statistics are collected by the USDA, and are kept on a calendar year basis. The percentage that represents Florida's sales rises and falls based on two annual factors – how farmers fare in the U.S. as a whole, and how well they do in Florida. In FY 08-09, Florida sales rose by a healthy 4.3% from \$7.646 billion to \$7.974 billion. But the national sales grew by 13.9% from \$284.8 billion to \$324.4 billion. The Department projects annual growth of 2% for Florida sales and 1% for national. So although we doubled the estimate for Florida's increase, compared with national sales, we dropped considerably. The program is simply a gauge of how the state stands in the national picture and is not designed to have an influence on the result.

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

- Training  Technology  
 Personnel  Other (Identify)

**Recommendations:** There are no initiatives that Management can employ to influence this issue. Weather, crop failures or over production, pests, competition and unpredictable consumer preferences, along with a myriad of other issues are all factors beyond human control. Management will, however, continue to use this data to measure Florida's contribution to the national agricultural output.

*Office of Policy and Budget – July 2009*

**LRPP Exhibit III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT**

**Department: Agriculture and Consumer Services**

**Program: Agriculture Economic Development**

**Service/Budget Entity: Agricultural Products Marketing**

**Measure: Number of leased square feet at State Farmers Markets**

**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
2,000,000	1,575,080	424,920	17%

**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:** Many buildings have gone off line due to hurricane damage and several have not been rebuilt. Others that are back online are experiencing a lag time between certificate of occupancy and being leased. The approved standard was not reduced to accommodate the downward change in available inventory.

**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:** Some of the buildings that went offline due to hurricane damage/destruction have come back online. However, due to the economic slowdown, many of these buildings have not yet been leased and several large properties have not been rebuilt due to FEMA delays. The tenants that were in the damaged/destroyed buildings had to find other operating locations and are now established elsewhere and likely will not return. Other tenant businesses simply ceased operations due to economic stresses created by the hurricane damage and the recession.

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

- Training
  Technology  
 Personnel
  Other (Identify)

**Recommendations:** The Approved Standard should be lowered to a more reasonable expectation. The bureau will continue to market available properties to the agricultural industry. We believe that as the economy upturns, there will be a growth opportunity in the industry, which will create a demand for agricultural marketing facilities.

### LRPP Exhibit III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT

**Department:** Agriculture and Consumer Services  
**Program:** Agriculture Economic Development  
**Service/Budget Entity:** Agricultural Products Marketing  
**Measure:** Percent of available square feet of State Farmer's Markets leased

**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
95%	79%	(16)	(17)%

**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:** The economic turndown coupled with new buildings coming online has put more building inventory online and has created a challenge to get the new properties leased.

**External Factors** (check all that apply):

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

**Explanation:** The economic slowdown has slowed agricultural business growth and has caused some businesses to close thus, creating more vacancies.

**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:** Management will continue to market its state-owned farmers market properties to agricultural concerns at a fair market value with incentives to entice agribusiness growth. Consideration will be given to leasing to non-agricultural entities in order to improve revenues and reduce pressures to raise lease rates on existing clients to cover operational costs.



## LRPP Exhibit III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT

**Department:** Agriculture and Consumer Services  
**Program:** Agricultural Economic Development  
**Service/Budget Entity:** Division of Aquaculture (42170300)  
**Measure:** Number of leases verified for compliance

**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
688	540	(148)	-21.5%

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

**Explanation:**

Due to lease cancellations, transfers, expirations, the number of actual leases eligible for verification for calendar year 2008 was 540.

**External Factors** (check all that apply):

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Resources Unavailable                               | <input type="checkbox"/> Technological Problems      |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Legal/Legislative Change                            | <input type="checkbox"/> Natural Disaster            |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Target Population Change                 | <input 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 number of leases eligible for verification is determined at the end of each calendar year and the number will vary from year to year and from the current approved standard.

**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:**

This performance measure is being re-evaluated based on an audit by the Inspector General.

## LRPP Exhibit III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT

**Department:** Agriculture and Consumer Services  
**Program:** Agricultural Environmental Services  
**Service/Budget Entity:** Agricultural Interdiction Stations  
**Measure:** Amount of revenue generated by Bills of Lading transmitted to the Department of Revenue from Agricultural Interdiction Stations

**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
9,096,760	7,332,131	-1,764,629	-24.1

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

**Explanation:**

Staffing shortages have contributed to the decline in the number of trucks inspected as we continue to struggle with retention issues. Therefore, the staffing shortages have also contributed to the amount of revenue generated by this program.

**External Factors** (check all that apply):

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

**Explanation:**

Truck traffic has steadily declined since the downturn of the economy. Our counts indicate a decrease of 20% since the beginning of FY 2007-08 and the Department of Transportation truck traffic counts are consistent with this.

**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 (Adjust Standard) |

**Recommendations:**

We have requested and received an adjustment to the standard for FY 2009-10. We will continue to monitor traffic counts and when the economy improves and truck counts increase again, we will request adjustments accordingly. We will also continue to pursue funding as an incentive for trained officers to remain with the agency.

Office of Policy and Budget – July 2009

### LRPP Exhibit III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT

**Department: Agriculture and Consumer Services**  
**Program: Agricultural Environmental Services**  
**Service/Budget Entity: Agricultural Interdiction Stations**  
**Measure: Number of Bills of Lading transmitted to the department of Revenue from Agricultural Interdiction Stations**

**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
57,472	48,336	-9,136	-18.9

**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:**

Staffing shortages have contributed to the decline in the overall number of trucks inspected as we continue to struggle with retention issues. Therefore, the number of Bills of Lading transmitted to DOR has decreased, as well.

**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:**

Truck traffic has steadily declined since the downturn of the economy. Our counts indicate a decrease of 20% since the beginning of FY 2007-08 and the Department of Transportation truck traffic counts are consistent with this.

Another issue that may have partially contributed to the decline in this measure is that the 2005 Legislature modified Chapter 213.053(8)(L), Florida Statute, to allow DACS sworn personnel to access limited taxpayer information. This has enabled us to reduce the number of Bills of Lading transmitted to Department of Revenue by focusing on companies not in compliance with tax laws, which improved efficiency. The actual performance for this measure may continue to decrease over the next couple of years due to this legislative change. It is difficult however, to determine how much of the decrease is due to this statutory change, the staffing issues or the decrease in truck traffic.

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

- Training
  Technology  
 Personnel
  Other (Adjust Standard)

**Recommendations:**

We have requested and received an adjustment to the standard for FY 2009-10. We will continue to monitor traffic counts and when the economy improves and truck counts increase again, we will request adjustments accordingly. We will also continue to pursue funding as an incentive for trained officers to remain with the agency.

*Office of Policy and Budget – July 2009*

**LRPP Exhibit III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT**

**Department: Agriculture and Consumer Services**  
**Program: Agricultural Environmental Services**  
**Service/Budget Entity: Agricultural Interdiction Stations**  
**Measure: Number of vehicles inspected at Agricultural Interdiction Stations transporting agricultural or regulated commodities**

**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
2,517,386	1,880,221	-637,165	-33.9

**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:**

Staffing shortages have contributed to the decline in the overall number of trucks inspected as we continue to struggle with retention issues. Therefore, the number of ag laden trucks inspected has decreased, as well.

**External Factors** (check all that apply):

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

**Explanation:**

Truck traffic has steadily declined since the downturn of the economy. Our counts indicate a decrease of 20% since the beginning of FY 2007-08 and the Department of Transportation truck traffic counts are consistent with this.

**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 (Adjust Standard) |

**Recommendations:**

We have requested and received an adjustment to the standard for FY 2009-10. We will continue to monitor traffic counts and when the economy improves and truck counts increase again, we will request adjustments accordingly. We will also continue to pursue funding as an incentive for trained officers to remain with the agency.

*Office of Policy and Budget – July 2009*

## LRPP Exhibit III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT

**Department: Agriculture and Consumer Services**

**Program: Agricultural Environmental Services**

**Service/Budget Entity: Agricultural Interdiction Stations**

**Measure: Number of vehicles inspected at Agricultural Interdiction Stations**

**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
11,708,770	9,466,834	-2,241,936	-19.1

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

**Explanation:**

Staffing shortages have contributed to the decline in the number of trucks inspected as we continue to struggle with retention issues.

**External Factors** (check all that apply):

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

**Explanation:**

Truck traffic has steadily declined since the downturn of the economy. Our counts indicate a decrease of 20% since the beginning of FY 2007-08 and the Department of Transportation truck traffic counts are consistent with this.

**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 (Adjust Standard) |

**Recommendations:**

We have requested and received an adjustment to the standard for FY 2009-10. We will continue to monitor traffic counts and when the economy improves and truck counts increase again, we will request adjustments accordingly. We will also continue to pursue funding as an incentive for trained officers to remain with the agency.

## LRPP Exhibit III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT

**Department:** Florida Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services,  
 Division of Animal Industry

**Program:** Agricultural Economic Development\_\_\_\_\_

**Service/Budget Entity:** Animal Pest and Disease Control\_\_

**Measure:** Number of employee hours spent on animal and agricultural emergency activities.

**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
16,952	10,334	(6,618)	39%

**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:** While the hours spent in preparedness, training and outreach efforts remain constant, the hours spent in actual response efforts are dependent on the incidence of natural disasters and animal disease events.

**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:** While the hours spent in preparedness, training and outreach efforts remain constant, the hours spent in actual response efforts are dependent on the incidence of natural disasters and animal disease events.

**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:** Department staff continue their preparation, training and outreach efforts in the areas of natural disaster and animal disease response.

## LRPP Exhibit III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT

**Department:** Florida Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services,  
**Division of Animal Industry**

**Program:** Agricultural Economic Development\_\_\_\_\_

**Service/Budget Entity:** Animal Pest and Disease Control\_\_

**Measure:** Percent of positive test results from livestock and poultry tested for specific diseases for which monitoring, controlling and eradication activities are established.

**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
0.43%	0.21%	(0.22%)	51%

**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:** Johne's serological testing in the past accounted for approximately 80% of positive test results. Current sampling protocol allows for the pooling of samples (5 samples combined into 1). This resulted in a reduction in the number of positive test results. Also, we continue to test an increased number of poultry samples for Avian Influenza and these surveillance tests are rarely positive.

**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:** Uncertainty of Johne's Cooperative Agreement funding issues related to offset producer costs translated into decreased interest in program by producers.

**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:** The Division will continue to attempt to secure federal cooperative agreement funding for surveillance programs.



## LRPP Exhibit III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT

**Department:** Florida Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services,  
 Division of Animal Industry

**Program:** Agricultural Economic Development\_\_\_\_\_

**Service/Budget Entity:** Animal Pest and Disease Control\_\_

**Measure:** Number of reports of suspected or positive dangerous, transmissible diseases received by the state veterinarian.

**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
282	269	(13)	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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other (Identify) |

**Explanation:** Reportable dangerous transmissible disease events vary from year to year based on disease prevalence.

**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:** Reportable dangerous transmissible disease events vary from year to year based on disease prevalence.

**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:** Department staff continue their education efforts with the veterinary community to ensure they are aware of the reporting requirements.

## LRPP Exhibit III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT

**Department:** Agriculture and Consumer Services \_\_\_\_\_  
**Program:** Agricultural Economic Development  
**Service/Budget Entity:** Animal Pest and Disease Control \_\_\_\_\_  
**Measure:** Number of tests and/or vaccinations performed on animals \_\_\_\_\_

**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
522,416	504,047	(18,369)	3.5%

**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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other (Reduction in federal funding) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> This Program/Service Cannot Fix The Problem         |  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Current Laws Are Working Against The Agency Mission |  |

**Explanation:** Reduction in federal funds for the Johne's testing program resulted in the number of tests conducted on cattle.

**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 (Request federal funding) |

**Recommendations:** The Division will continue to attempt to secure federal cooperative agreement funding for specific disease testing.

## LRPP Exhibit III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT

**Department:** Agriculture and Consumer Services  
**Program:** Agricultural Economic Development  
**Service/Budget Entity:** Plant Pest and Disease Control  
**Measure:** Number of cartons of citrus certified as fly-free for export

**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
10,014,270	6,195,442	3,818,828	38%

**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 checked="" 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:** Plant Disease/pathological factors (citrus greening and citrus canker infestations) resulted in the destruction of many citrus trees in the citrus production areas. This resulted in lower fruit yields reducing the number of cartons of citrus for export. The lower yield ultimately reduces the number of cartons needing to be certified by the Department. Additionally, the economic recession has lead to a drop in the number of cartons requiring certification.

**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:** Federal quarantine restrictions for domestic fruit movement will be eased in FY 10-11 resulting in an expected increase in the output of this measure. It is recommended that this standard remain at the current figure.

## LRPP Exhibit III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT

**Department:** Agriculture and Consumer Services  
**Program:** Agricultural Economic Development  
**Service/Budget Entity:** Plant Pest and Disease Control  
**Measure:** Number of plant, fruit fly trap, and honeybee inspections performed

**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
1,000,000	787,482	212,518	21%

**Factors Accounting for the Difference:**

**Internal Factors** (check all that apply):

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

**Explanation:** The landscape of Florida plant protection has changed significantly over the previous four fiscal years. Although personnel totals in our division have dropped 56% and appropriations dropped 88%, the standard for this performance measure had not dropped proportionately.

**External Factors** (check all that apply):

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| <input checked="" 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 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:** Over the last four years, state budget constraints and changes in federal priorities as they pertain to citrus canker eradication and citrus health management in general have led to a significant reduction in resources without the commensurate reduction of the performance standard.

**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:** Reduce the approved standard to 750,000 which is a more attainable measure given the current financial and personnel resource levels.



Performance Measure  
Validity and Reliability –  
LRPP  
Exhibit IV

## LRPP EXHIBIT IV: PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY

**Department:** Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services  
**Program:** Office of the Commissioner and Division of Administration  
**Service:** Agricultural Law Enforcement  
**Measure:** Criminal Investigation Closure Rate  
(DOACS approved measure # 1)

**Action** (check one):

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

### Glossary of Key Terms:

**Investigation** - The systematic examination of circumstances and facts in an effort to obtain a conclusion as to what has occurred, or not occurred.

**Prosecution** - The presentation of facts or circumstances based upon evidence that initiates a legal proceeding.

**Closure Rate** – The quantity or measure attached to the conclusion of investigations conducted and completed (percentage of the total number of cases opened during a reporting period that are closed).

**Regulatory** - To control or direct according to rule, principle, or law as it relates to the mission of the Department and regulated community.

**Department** - Means the Florida Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services.

**Criminal Violation** - Term used to identify a violation of Criminal Law as specified by Florida State Statute or Florida having a penalty of confinement and/or fine.

**Civil Violation** – Matters which are non-criminal in nature, but are still a violation of a specified law or rule, having the capability of a fine or sanction.

**Administrative Violation** - A violation of a specific law or rule that directs or regulates how a specific activity may occur, and allows for prohibiting certain activity, and/or imposing sanction or penalty for violation of a specific law or rule.

Action – Any activity conducted by a law enforcement officer in the performance of their duties.

Clearance - Final disposition or conclusion of an investigation.

Open case - Initiation of a report to document an investigation or action by a law enforcement officer.

Closed case – Closure of a report documenting an Investigation or other matter that warrants no further investigation or action.

### **Data Sources and Methodology:**

The number of investigations conducted and/or actions taken is collected and maintained by law enforcement investigators and officers assigned to the Bureau of Investigative Services of the Office of Agricultural Law Enforcement.

The Bureau provides investigative support for all Divisions of the Department in both civil and criminal matters as well as working closely with local, state, and federal agencies, providing investigative assistance and support in all matters over which the Department has jurisdiction and is directly involved in safeguarding the public in issues relating to homeland security.

General categories of types of events documented and incidents investigated include: Animal / Livestock related, Aquaculture related, Background / Pre-employment, Bomb threat / Destructive Devices, Burglary / Trespass, By Passing Ag Station, Consumer Related, Dignitary / Protective Ops, Drug / Alcohol related, Entomology / Pest Control related, Environmental, Executive Investigations, Field Interviews, Fire related, Food Safety related, Fruit and Vegetable related, Illegal Aliens, Informational Reports – Non specific, Law Enforcement Sensitive Information, Licensing related, Persons Reports, Plant related, Special Details, Standards related, State lands related, Theft, and Traffic. The general categories listed above may have multiple specific subcategories associated with them.

The total number of investigations or actions are logged and recorded on various activity reporting forms. Each violation of the law or a rule will have appropriate documents transmitted to a court or other appropriate forums. Likewise, each activity is reported to a Law Enforcement Lieutenant and the Captain of the Bureau of Investigative Services. The Captain keeps the Chief apprised of activities and cases within the unit. Reports and cases are approved by the Captain, and not ALL violations find their way to the Chief.

When a new case is initiated, a case file is created by entering key information into our Automated Case Information System (ACISS). The system automatically assigns a case number and enables us to track our progress.



Information regarding an investigation or action is entered into ACISS, documenting the investigative process. When a case is closed, the final disposition is also documented in ACISS. Each quarter and at the end of the fiscal year, staff within the Office of Agricultural Law Enforcement generates queries from ACISS, which provide both the number of cases opened and the number of cases closed during the reporting period.

The closure rate is determined by dividing the total number of cases closed by the total number of cases opened during the reporting period.

This methodology was used to compile the FY 2008-09 actual performance of this measure.

**SPECIAL NOTE:**

The Department's Inspector General conducted an audit of this measure in August 2005. The Inspector General strongly recommended that all Conservation and Recreation Land (CARL) Officer State Land investigative cases be included in the Bureau of Investigative Services' case closure rate calculation due to the fact that CARL Officers work identical type investigations and report to the Bureau of Investigative Services. CARL Officers are, however, funded by the Division of Forestry.

For the reasons stated above, the methodology for this measure was modified in FY 2005-06. Had this been done for FY 2003-04 and FY 2004-05, the closure rate would have been as follows:

	<u>Reported</u>	<u>Adjusted</u>
FY 2003-04	84	63
FY 2004-05	80	107

**Validity:**

The number of criminal, civil or administrative violations and actions taken are continuously reviewed, monitored and audited by the Captain and the Bureau Chief of Investigative Services. Closed cases and other activity reports are available for public inspection, pursuant to Chapter 119, Florida Statutes. The activities of the Bureau of Investigative Services can be verified by either the Department of Agriculture & Consumer Services, or from county and circuit court records.

This measure is an appropriate indication of activities performed and successful closure of cases.

**Reliability:**

The methodologies and recording instruments used to collect data consist of case files and activity sheets prepared, reviewed and approved by six (6) Law Enforcement Lieutenants, one (1) Law Enforcement Captain, and the Chief of the Bureau. Because of the methodical review process conducted by these supervisors, the data is considered very reliable. The data collected requires factual reporting and not interpretations of the facts; therefore, other equally qualified law enforcement investigators, supervisors, analysts or auditors, would reach the same or similar conclusions. The information flows from the officers conducting the investigation or action, to their Lieutenant, to the Captain of the Bureau (who monitors the day-to-day activities of the Bureau), and ultimately to the Chief of Investigative Services, and is well documented for consistency and reliability. Reports and cases are approved by the Captain, and not ALL violations find their way to the Chief.

The Bureau's reporting tool is the ACISS Case Management System. Information is data which is input by investigating officers. Once a case is closed, the information remains static. The system allows for a variety of reports to be run to include actual investigative reports, analysis reports, persons and property reports. Due to the varying types of reports which can be provided, the same type of report must be requested in order to duplicate information on the original report.

**LRPP EXHIBIT IV: PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY**

**Department: Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services**  
**Program: Office of the Commissioner and Division of Administration**  
**Service: Agricultural Law Enforcement**  
**Measure: Number of law enforcement investigations initiated**  
**(DOACS approved measure # 2)**

**Action** (check one):

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

**Glossary:**

Investigation - The systematic examination of circumstances and facts in an effort to obtain a conclusion as to what has occurred, or not occurred.

Prosecution - The presentation of facts or circumstances based upon evidence that initiates a legal proceeding.

Closure Rate - The quantity or measure attached to the conclusion of investigations conducted and completed (percentage of the total number of cases opened during a reporting period that are closed).

Regulatory - To control or direct according to rule, principle, or law as it relates to the mission of the Department and regulated community.

Department - Means the Florida Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services.

Criminal Violation - Term used to identify a violation of Criminal Law as specified by Florida State Statute or Florida having a penalty of confinement and/or fine.

Civil Violation – Matters which are non-criminal in nature, but are still a violation of a specified law or rule, having the capability of a fine or sanction.

Administrative Violation - A violation of a specific law or rule that directs or regulates how a specific activity may occur, and allows for prohibiting certain activity, and/or imposing sanction or penalty for violation of a specific law or rule.

Action – Any activity conducted by a law enforcement officer in the performance of their duties.

Clearance - Final disposition or conclusion of an investigation.

Open case - Initiation of a report to document an investigation or action by a law enforcement officer.

Closed case – Closure of a report documenting an Investigation or other matter that warrants no further investigation or action.

**Data Sources and Methodology:**

The number of investigations conducted and/or actions taken is collected and maintained by law enforcement investigators and officers assigned to the Bureau of Investigative Services of the Office of Agricultural Law Enforcement.

The Bureau provides investigative support for all Divisions of the Department in both civil and criminal matters as well as working closely with local, state, and federal agencies, providing investigative assistance and support in all matters over which the Department has jurisdiction and is directly involved in safeguarding the public in issues relating to homeland security.

General categories of types of events documented and incidents investigated include: Animal / Livestock related, Aquaculture related, Background / Pre-employment, Bomb threat / Destructive Devices, Burglary / Trespass, By Passing Ag Station, Consumer Related, Dignitary / Protective Ops, Drug / Alcohol related, Entomology / Pest Control related, Environmental, Executive Investigations, Field Interviews, Fire related, Food Safety related, Fruit and Vegetable related, Illegal Aliens, Informational Reports – Non specific, Law Enforcement Sensitive Information, Licensing related, Persons Reports, Plant related, Special Details, Standards related, State lands related, Theft, and Traffic. The general categories listed above may have multiple specific subcategories associated with them.

The total number of investigations or actions are logged and recorded on various activity reporting forms. Each violation of the law or a rule will have appropriate documents transmitted to a court or other appropriate forums. Likewise, each activity is reported to a Law Enforcement Lieutenant and the Captain of the Bureau of Investigative Services. The Captain keeps the Chief apprised of activities and cases within the unit. Reports and cases are approved by the Captain, and not ALL violations find their way to the Chief.

When a new case is initiated, a case file is created by entering key information into our Automated Case Information System (ACISS). The system automatically assigns a case number and enables us to track our progress. Information regarding an investigation or action is entered into ACISS, documenting the investigative process. Each quarter and at the end of the fiscal year, staff within the Office of Agricultural Law Enforcement generates a query from ACISS, which provides the number of cases opened during the reporting period.

This methodology was used to compile the FY 2008-09 actual performance of this measure.

#### SPECIAL NOTE:

The Department's Inspector General conducted an audit of this measure in August 2005. The Inspector General strongly recommended that all CARL Officer's State Land investigative cases be included in the Bureau of Investigative Services' cases initiated due to the fact that CARL Officers work

identical type investigations and report to the Bureau of Investigative Services. CARL Officers are, however, funded by the Division of Forestry.

For the reasons stated above, the methodology for this measure was modified in FY 2005-06. Had this been done for FY 2002-03, FY 2003-04 and FY 2004-05, the number of law enforcement investigations initiated by the Bureau of Investigative Services would have been as follows:

	<u>Reported</u>	<u>Adjusted</u>
FY 2002-03	1,351	2,005
FY 2003-04	923	1,424
FY 2004-05	1,276	1,826

**Validity:**

The number of investigations initiated is contingent upon crimes reported, assistance requested and actions taken, but it is a good indicator of workload. This information is reviewed, monitored and audited by the Captain and the Chief of the Bureau of Investigative Services. Closed cases and other activity reports are available for public inspection pursuant to Chapter 119, Florida Statutes. The activities of the Bureau of Investigative Services can be easily verified by either the Department of Agriculture & Consumer Services, or by county and circuit court records.

**Reliability:**

The methodologies and recording instruments used to collect data consist of case files and activities sheets prepared, reviewed and approved by six (6) Law Enforcement Lieutenants, one (1) Law Enforcement Captain, and the Chief of the Bureau of Investigative Services. As a result of the methodical review process, the data is considered very reliable.

The data collected requires factual reporting and not interpretations of the facts; therefore, other equally qualified law enforcement investigators, supervisors, analysts or auditors, would reach the same or similar conclusions. The information flows from Investigator to Lieutenant to the Captain of the Bureau (who monitors the day-to-day activities of the Bureau), and ultimately to the Chief of Investigative Services, and is well documented for consistency and reliability. Reports and cases are approved by the Captain, and not ALL violations find their way to the Chief.

The Bureau's reporting tool is the ACISS Case Management System. Information is data which is input by investigating officers. Once a case is closed, the information remains static. The system allows for a variety of reports to be run to include actual investigative reports, analysis reports, persons and property reports. Due to the varying types of reports which can be provided, the same type of report must be requested in order to duplicate information on the original report.

## LRPP EXHIBIT IV: PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY

**Department:** Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services  
**Program:** Office of the Commissioner and Division of Administration  
**Service:** Agricultural Water Policy Coordination  
**Measure:** Number of acres in priority basins or watersheds outside the Northern Everglades and Estuaries Protection Program (NEEPP) area enrolled annually, through Notices of Intent, in Agricultural Water Policy Best Management Practices (BMPs) (DOACS approved measure # 3)

**Action** (check one):

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

### **Glossary:**

Best Management Practices (BMPs) - Science-based structural or nonstructural measures, adopted by the Department, that are designed to minimize the discharge of agricultural pollutants to ground or surface waters and/or conserve water resources.

Notice of Intent (NOI) - A standardized form on which an agricultural producer submits information about the property on which BMPs will be implemented, accompanied by a checklist of the BMPs applicable to the property. NOIs for Office of Agricultural Water Policy (OAWP) BMP programs are located on the OAWP website.

Priority watersheds/basins - Rivers, river segments, ground water basins, or surface water basins that are identified by the Florida Department of Environmental Protection (FDEP) as impaired, based on scientifically acceptable water quality data.

Northern Everglades and Estuaries Protection Program Area (NEEPP area) - The Lake Okeechobee Watershed, as defined by subsection 373.4595(2), Florida Statutes, and St. Lucie, Martin, Glades, Hendry, Charlotte, Lee, Highlands, and Okeechobee counties.

The area used to report on this measure consists of the counties falling outside the NEEPP area as defined above.

### **Data Sources and Methodology:**

FDEP has divided the state into 29 priority watersheds, and has identified impaired waters in all of them. Consequently, all agricultural operations in the state are located in priority watersheds. The OAWP tracks and maintains NOIs received from landowners to implement BMPs in priority basins or watersheds throughout the state. The data received on each NOI includes number of acres enrolled, and is entered by BMP

program and county into the Office of Agricultural Water Policy's automated "Best Management Practices Tracking System" (BMPTS). It is necessary to track program enrollments by county because property ownership information is not kept by basin or watershed and the primary property identifier on the NOI is the county tax parcel identification number.

**Validity:**

The number of acres on which BMPs will be implemented on an operation is submitted on a standardized NOI. OAWP staff reviews the acreage and other information contained on the NOI and, if necessary, conducts follow up to verify or correct the information. Following a standard procedure, staff enters the NOI information into the BMPTS, and checks the entries against the NOIs. The data (acreage) collected are directly related to the performance measure. The method of collection and entry into the BMPTS provides an accurate count of acres newly enrolled in Office of Agricultural Water Policy (OAWP) BMPs in priority basins or watersheds outside of the NEEPP area during each quarter and annually.

**Reliability:**

An automated system, BMPTS, is being used to record, calculate, track, and maintain the data collected. The BMPTS is programmed to count (summarize) the amount of agricultural acreage reported on the standardized NOIs. The utilization of an automated system, with limited points of data entry, significantly reduces the chance for errors or discrepancies. Trained OAWP staffs enter the data submitted on the NOIs into the automated system, checking their entries against the NOIs. The system totals the agricultural acreage enrolled in BMPs, both quarterly and annually, by county and BMP program. This information can be found by accessing several automated reports in BMPTS. Two of the reports are configured to report on performance measures 3 and 5, and include the counties/programs relevant to those measures.

The reliability of the system is checked quarterly to ensure that a re-run of the report run for the previous quarter produces the same acreage total. Annual report figures are checked against the acreage totals of the four quarters that fall within the reporting year. The probability is very high that the same results would be achieved repeatedly by others using the same procedures.

**LRPP EXHIBIT IV: PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY**

**Department:** Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services  
**Program:** Office of the Commissioner and Division of Administration  
**Service:** Agricultural Water Policy Coordination  
**Measure:** Number of water policy assists provided to agricultural interests (DOACS approved measure # 4)



**Action** (check one):

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

**Glossary:**

Agricultural interest - Any individual, group, agency, or organization that needs information and/or assistance with regard to water resource-related agricultural issues.

Water Policy Assist - a contact with an agricultural interest regarding one or more of the programs that the Office of Agricultural Water Policy provides for the implementation of Best Management Practices (BMPs) adopted by Department rule for the purpose of improving water quality and conservation. Examples include providing information on OAWP programs, BMP development and implementation, on-farm technical assistance, assistance with regulatory exemptions determinations, and inter-agency coordination on water policy development.

**Data Sources and Methodology:**

The Office of Agricultural Water Policy has clearly identified what constitutes an assist. Staff is required to enter all assist activity, by appropriate category, into the Office of Agricultural Water Policy's automated system, the "Journal of Water Policy Assists". Upon data entry, the automated system can generate reports of the types and numbers of assists recorded and to compute the total number of assists.

**Validity:**

This measure is valid in that it represents the specific types of water policy assists that are provided by staff to agricultural interests. The types of assists have been identified, clearly defined and automated, on-line, for data entry. Staff enters the data into the database "Journal of Water Policy Assists". Entries include staff name, assist type, name of the person assisted or event attended, and funding source. This allows auditing as to the validity of the entries, if deemed necessary.

**Reliability:**

The data is entered into an automated system, which locks in the number of assists reported at the end of each quarter, prohibiting data manipulation. The "Journal of Water Policy Assists" can be queried to report a total for each assist category and compute an overall total. The probability is high that the same results would be achieved repeatedly, since all calculations are derived from the "Journal of Water Policy Assists".

## LRPP EXHIBIT IV: PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY

**Department:** Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services  
**Program:** Office of the Commissioner and Division of Administration  
**Service:** Agricultural Water Policy Coordination  
**Measure:** Number of acres in the Northern Everglades and Estuaries Protection Program area enrolled annually, through Notices of Intent, in Agricultural Water Policy Best Management Practices programs. (DOACS approved measure # 5)

**Action** (check one):

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

### **Glossary:**

Best Management Practices (BMPs) - Science-based structural or nonstructural measures, adopted by the Department, that are designed to minimize the discharge of agricultural pollutants to ground or surface waters and/or conserve water resources.

Notice of Intent (NOI) – A standardized form on which an agricultural producer submits information about the property on which BMPs will be implemented, accompanied by a checklist of the BMPs applicable to the property. NOIs for Office of Agricultural Water Policy (OAWP) BMP programs are located on the OAWP website.

Priority watersheds/basins - Rivers, river segments, ground water basins, or surface water basins that are identified by the Florida Department of Environmental Protection (FDEP) as impaired, based on scientifically acceptable water quality data.

Northern Everglades and Estuaries Protection Program Area (NEEPP area) - The Lake Okeechobee Watershed, as defined by subsection 373.4595(2), Florida Statutes, and St. Lucie, Martin, Glades, Hendry, Charlotte, Lee, Highlands, and Okeechobee counties.

### **Data Sources and Methodology:**

FDEP has divided the state into 29 priority watersheds, and has identified impaired waters in all of them. Consequently, all agricultural operations in the state are located in priority watersheds. The OAWP tracks and maintains NOIs received from landowners to implement BMPs in priority basins or watersheds throughout the state. The data received on each NOI includes number of acres enrolled, and is entered by county and BMP program into the Office of Agricultural Water Policy's automated "Best Management Practices Tracking System" (BMPTS). It is necessary to track program

enrollments by county because property ownership information is not kept by basin or watershed and the primary property identifier on the NOI is the county tax parcel identification number.

**Validity:**

The number of acres on which BMPs will be implemented on an operation is submitted on a standardized NOI. OAWP staff reviews the acreage and other information contained on the NOI and, if necessary, conducts follow up to verify or correct the information. Following a standard procedure, staff enters the NOI information into the BMPTS, and checks the entries against the NOIs. The data (acreage) collected are directly related to the performance measure. The method of collection and entry into the BMPTS provides an accurate count of acres newly enrolled in Office of Agricultural Water Policy (OAWP) BMPs in priority basins or watersheds outside of the NEEPP area during each quarter and annually.

**Reliability:**

An automated system, BMPTS, is being used to record, calculate, track, and maintain the data collected. The BMPTS is programmed to count (summarize) the amount of agricultural acreage reported on the standardized NOIs. The utilization of an automated system, with limited points of data entry, significantly reduces the chance for errors or discrepancies. Trained OAWP staff enters the data submitted on the NOIs into the automated system, checking their entries against the NOIs. The system totals the agricultural acreage enrolled in BMPs, both quarterly and annually, by county and BMP program. This information can be found by accessing several automated reports in BMPTS. Two of the reports are configured to report on performance measures 3 and 5, and include the counties/programs relevant to those measures.

The reliability of the system is checked quarterly to ensure that a re-run of the report run for the previous quarter produces the same acreage total. Annual report figures are checked against the acreage totals of the four quarters that fall within the reporting year. The probability is very high that the same results would be achieved repeatedly by others using the same procedures.

**LRPP EXHIBIT IV: PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY**

**Department: Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services**

**Program: Office of the Commissioner and Division of Administration**

**Service: Agricultural Water Policy Coordination**

**Measure: Number of gallons of water potentially conserved annually by agricultural operations pursuant to site-specific recommendations provided by participating Mobile Irrigation Labs during the fiscal year (FDOACS approved measure # 6)**

**Action** (check one):

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

### **Glossary of Key Terms:**

Agricultural operations - any farm or nursery that uses an irrigation system to provide water to their crop or commodity.

Mobile Irrigation Lab (MIL) - a one- or two-person team, with expertise in analyzing irrigation systems and educating property owners that provides site-specific recommendations and assistance on improving irrigation water-use efficiencies in order to increase water conservation.

Gallons of water potentially conserved - an estimate of the amount of water that could be saved by implementing irrigation system modifications recommended through mobile irrigation laboratory evaluations.

### **Data Sources and Methodology:**

Gallons of water potentially conserved are derived by the MILs using a standard methodology contained in the *Mobile Irrigation Lab Handbook*, Natural Resources Conservation Service and Florida Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services, August 2007. The figures derived by each MIL are sent to the Office of Agricultural Water Policy's Professional Engineer III for review, evaluation and storage in the Office of Agricultural Water Policy's secured electronic I-drive, which is backed up on a daily basis.

### **Validity:**

This measure is an accurate indication of how much water could be saved by implementing MIL recommendations. It is based on written recommendations given pursuant to site-specific evaluations, and is calculated using a standard methodology. The process is approved by FDACS in advance and is reviewed and evaluated periodically.

The MILs provide their data in standard electronic and hard-copy formats. The formats used are developed by FDACS and its partner agencies, and are reviewed and evaluated on an on-going basis. The Professional Engineer III reviews, approves, and totals the report data provided by each MIL for each quarter, and then enters the data into the Office of Agricultural Water Policy secure electronic I-drive, which is backed up on a daily basis. A separate report is then generated by the Professional Engineer III, which provides an estimate of the total number of gallons of water potentially conserved

for the quarter. Other than totaling the figures reported by the MILs, there is no data manipulation required.

**Reliability:**

The MILs under contract with Florida Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services are required to send the data to the OAWP via regular mail and e-mail on a quarterly basis. Data from the MILs that are not under contract with FDACS is requested by FDACS on a quarterly basis, and provided by the MILs, if it is available. The data received from all MILs is in a standard report format and is considered final.

The Professional Engineer III reviews, approves, and totals the data as reported. All data received is entered into the Office of Agricultural Water Policy secure electronic I-drive, which is backed up on a daily basis.

The data is reviewed and approved by the Professional Engineer III quarterly to ensure it is correct. The probability is high that the same standardized procedures used to collect, compile, report, review, total, and file the data could be repeated by others to achieve the same results.

## LRPP EXHIBIT IV: PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY

**Department:** Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services  
**Program:** Office of the Commissioner and Division of Administration  
**Service:** Executive Direction and Support Services  
**Measure:** Administrative costs as a percent of total agency costs  
(DOACS approved measure # 7)

**Action** (check one):

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

### **Glossary:**

Exhibit B – A report generated from the State budget system (LAS/PBS) which reflects expenditures for the Department.

FLAIR – Florida Accounting Information Resource, which is the State’s accounting database

LAS/PBS – Legislative Appropriation System / Planning and Budgeting Subsystem, which is the State’s budgeting computer system

### **Data Sources and Methodology:**

The Division of Administration, Bureau of Finance and Accounting enters every financial transaction into the FLAIR System. At the end of each fiscal year, after a series of checks and balances, the Executive Office of the Governor uploads this information into LAS/PBS. Staff within the Department’s Office of Policy and Budget generates an “Exhibit B” from LAS/PBS, which reflects total actual expenditures, excluding fixed capital outlay, for the previous fiscal year, by budget entity.

Total actual expenditures (excluding fixed capital outlay) for the Executive Direction and Support Services (Administration) is then divided by the total actual expenditures (excluding fixed capital outlay) for the Department and multiplied by 100 to determine administrative costs, as a percent of total agency costs.

### **Validity:**

The measure is valid in that it provides an accurate percentage of Administrative Costs compared to Total Agency Costs. A series of checks and balances, both internal and external, are conducted to ensure that all transactions are entered into the FLAIR System.

This measure does not necessarily indicate how successful the agency is at keeping administrative costs down nor necessarily provide an accurate year-to-year comparison because a decrease in the agency's overall budget could cause a substantial increase in the percent of administrative costs compared to total agency costs, without an actual increase in administrative costs.

**Reliability:**

Historical files are maintained in LAS/PBS and an Exhibit B report can be generated repeatedly, producing the same expenditure data. The Exhibit B report generated from the LAS/PBS System at the end of the fiscal year is maintained in a hard copy file along with the report specifications in the current year LRPP submittal file titled "Exhibit II – Performance Measures and Standards - Administration". At least two people compute the percentage and attach the adding machine tapes to the report. There is a high probability that the same conclusion (percentage) would be reached by anyone repeating the calculation.

**LRPP EXHIBIT IV: PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY**

**Department:** Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services  
**Program:** Office of the Commissioner and Division of Administration  
**Service:** Executive Direction and Support Services  
**Measure:** Administrative positions as a percent of total agency positions  
(DOACS approved measure # 8)

**Action** (check one):

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

**Glossary:**

Exhibit B – A report generated from the State budget system (LAS/PBS) which reflects expenditures for the Department.

LAS/PBS – Legislative Appropriation System / Planning and Budgeting Subsystem, which is the State's budgeting computer system

People First – The State personnel system/database

### **Data Sources and Methodology:**

Each year, the Florida Legislature appropriates positions to the Department by budget entity. The Bureau of Personnel Management, within the Division of Administration, maintains information regarding Department positions in the People First database. This information is reconciled internally and by the Executive Office of the Governor. Staff within the Department's Office of Policy and Budget generates an "Exhibit B" from LAS/PBS, which reflects total positions for the previous fiscal year, by budget entity.

Total positions for the Executive Direction and Support Service is then divided by the total positions for the Department and multiplied by 100 to determine administrative positions, as a percent of total agency positions.

### **Validity:**

The measure is valid in that it provides an accurate percentage of Administrative Positions compared to Total Agency Positions. It does not necessarily indicate how successful the Agency is at keeping administrative positions down nor necessarily provide an accurate year-to-year comparison because a decrease in the number of positions within the agency as a whole could cause a substantial increase in the percent of administrative positions compared to total agency positions, without an actual increase.

### **Reliability:**

Historical files are maintained in LAS/PBS and an Exhibit B report can be generated repeatedly, producing the same figures. The Exhibit B report generated from the LAS/PBS System at the end of the fiscal year is maintained in a hard copy file along with the report specifications in the current year LRPP submittal file titled "Exhibit II – Performance Measures and Standards - Administration". At least two people compute the percentage and attach the adding machine tapes to the report. There is a high probability that the same conclusion (percentage) would be reached by anyone repeating the calculation.



## LRPP EXHIBIT IV: PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY

**Department:** Agriculture and Consumer Services  
**Program:** Office of the Commissioner and Division of Administration  
**Service:** Division of Licensing  
**Measure:** Percent of License Revocations or Suspensions Initiated within 20 Days after Receipt of Disqualifying Information (All License Types) (DOACS approved measure # 9)

**Action** (check one):

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

### **Data Sources and Methodology:**

The data used to generate the report for this measure is stored in an Oracle RDB database named *Licensing*. A computer program is executed to extract data from this database that contains when disqualifying information about a licensee was received, when fingerprint information was submitted and the criminal history results received and when the revocation or suspension of the license was initiated. The dates of these events are used to calculate the number of days between receipt of disqualifying information and initiation of the revocation or suspension of a license. To calculate this measure, the total number of licenses for which revocation or suspension was initiated within 20 days of disqualifying information is divided by the total number of licenses with disqualifying information. The name of the report created by this program is *event\_457\_due\_report.rpt*.

### **Validity:**

This measure is an adequate and valid means of evaluating the degree to which individuals who are ineligible for licensure are prevented from obtaining or retaining a license. Unless the Division is authorized to spend Trust Fund dollars to hire and retain sufficient FTE and OPS personnel to handle the incoming work, there is concern the Division cannot meet this measure.

### **Reliability:**

This measure is very reliable; however, it must be understood that the Division's backlog of work yet to be performed impacts this component. The report that generates the result of this measure is completely documented and stored in change management software. The report can be run at any time and the results will be consistent. The report generated at the end of the fiscal year, report specifications and detailed documentation about this performance measure are maintained in a notebook entitled *Performance Measures for FY* located in the office of the Bureau Chief of Support Services.

## LRPP EXHIBIT IV: PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY

**Department:** Agriculture and Consumer Services  
**Program:** Office of the Commissioner and Division of Administration  
**Service:** Division of Licensing  
**Measure:** Percent of Security, Investigative and Recovery Licenses Issued within 90 Days of Receipt of an Application (DOACS approved measure # 10)

**Action** (check one):

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

### **Data Sources and Methodology:**

The data used to generate the report for this measure is stored in an Oracle RDB database named *Licensing*. A computer program is executed to extract data from this database that contains when an application was received, when the applicant's fingerprint information was submitted to the Florida Department of Law Enforcement (FDLE)/Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) for the criminal history record check to be performed and when the corresponding results were received, and when the application disposition was determined. The dates of these events are used to calculate the number of days to issue a license. The total number of licenses issued within 90 days of the Division's receipt of the application is divided by the total number of licenses issued to determine the percent of licenses issued within 90 days. The name of the report created by this program is *URP200ALL\_RPT.RPT*.

### **Validity:**

Until FY 2007-08, this measure was affected by the division's ability to coordinate with the FDLE and the FBI to reduce the lag time in receiving the results from the criminal history records checks performed by those agencies. In mid-September 2007, the Division initiated a process whereby the applicant's fingerprint card is scanned and the fingerprints are submitted electronically to the FDLE/FBI for the criminal history record check to be performed. The results are received electronically, usually within 48 hours. Based on the support given by the Legislature and the Governor's office to the Division in Fiscal Year 2008-09 to hire additional OPS employees and retain its authorized FTE, the Division can meet this measure and it remains valid. It is critical, however, for the Division to have continued authorization to spend Trust Fund dollars to hire and retain sufficient FTE and OPS personnel to handle the incoming work.

### **Reliability:**

This measure is very reliable. The computer program that generates the result of this measure is completely documented and stored in change management software. The report can be run at any time and the results will be consistent. The report generated at the end of the fiscal year, report specifications, and detailed documentation about this performance measure are maintained in a notebook entitled *Performance Measures For FY* located in the office of the Bureau Chief of Support Services.

The event history database of the Licensing application records when the applicant's fingerprint information was submitted to the Florida Department of Law Enforcement (FDLE)/Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) for the criminal history record check to be performed and when the corresponding results were received, and when the application disposition was determined.

#### **LRPP EXHIBIT IV: PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY**

**Department:** Agriculture and Consumer Services  
**Program:** Office of the Commissioner and Division of Administration  
**Service:** Division of Licensing  
**Measure:** Percent/Number Concealed Weapon/Firearm Licenses Issued within 90-Day Statutory Timeframe without Fingerprint Results (DOACS approved measure # 11)

**Action** (check one):

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

#### **Data Sources and Methodology:**

The data used to generate reports for this measure is stored in an Oracle RDB database named *Licensing*. A computer program is executed to extract data from this database that counts the number of concealed weapon licenses issued within the 90-day timeframe and creates a report entitled *workload\_activity\_report.rpt*. A second program is executed that counts the total number of licenses issued within 90 days without fingerprint card-processing results and creates a report entitled *performance\_print\_file.rpt*. The result is then divided by the result from the *workload\_activity\_report.rpt* to determine the percent of licenses issued within the 90-day statutory timeframe without fingerprint card-processing results having yet been received.

#### **Validity:**

Until FY 2007-08, this measure was affected by the division's ability to coordinate with the FDLE and the FBI to reduce the lag time in receiving the results from the criminal history records checks performed by those agencies. In mid-September 2007, the Division initiated a process whereby the applicant's fingerprint card is scanned and the fingerprints are submitted electronically to the FDLE/FBI for the criminal history record check to be performed. The results are received electronically, usually within 48 hours. Based on the support given by the Legislature and the Governor's office to the Division in Fiscal Year 2008-09 to hire additional OPS employees and retain its authorized FTE, the Division can meet this measure and it remains valid. It is critical, however, for the Division to have continued authorization to spend Trust Fund dollars to hire and retain sufficient FTE and OPS personnel to handle the incoming work.

**Reliability:**

This measure is very reliable. The computer program that generates the result of this measure is completely documented and stored in change management software. The report can be run at any time and the results will be consistent. The report generated at the end of the fiscal year, report specifications, and detailed documentation about this performance measure are maintained in a notebook entitled *Performance Measures For FY* located in the office of the Bureau Chief of Support Services.

The event history database of the Licensing application records when the applicant's fingerprint information was submitted to the Florida Department of Law Enforcement (FDLE)/Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) for the criminal history record check to be performed and when the corresponding results were received, and when the application disposition was determined.

**LRPP EXHIBIT IV: PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY**

**Department:** Agriculture and Consumer Services  
**Program:** Office of the Commissioner and Division of Administration  
**Service:** Division of Licensing  
**Measure:** Number of Default Concealed Weapon/Firearm Licensees with Prior Criminal Histories  
(DOACS approved measure # 12)

**Action** (check one):

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

**Data Sources and Methodology:**

The data used to generate the report for this measure is stored in an Oracle RDB database named *Licensing*. A computer program is executed that reads the Licensing Database and determines which event history records indicate the licensee has prior criminal history and creates a report named *performance\_print\_file.rpt*.

**Validity:**

It should be noted, this performance measure counts all default concealed weapon/firearm licenses that are issued at 90 days without the results from the criminal history record check having been received from the Florida Department of Law Enforcement (FDLE)/Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI). All results with criminal history records received after the 90-day default date are included in the count, regardless of whether the information contained in the result is disqualifying (in which case, the license would have been issued regardless).

Until FY 2007-08, this measure was affected by the division's ability to coordinate with the FDLE and the FBI to reduce the lag time in receiving the results from the criminal history records checks performed by those agencies. In mid-September 2007, the Division initiated a process whereby the applicant's fingerprint card is scanned and the fingerprints are submitted electronically to the FDLE/FBI for the criminal history record

check to be performed. The results are received electronically, usually within 48 hours. The actual time the division spends processing the application is less than 90 days. Based on the support given by the Legislature and the Governor's office to the Division in Fiscal Year 2008-09 to hire additional OPS employees and retain its authorized FTE, the Division can meet this measure and it remains valid. It is critical, however, for the Division to have continued authorization to spend Trust Fund dollars to hire and retain sufficient FTE and OPS personnel to handle the incoming work.

**Reliability:**

This measure is very reliable. The report that generates the result of this measure is completely documented and stored in change management software. The report can be run at any time and the results will be consistent. The report generated at the end of the fiscal year, report specifications, and detailed documentation about this performance measure are maintained in a notebook entitled *Performance Measures For FY* located in the office of the Bureau Chief of Support Services.

The event history database of the Licensing application records when the applicant's fingerprint information was submitted to the Florida Department of Law Enforcement (FDLE)/Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) for the criminal history record check to be performed and when the corresponding results were received, and when the application disposition was determined.

**LRPP EXHIBIT IV: PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY**

**Department:** Agriculture and Consumer Services  
**Program:** Office of the Commissioner and Division of Administration  
**Service:** Division of Licensing  
**Measure:** Percent of Security, Investigative and Recovery Investigations Completed within 60 Days  
(DOACS approved measure # 13)

**Action** (check one):

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

**Data Sources and Methodology:**

The data used to generate the report for this measure is stored in an Oracle RDB database named *Licensing*. A computer program is executed to extract data from this database that contains investigations completed during the 60-day time frame and the date each investigation was opened and completed. These dates are used to calculate the number of days to complete an investigation. To calculate this measure, the total number of investigations completed in 60 days is divided by the total number of investigations completed. The name of the report created by this program is *case\_report\_file.rpt*.

**Validity:**

This measure is affected by the level of compliance within the industry (keeping the number of investigations manageable within current staffing levels) or the ability to gather necessary information from outside organizations. The measure could also be affected by changes in staffing levels within the Division's Bureau of Regulation and Enforcement.

**Reliability:**

This measure is very reliable. The report that generates the result of this measure is completely documented and stored in change management software. The report can be run at any time and the results will be consistent. The report generated at the end of the fiscal year, report specifications and detailed documentation about this performance measure are maintained in a notebook entitled *Performance Measures for FY* located in the office of the Bureau Chief of Support Services.

The Licensing Database maintains an investigation history with an alert function that notifies supervisors and the bureau chief when investigations have reached the 45-day mark. This enables the division management to take action to ensure that most investigations are completed within the division's goal of 60 days. The system also collects information regarding the investigations where extensions outside the 60-day time frame were requested and granted.

This measure could be affected by changes in staffing and resource availability.

**LRPP EXHIBIT IV: PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY**

**Department:** Agriculture and Consumer Services  
**Program:** Office of the Commissioner and Division of Administration  
**Service:** Division of Licensing  
**Measure:** Percent of Security, Investigative and Recovery Inspections Completed within 30 Days  
(DOACS approved measure # 14)

**Action** (check one):

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

**Data Sources and Methodology:**

The data used to generate the report for this measure is stored in an Oracle RDB database named *Licensing*. A computer program is executed to extract data from this database that contains inspections completed during the 30-day time frame and the date the inspection was opened and completed. These dates are used to calculate the number of days to complete an inspection. To calculate this measure, the total number of inspections completed in 30 days is divided by the total number of inspections completed. The name of the report created by this program is *case\_report\_file.rpt*.

**Validity:**

This measure is affected by the level of compliance within the industry (keeping the number of inspections manageable within current staffing levels) or the ability to gather necessary information from outside organizations. The measure could also be affected by changes in staffing levels within the Division's Bureau of Regulation and Enforcement.

**Reliability:**

This measure is very reliable. The report that generates the result of this measure is completely documented and stored in change management software. The report can be run at any time and the results will be consistent. The report generated at the end of the fiscal year, report specifications and detailed documentation about this performance measure are maintained in a notebook entitled *Performance Measures for FY* located in the office of the Bureau Chief of Support Services.

The Licensing Database maintains an inspection history that enables supervisors and the bureau chief to track the progress of inspections. This enables the division management to take action to ensure that most inspections are completed within the division's goal of 30 days.

This measure could be affected by changes in staffing and resource availability.

**LRPP EXHIBIT IV: PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY**

**Department:** Agriculture and Consumer Services  
**Program:** Office of the Commissioner and Division of Administration  
**Service:** Division of Licensing  
**Measure:** Average Cost of Concealed Weapon/Firearm Application Processed (DOACS approved measure # 15)

**Action** (check one):

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

**Data Sources and Methodology:**

Direct cost figures are determined by using the budget data for the organization responsible for the measured activity and adding a prorated amount to cover indirect costs (Director's Office and Support Services). These figures are stored in an Excel spreadsheet named *\Bureau of Support Services\Bureau Chief\Performance Measures\Average Cost Measures.xls* and are automatically refreshed monthly with current budget data. Additional data used to determine this measure is stored in an Oracle RDB database named *Licensing*. A computer program is executed and a report named *workload\_activity\_report.rpt* is created that counts the number of concealed weapon licenses issued within the time frame. This cost figure is divided by the number of concealed weapon licenses issued to give the average cost per concealed weapon/firearm application processed.

**Validity:**

This measure could be easily influenced by factors beyond the control of the Division. Changes in the number of applications received due to the crime rate, cutbacks in law enforcement capacity, and cuts in staffing due to reductions in appropriations could cause this measure to fluctuate and not provide a true representation of the Division's efficiency.

**Reliability:**

This measure is an adequate indicator of efficiency. Its primary purpose is to provide a benchmark against which changes in process, use of technology or privatization issues can be evaluated in terms of their associated implementation costs relative to savings potential. This measure provides a common unit of analysis and, is appropriate for use in performance measurement. This measure could be affected by changes in staffing and resource availability.

The report generated at the end of the fiscal year, report specifications and detailed documentation about this performance measure are maintained in a notebook entitled *Performance Measures for FY* located in the office of the Bureau Chief of Support Services.

**LRPP EXHIBIT IV: PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY**

**Department:** Agriculture and Consumer Services  
**Program:** Office of the Commissioner and Division of Administration  
**Service:** Division of Licensing  
**Measure:** Average Cost of Security, Investigative and Recovery Application Processed  
(DOACS approved measure # 16)

**Action** (check one):

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

**Data Sources and Methodology:**

Direct cost figures are determined by using the budget data for the organization responsible for the measured activity and adding a prorated amount to cover indirect costs (Director's Office and Support Services). These figures are stored in an Excel spreadsheet named *\Bureau of Support Services\ Bureau Chief\Performance Measures\Average Cost Measures.xls* and are automatically refreshed monthly from budget data. Additional data used to determine this measure is stored in an Oracle RDB database named *Licensing*. A computer program is executed and a report named *workload\_activity\_report.rpt* is created that counts the number of security, investigative and recovery licenses issued within the timeframe. This cost figure is divided by the number of security, investigative and recovery licenses issued to give the average cost per security, investigative and recovery application processed.



**Validity:**

This measure could be easily influenced by factors beyond the control of the Division. Changes in the number of applications received due to the crime rate, cutbacks in law enforcement capacity, and cuts in staffing due to reductions in appropriations could cause this measure to fluctuate and not provide a true representation of the Division's efficiency.

**Reliability:**

This measure is an adequate indicator of efficiency. Its primary purpose is to provide a benchmark against which changes in process, use of technology or privatization issues can be evaluated in terms of their associated implementation costs relative to savings potential. This measure provides a common unit of analysis and, is appropriate for use in performance measurement. This measure could be affected by changes in staffing and resource availability.

The report generated at the end of the fiscal year, report specifications and detailed documentation about this performance measure are maintained in a notebook entitled *Performance Measures for FY* located in the office of the Bureau Chief of Support Services.

**LRPP EXHIBIT IV: PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY**

**Department:** Agriculture and Consumer Services  
**Program:** Office of the Commissioner and Division of Administration  
**Service:** Division of Licensing  
**Measure:** Average Cost of Security, Investigative and Recovery Investigation (DOACS approved measure # 17)

**Action** (check one):

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

**Data Sources and Methodology:**

Direct cost figures are determined by using the budget data for the organization responsible for the measured activity and adding a prorated amount to cover indirect costs (Director's Office and Support Services). These figures are stored in an Excel spreadsheet named *\Bureau of Support Services\ Bureau Chief\Performance Measures\Average Cost Measures.xls* and are automatically refreshed monthly from budget data. Additional data used to determine this measure is stored in an Oracle RDB database named *Licensing*. A computer program is executed and a report named *caseload\_report.rpt* is created that counts the number of security, investigative and recovery investigations within the timeframe. This cost figure is divided by the number of security, investigative and recovery license investigations to give the average cost per security, investigative and recovery investigation.

**Validity:**

This measure could be easily influenced by factors beyond the control of the Division. Changes in the number of complaints received due to the crime rate, cutbacks in law enforcement capacity, and cuts in staffing due to reductions in appropriations could cause this measure to fluctuate and not provide a true representation of the Division's efficiency.

**Reliability:**

This measure is an adequate indicator of efficiency. Its primary purpose is to provide a benchmark against which changes in process, use of technology or privatization issues can be evaluated in terms of their associated implementation costs relative to savings potential. This measure provides a common unit of analysis and, is appropriate for use in performance measurement. This measure could be affected by changes in staffing and resource availability.

The report generated at the end of the fiscal year, report specifications and detailed documentation about this performance measure are maintained in a notebook entitled *Performance Measures for FY* located in the office of the Bureau Chief of Support Services.

**LRPP EXHIBIT IV: PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY**

**Department:** Agriculture and Consumer Services  
**Program:** Office of the Commissioner and Division of Administration  
**Service:** Division of Licensing  
**Measure:** Average Cost of Security, Investigative and Recovery Compliance Inspection  
(DOACS approved measure # 18)

**Action** (check one):

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

**Data Sources and Methodology:**

Direct cost figures are determined by using the budget data for the organization responsible for the measured activity and adding a prorated amount to cover indirect costs (Director's Office and Support Services). These figures are stored in an Excel spreadsheet named *\Bureau of Support Services\ Bureau Chief\Performance Measures\Average Cost Measures.xls* and are automatically refreshed monthly from budget data. Additional data used to determine this measure is stored in an Oracle RDB database named *Licensing*. A computer program is executed and a report named *caseload\_report.rpt* is created that counts the number of security, investigative and recovery inspections within the fiscal year timeframe. This cost figure is divided by the number of security, investigative and recovery license inspections to yield the average cost per security, investigative and recovery inspection.

**Validity:**

This measure could be influenced by factors beyond the control of the Division. Changes in the demand for new business inspections, and cuts in staffing due to reductions in appropriations could cause this measure to fluctuate and not provide a true representation of the Division's efficiency. It is important, however, to have a baseline formula to indicate efficiency. Radical changes in conditions can be identified and the cost formula can be revised to provide adequate comparative measures.

**Reliability:**

This measure is an adequate indicator of efficiency. Its primary purpose is to provide a benchmark against which changes in process, use of technology or privatization issues can be evaluated in terms of their associated implementation costs relative to savings potential. This measure provides a common unit of analysis and, is appropriate for use in performance measurement. This measure could be affected by changes in staffing and resource availability.

The report generated at the end of the fiscal year, report specifications and detailed documentation about this performance measure are maintained in a notebook entitled *Performance Measures for FY* located in the office of the Bureau Chief of Support Services.

**LRPP EXHIBIT IV: PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY**

**Department:** Agriculture and Consumer Services  
**Program:** Office of the Commissioner and Division of Administration  
**Service:** Division of Licensing  
**Measure:** Average Cost of Administrative Action (Revocation, Fine, Probation and Compliance Letter)  
(DOACS approved measure # 19)

**Action** (check one):

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

**Data Sources and Methodology:**

Direct cost figures are determined by using the budget data for the organization responsible for the measured activity and adding a prorated amount to cover indirect costs (Director's Office and Support Services). These figures are stored in an Excel spreadsheet named *\Bureau of Support Services\ Bureau Chief\Performance Measures\Average Cost Measures.xls* and are automatically refreshed monthly from budget data. A computer program is executed that reads the Licensing database and selects administrative action records and creates a report named *performance\_print\_file.rpt*. This cost figure is divided by the number of administrative actions to yield the average cost per administrative action.

**Validity:**

This measure could be influenced by factors beyond the control of the Division. Changes in the number of complaints received and investigations opened as well as an influx of private security, recovery, or investigative firms requiring inspection activities could cause fluctuations in the unit cost. Likewise, cuts in staffing due to reductions in appropriations could cause fluctuations. However, it is important to have a baseline formula to indicate efficiency. Radical changes in conditions can be identified and the cost formula can be revised to provide adequate comparative measurements.

**Reliability:**

This measure is an adequate indicator of efficiency. Its primary purpose is to provide a benchmark against which changes in process, use of technology or privatization issues can be evaluated in terms of their associated implementation costs relative to savings potential. This measure provides a common unit of analysis and, is appropriate for use in performance measurement. This measure could be affected by changes in staffing and resource availability.

The report generated at the end of the fiscal year, report specifications and detailed documentation about this performance measure are maintained in a notebook entitled *Performance Measures for FY* located in the office of the Bureau Chief of Support Services.

**LRPP EXHIBIT IV: PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY****Department: Agriculture and Consumer Services****Program: Office of the Commissioner and Division of Administration****Service: Division of Licensing****Measure: Number of Investigations Performed (Security, Investigative and Recovery Complaint and Agency Generated Investigations)  
(DOACS approved measure # 20)****Action** (check one):

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

**Data Sources and Methodology:**

The data used to generate this report is stored in an Oracle RDB database named *Licensing*. A computer program is executed to extract data from this database that contains the number of investigations performed. The name of the report created by this program is *case\_report\_file.rpt*.

**Validity:**

This measure is an adequate workload indicator. The number of investigations performed is fairly stable throughout the year. Validity of this measure is high because the process by which an investigation is logged and opened is captured within the Licensing database.

**Reliability:**

The number of investigations performed is a reliable indicator of workload and can also serve as a barometer to determine the level of compliance by licensees. This measure could be affected by changes in staffing and resource availability.

The report generated at the end of the fiscal year, report specifications and detailed documentation about this performance measure are maintained in a notebook entitled *Performance Measures for FY* located in the office of the Bureau Chief of Support Services.

**LRPP EXHIBIT IV: PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY**

**Department:** Agriculture and Consumer Services  
**Program:** Office of the Commissioner and Division of Administration  
**Service:** Division of Licensing  
**Measure:** Number of Compliance Inspections Performed (Security, Investigative and Recovery Licensees/New Agency Inspections and Random Inspections)  
(DOACS approved measure # 21)

**Action** (check one):

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

**Data Sources and Methodology:**

The data used to generate this report is stored in an Oracle RDB database named *Licensing*. A computer program is executed to extract data from this database that contains number of inspections performed. The name of the report created by this program is *case\_report\_file.rpt*.

**Validity:**

This measure is an adequate demand-indicator. The number of inspections is fairly stable throughout the year. Validity of this measure is high because the process by which an inspection is logged and opened is captured within the Licensing database.

**Reliability:**

Inspections are opened and the case number is generated by the Licensing database.

The number of inspections performed is an appropriate indicator of demand and can also serve as a barometer to determine the level of compliance by licensees. The Division performs randomly generated (by the computer) inspections to ensure that licensees are in compliance. This measure could be affected by changes in staffing and resource availability. See proposed text changes in measure above.

The report generated at the end of the fiscal year, report specifications and detailed documentation about this performance measure are maintained in a notebook entitled

*Performance Measures for FY* located in the office of the Bureau Chief of Support Services.

## LRPP EXHIBIT IV: PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY

**Department:** Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services

**Program:** Forest and Resource Protection

**Service:** Land Management

**Measure:** Percent of State Forest Timber Producing Acres Adequately Stocked and Growing  
(DOACS approved measure # 22)

**Action** (check one):

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

### **Glossary:**

State Forest Timber Producing Acres - Acres of State Forest that are capable of producing commercial quality/quantity timber. An acre = 43,560 square feet (4,840 square yards)

Adequately Stocked and Growing - A pine timber stand containing an average of at least 40 square feet per acre of merchantable basal area, or at least 300 pre-merchantable pine seedlings/saplings per acre, where volume growth of merchantable timber exceeds mortality.

Timber Stand – A contiguous management unit containing trees of similar enough size, age, species, etc., to make it distinct from adjacent areas.

Basal Area – The sum of the cross-sectional areas of all merchantable trees in a given timber stand, measured at 4.5 feet above ground level. This measurement is expressed in square feet per acre.

### **Data Sources and Methodology:**

The initial timber stocking data is derived from the Division's 1997 State Forest Inventory. Since 1997, many of the State Forests have been re-inventoried by additional field measurements and the resulting information has been updated as needed. Inventories of State Forest timber is an on-going process with the goal of completing an inventory of an entire State Forest's timber on at least 10-year cycles. In addition, reliable timber growth and yield modeling computer software is utilized for those parcels of timber that have not been recently inventoried.

To complete a timber inventory, stand and forest data at a specified number of random sample points is collected by foresters throughout each State Forest to obtain pine

timber stock data with a statistical accuracy confidence level of 95%, and with a limit of error of  $\pm 10\%$  on a forest-wide basis. This data is shared with the Forest Management Bureau and is stored on an Excel spreadsheet that is maintained and backed-up by a State Lands Natural Resource Analyst located within the Forest Management Bureau.

The percent of State Forest timber producing acres adequately stocked and growing is calculated by dividing the number of acres adequately stocked and growing by the number of timber producing acres. For example, on June 30, 2001, 54% of State Forest timber producing acres were adequately stocked and growing as 250,183 acres were adequately stocked and growing out of a total of 463,302 State Forest timber producing acres.

**Validity:**

This measure is a valid measure of performance of the Division of Forestry because it indicates the degree to which State Forests' lands are being managed to ensure that the timber stands located on them are capable of producing commercial quality/quantity lumber. However, the percent of State Forest timber producing acres adequately stocked and growing may increase or decrease each year due to factors such as new State Forest acquisitions and timber harvests as well as wildfire destruction of existing timber stands. A decrease in the percentage is not necessarily indicative of declining performance by the Division since many factors that could cause a decrease are not within the Division's control. Factors not within the Division's control that can decrease timber producing acres include wildfires, hurricanes, tornados, insect outbreaks, etc.

**Reliability:**

This forest resource sampling methodology consistently produces accurate forest data, and has been used by other forestry agencies and timber companies for decades to help determine timber productivity. The percent of State Forest timber producing acres adequately stocked and growing can be determined by most anyone using the data available to staff. This percentage figure is monitored on an on-going basis and is reported quarterly during the fiscal year by the Forest Management Bureau for the Department. Reporting the data quarterly helps assure the reliability of the data due to the frequency for which the data is compiled and reviewed prior to submission. The forest data used to derive the figure is stored on an Excel spreadsheet that is maintained and backed-up on a routine basis by Forest Management Bureau staff.

**LRPP EXHIBIT IV: PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY**

**Department:** Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services  
**Program:** Forest and Resource Protection  
**Service:** Land Management  
**Measure:** Number of acres of State Forests managed by the Department  
(DOACS approved measure # 23)



**Action** (check one):

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

**Glossary:**

Acre - 43,560 square feet (4,840 square yards)

**Data Sources and Methodology:**

The Bureau of Forest Management, State Land Section, maintains and updates a spreadsheet of State Forest parcels as parcels are acquired and assigned to the Division of Forestry for management. The spreadsheet is named "State Forest Acres" and located on the Division's "S" computer drive. It is maintained by the State Lands Supervisor in the Bureau. The parcel acreage is obtained from boundary survey information on State Forest land parcels and the total acreage figures are adjusted as each new parcel is obtained or forest acreage is decreased.

**Validity:**

This measure is a valid measure of performance because it indicates the current acreage of State Forests managed by the Division of Forestry. The acreage figures come directly from boundary survey information so they are as accurate as the survey. However, the measure does not provide any indication of how well the forests are managed.

**Reliability:**

The acreage figures for State Forests are extremely accurate since they are based upon boundary survey information certified by professional surveyors. Anyone would arrive at the same total acreage figure looking at the spreadsheet maintained by staff. This acreage figure is monitored on an on-going basis and is reported quarterly during the fiscal year by the Forest Management Bureau for the Department. Reporting the data quarterly helps assure the reliability of the data due to the frequency for which the data is compiled and reviewed prior to submission. The forest data is maintained on a routine basis by Forest Management Bureau staff.

**Department: Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services**

**Program: Forest and Resource Protection**

**Service: Land Management**

**Measure: Number of hours spent providing forest-related technical assists to non-industrial private landowners (DOACS approved measure # 24)**

**Action** (check one):

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

### **Glossary:**

Forest-Related Technical Assist - Includes telephone calls, personal visits, conversations or work performed related to the implementation of management recommendations by a resource professional and supported by documentation either in electronic or "hard copy" format. Such documentation may include, but is not limited to, the following types: Forest Management Plan, Needs Determination Form (AD-862), Tree Planting Prescription, Prescribed Burn Plan, correspondence, etc.

Non-Industrial Private Landowner - The owner of private forestland, excluding forest industry land or forest industry-leased land.

### **Data Sources and Methodology:**

The Florida Division of Forestry maintains a custom software application which resides on the Division's Internal Application Server and utilizes data on the Department's UNIX Computer hosting the Oracle database "DOF". This software named "TAARS" (Time Allocation and Accomplishment Reporting System) is available to Forestry staff.

The Division's Application Support Section and Database Administrator maintain the software application code, verify the authenticated forestry users with access permissions to database information, and follow Department Information Technology Change Management Rules for program updates and documentation of the procedures required to produce needed reports. The Division's Application Support Section is responsible for setting-up the pay period access and running queries and other summaries as requested.

Forestry staff report or track all hours worked during each pay period and allocate them to one of several activities. Personnel record their work activities, recipient of each activity, as well as hours spent performing the activity, directly into TAARS via a browser based Web Form data collection screen, choosing the correct activity and recipient codes for the measure's description. Any employee that has provided an

assist to a non-industrial private landowner (either minority or non-minority landowner) will record that activity and how much time they spent doing the activity.

To determine how many hours are spent providing technical assists to non-industrial private landowners during a specific time period, the TAARS database is queried by a Planner in the Division's Forest Resource Planning and Support Services Bureau to obtain the number of hours spent providing activities that are identified as forest-related technical assists during a specific time period. An Excel report is generated from the query to obtain the sum of the number of hours spent providing assists to non-industrial landowners (both minority and non-minority landowners). This report is located on the Division's computer "I" Drive.

### **Validity:**

The number of hours spent providing forest-related technical assists to non-industrial private landowners is a legitimate measure of work performed by the Division of Forestry. It reflects how much time is being spent throughout the fiscal year by service foresters and rangers giving verbal and written assistance promoting forestland stewardship, good forest management, and tree planting and care. Unfortunately, what is counted in TAARS is actual hours spent by staff providing assistance, but not how many persons are benefiting from this assistance. For example, providing a 1 hour presentation on tree planting and care to 100 people is counted as 1 hour of technical assistance rather than 100 hours of technical assistance. A decision was made in the past to count hours of assistance rather than number of assists because an assist can take anywhere from 10 minutes to numerous hours. However, a way to measure assistance provided at the same time to numerous individuals is being contemplated. Further, while this measure indicates number of hours spent providing technical assistance, it does not indicate how well the Division assists landowners.

TAARS is an automated web-based data recording application that serves as the bank where the data concerning the number of hours spent providing technical assists to non-industrial private landowners is recorded and stored. Data is validated by each employee, by that individual viewing the records they enter, prior to transmitting the data to the TAARS database. They may review or correct their inputted data throughout the fiscal year. Staff also has access to a web-based document which explains how to associate specific work tasks to the correct activity code and use the online system. Supervisors are also responsible for their employees providing accurate data and can view employee data on-line or can screen print for review, each employee's data, or their whole work unit's TAARS data.

### **Reliability:**

The data used to arrive at the number of hours spent providing forest-related technical assists to non-industrial private landowners is generated from a computerized data recording system. The reliability of the data from this system is dependent on the persons recording data into the system as well as the persons reviewing the data recorded into the system. In addition, reports created from this system must be generated correctly. To ensure the best possible reliability of the data, training sessions

reviewing activity definitions and discussing examples and problems have been conducted for employees. The data collection screen has predefined activities and recipients in drop-down box selection format to reduce input errors. Management emphasis is placed on timely entering of data. When persons reviewing recorded data find discrepancies, they are quickly addressed. All reports generated are also reviewed for accuracy by appropriate Division staff prior to release.

The Division's Application Support Section maintains Information Technology documentation on the procedures required to produce the reports. The procedures are stored in the Information Technology Production Control Support folder with the Information Technology Section of the Forest Resource Planning and Support Services Bureau.

The number of hours spent providing forest-related technical assists to non-industrial private landowners is monitored and reported quarterly during the fiscal year by the Forest Resource Planning and Support Services Bureau for the Department. Reporting the data quarterly helps assure the reliability of the data due to the frequency for which the data is compiled and reviewed prior to submission.

#### **LRPP EXHIBIT IV: PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY**

**Department: Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services**

**Program: Forest and Resource Protection**

**Service: Land Management**

**Measure: Number of hours spent providing forest-related technical assists to public land management agencies (DOACS approved measure # 25)**

**Action** (check one):

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

#### **Glossary:**

Forest-related Technical Assist - Includes telephone calls, correspondence, personal visits or work performed related to the management of the forest resource owned by the public land management agency.

Public Land Management Agencies – Includes Florida Department of Environmental Protection, Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission and Water Management Districts.

## **Data Sources and Methodology:**

The Florida Division of Forestry maintains a custom software application which resides on the Division's Internal Application Server and utilizes data on the Department's UNIX Computer hosting the Oracle database "DOF". This software named "TAARS" (Time Allocation and Accomplishment Reporting System) is available to Forestry staff.

The Division's Application Support Section and Database Administrator maintain the software application code, verify the authenticated forestry users with access permissions to database information, and follow Department Information Technology Change Management Rules for program updates and documentation of the procedures required to produce needed reports. The Division's Application Support Section is responsible for setting-up the pay period access and running queries and other summaries as requested.

Forestry staff report or track all hours worked during each pay period and allocate them to one of several activities. Personnel record their work activities, recipient of each activity, as well as hours spent performing the activity, directly into TAARS via a browser based Web Form data collection screen choosing the correct activity and recipient codes for the measure's description. Any employee that has provided an assist to a public land management agency will record that activity and how much time they spent doing the activity.

To determine how many hours are spent providing forest-related technical assists to public land management agencies, the TAARS database is queried by a Planner in the Division's Forest Resource Planning and Support Services Bureau to obtain the number of hours spent providing activities that are identified as forest-related technical assists to public land management agencies during a specific time period. An Excel report is generated from this query to obtain the sum of the number of hours spent providing activities/assists to public land management agencies. This report is located on the Division's computer "I" Drive.

## **Validity:**

The number of hours spent providing forest-related technical assists to public land management agencies is a legitimate measure of work performed by the Division of Forestry. It reflects how much time is being spent throughout the fiscal year fulfilling the requirements of Sections 253.036 and 589.04(3), Florida Statutes, which indicates the Division shall provide to other agencies having land management responsibilities, technical guidance and management plan development for managing the forest resources on State-owned lands. Beginning in Fiscal Year 2008-09, assistance to counties and municipalities will be included in the count for assistance to public land management agencies. Previously, TAARS did not include counties and municipalities as public land management agencies, rather as local governments, so hours providing assistance to these entities was not included in the count. Further, while this measure indicates number of hours spent providing assistance, it does not indicate how well the Division assists public land management agencies.

TAARS is an automated web-based data recording application that serves as the bank where the data concerning the number of hours spent providing technical assists to public land management agencies is recorded and stored. Data is validated by each employee, by that individual viewing the records they enter, prior to transmitting the data to the TAARS database. They may review or correct their inputted data throughout the fiscal year. Staff also has access to a web-based document which explains how to associate specific work tasks to the correct activity code and use the online system. Supervisors are also responsible for their employees providing accurate data and can view employee data on-line or can screen print for review, each employee's data, or their whole work unit's TAARS data.

**Reliability:**

The data used to arrive at the number of hours spent providing forest-related technical assists to public land management agencies is generated from a computerized data recording system. The reliability of the data from this system is dependent on the persons recording data into the system as well as the persons reviewing the data recorded into the system. In addition, reports created from this system must be generated correctly. To ensure the best possible reliability of the data, training sessions reviewing activity definitions and discussing examples and problems have been conducted for employees. The data collection screen has predefined activities and recipients in drop-down box selection format to reduce input errors. Management emphasis is place on timely entering of data. When persons reviewing recorded data find discrepancies, they are quickly addressed. All reports generated are also reviewed for accuracy by appropriate Division staff prior to release.

The Division's Application Support Section maintains Information Technology documentation on the procedures required to produce the reports. The procedures are stored in the Information Technology Production Control Support folder with the Information Technology Section of the Forest Resource Planning and Support Services Bureau.

This number of hours spent providing forest-related technical assists to public land management agencies is monitored and reported quarterly during the fiscal year by the Forest Resource Planning and Support Services Bureau for the Department. Reporting the data quarterly helps assure the reliability of the data due to the frequency for which the data is compiled and reviewed prior to submission.

**LRPP EXHIBIT IV: PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY**

**Department: Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services**

**Program: Forest and Resource Protection**  
**Service: Land Management**  
**Measure: Number of State Forest visitors served**  
**(DOACS approved measure # 26)**

**Action** (check one):

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

**Glossary:**

State Forest Visitors served - The number of people that visit State Forests from July 1 to June 30 of the next year.

**Data Sources and Methodology:**

The number of State Forest visitors served is a compilation of both actual and estimated counts. Actual counts comprise 23% of this figure while 77% is estimated, however, state forests have been provided direction to develop a plan to improve visitor served information. Actual counts are recorded by camping registrations, honor fee stations (camping and day use), trailwalker registrations, and State Forest Use Permits. Estimated counts are taken by forestry personnel on random patrol of trail heads and recreation areas on given days of the week that represent a typical operational period. This visitor count information is located on the State Forest Accomplishment Reports completed by staff of each State Forest, and are submitted monthly to the State Lands Planning Administrator within the Forest Management Bureau. The State Lands Planning Administrator maintains a spreadsheet used to compile this data.

A secondary estimate is the number of hunters utilizing a State Forest during a scheduled hunt. This estimate is provided to the Division of Forestry by the Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission and is utilized by the State Lands Planning Administrator to help estimate visitors to State Forests.

**Validity:**

This measure is a valid measure of performance for the Division of Forestry to the extent that it gauges the number of visitors to each State Forest. It does not indicate the level of satisfaction of visitors with the State Forests they visit.

The Division seeks to provide outdoor resources-based recreational opportunities for visitors. The character of State Forest recreation is a dispersed resource based activity. Located in primitive settings with large tracts of land, detailed accounting for state forest visitor use is challenging. The appropriateness of the measuring instrument can be

increased through the use of an accepted recreational standard where each automobile represents 3.5 users. This would improve the validity of the estimated counts.

Current operational plans include installation of traffic counters, and honor fee stations in non-staffed areas to generate a higher, more reliable, percentage of actual counts for State Forest visitors. The traffic counters are being installed at this time and this ongoing project will eventually establish them at all key areas of the State Forest System.

**Reliability:**

As actual visitor counts currently comprise 23% of the number of State Forest visitors reported, while 77% of the number is estimated, the reliability of the entire counting methodology is relatively low. The number reported can be determined by most anyone using the same information available to Forest Management Bureau staff. This number of visitors served figure is monitored on a frequent basis and is reported quarterly during the fiscal year by the Forest Management Bureau for the Department. Reporting the data quarterly helps assure the reliability of the data due to the frequency for which the data is compiled and reviewed prior to submission. The visitor data is maintained on a routine basis by Forest Management Bureau staff.



## LRPP EXHIBIT IV: PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY

**Department:** Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services  
**Program:** Forest and Resource Protection  
**Service:** Wildfire Prevention and Management  
**Measure:** Percent of acres of protected forest and wildlands not burned by wildfires  
(DOACS approved measure # 27)

**Action** (check one):

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

### **Glossary:**

Acres of protected forest and wildlands - All wildlands in Florida that are under Cooperative County Fire Protection Agreements with the Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services/Division of Forestry as required by Florida Statutes and all state-owned wildlands.

Wildfire - Any wildland fire of either natural or man-caused origin that is or has become uncontrolled (e.g., an escaped control burn becomes a wildfire when it is no longer controlled).

Fire Report - A report that the Division of Forestry firefighters complete to record the details of a wildfire. The report includes fire cause and origin, weather, fire location, fire resources used and time information.

Fire Management Information System - A computer database residing within the Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services' Information Technology Section that stores and processes information related to wildfires responded to by the Division of Forestry.

Unit Manager - A Division of Forestry District or Center Manager

### **Data Sources and Methodology:**

Wildfire data is collected on the Division's Fire Report and entered each month into the Fire Management Information System (FMIS), which resides in the Department's Information Technology Section. The Fire Report is completed by the Division of forestry firefighters to record the details of a wildfire. The report includes fire cause and origin, weather, fire location, fire resources used and time information. The report that

is used to generate the number of acres burned is the "Fire Activity" report, and the specifications for this report are stored in the FMIS documentation.

The Forest Protection Bureau determines the percent of acres of protected forest and wildlands not burned by subtracting the total number of acres burned by wildfires in a given fiscal year from the total number of acres under protection, and dividing the result by the total number of acres under protection. The total number of acres under protection (21,632,261 acres in Fiscal Year 2008-09 and 26,329,082 acres for Fiscal Year 2009-10) is annually derived from a Geographic Information System-Based model to determine the protected acres within a county.

**Validity:**

This measure is a valid measure of performance because it does provide the percentage of forest and wildlands protected by the Division of Forestry that does not burn by wildfire, as the measure states. The Division strives to effectively and efficiently prevent, detect, suppress and extinguish wildfires by accomplishing such tasks as pre-suppression fire line plowing, prescribed burning, wildfire management training, issuing burning authorizations, wildfire prevention, wildfire mitigation and Volunteer Fire assistance. However, weather conditions and other factors over which the Division has no control play a role in the percent of acres burned.

Each Unit Manager is responsible for ensuring the validity and accuracy of the Fire Report data that is entered into the Fire Management Information System (FMIS). Every report must be reviewed and approved before it becomes an official part of the record system in FMIS.

**Reliability:**

The FMIS system has been structured-based on the old mainframe fire reporting system and for this reason does not require interpretation; therefore, the same conclusion could be reached by anyone. Over the years, this fire reporting system has proven to be consistently accurate.

This percent of forest and wildlands that does not burn by wildfires is monitored and reported quarterly during the fiscal year by the Forest Protection Bureau for the Department. Reporting the data quarterly helps assure the reliability of the data due to the frequency for which the data is compiled and reviewed prior to submission.

**LRPP EXHIBIT IV: PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY**

**Department:** Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services  
**Program:** Forest and Resource Protection  
**Service:** Wildfire Prevention and Management  
**Measure:** Percent of threatened structures not burned by wildfires  
(DOACS approved measure # 28)

**Action** (check one):

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

**Glossary:**

Structures threatened by wildfire - Any structural improvement that lies in the path of an oncoming wildfire that, if not for appropriate suppression action being taken, could result in the loss of or damage to the structural improvement. Threatened does not necessarily mean the structure is damaged, either due to radiant heat or direct flame contact.

Wildfire - Any wildland fire of either natural or man-caused origin that is or has become uncontrolled (e.g., an escaped control burn becomes a wildfire when it is no longer controlled).

Incident Commander – The individual in charge at the incident (Wildfire)

Fire Management Information System - A computer database residing within the Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services' Information Technology Section that stores and processes information related to wildfires responded to by the Division of Forestry.

**Data Sources and Methodology:**

The Incident Commander overseeing the suppression operation of the wildfire will determine the number of structures threatened but not burned from wildfires. If a structure is destroyed it is counted as burned. If it is threatened it is not counted as burned. This number is given to the Duty Officer who records the number on the Division's Fire Management Information System's (FMIS) Incident Card. These forms become fire reports and are reviewed by the Incident Commander and their Supervisor (in most cases this is a forest ranger and their Forest Area Supervisor) This data is summarized by FMIS and can become part of other records, e.g. Incident Command System Form 209.

The Forest Protection Bureau determines the percent of structures threatened but not burned by dividing the number of structures threatened but not burned, by the sum of the number of structures burned and the number of structures threatened but not burned. These numbers are obtained from a "Summary Report" that is queried from FMIS by the Forest Protection Bureau, and the specifications for this report are stored in the FMIS documentation.

**Validity:**

This measure is a valid measure of performance because it indicates the extent to which the Division of Forestry is able to suppress wildfires before they burn structures. The Division strives to effectively and efficiently prevent, detect, suppress and extinguish wildfires by accomplishing such tasks as pre-suppression fire line plowing, prescribed burning, wildfire management training, issuing burning authorizations, wildfire prevention, wildfire mitigation and Volunteer Fire assistance. However, a lower percentage for this measure does not necessarily indicate a drop in performance. Other factors out of the Division's control play a role in the outcome of this measure. For example, a citizen conducts a non-authorized pile or yard debris burn in close proximity to a structure, which escapes and burns the structure before the Division of Forestry's arrival. Additionally time of year will influence the number, cause, and point of origin of wildfires. If Florida suffers drought conditions, Florida is more likely to have a higher number of fires. And because of the dry conditions, the fires may spread more quickly, be harder to control, and therefore, burn more structures.

**Reliability:**

At this time, the determination of whether or not a structure is threatened is the professional judgment of the Incident Commander based upon their experience with wildfire. Personnel are trained in fire behavior and tactics which helps them determine if a structure would be threatened if the Division did not take suppression action. Anyone running a query of FMIS for this data should return the same results.

The percent of threatened structures not burned is monitored and reported quarterly during the fiscal year by the Forest Protection Bureau for the Department. Reporting the data quarterly helps assure the reliability of the data due to the frequency for which the data is compiled and reviewed prior to submission.

**LRPP EXHIBIT IV: PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY**

**Department: Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services**

**Program: Forest and Resource Protection**

**Service: Wildfire Prevention and Management**

**Measure: Number/Percent of wildfires caused by humans  
(DOACS approved measure # 29)**

**Action** (check one):

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

**Glossary:**

Wildfire - Any wildland fire of either natural or man-caused origin that is or has become uncontrolled (e.g., an escaped control burn becomes a wildfire when it is no longer controlled).

Fire Management Information System (FMIS) - A computer database residing within the Department's Information Technology Section that stores and processes information related to wildfires responded to by the Division of Forestry.

Unit Manager - A Division of Forestry District or Center Manager

### **Data Sources and Methodology:**

Wildfire cause data is taken from the Division's Fire Report and entered directly into the Fire Management Information System (FMIS) which resides within the Department's Information Technology Section. The fire data information combines both human-caused and natural-caused wildfires that can be summarized on both a fiscal and calendar year basis. The report that is used to generate the number of wildfires caused by humans is the "Fires by Fire Causes" report of the Forest Protection Bureau, and the specifications for this report are stored in the FMIS documentation. The number of human-caused fires is the total number of fires minus the number of lightening fires. The percent of fires caused by humans is determined by the Forest Protection Bureau by dividing the number of human caused fires by the total number of fires, both human-caused and natural-caused.

### **Validity:**

Measuring the number/percent of wildfires caused by humans is a valid measure of the Division of Forestry's (as well as the U.S. Forest Service's) ability to prevent wildfires in Florida. The Division strives to effectively and efficiently prevent wildfires by accomplishing such tasks as issuing burning authorizations and wildfire prevention activities. Each Unit Manager is responsible for ensuring the validity and accuracy of the fire report data that is entered into the Fire Management Information System. However, both the number and percent of wildfires can increase due to conditions beyond our control and despite our best effort to prevent them.

### **Reliability:**

The Fire Management Information System (FMIS) was developed based on the previous fire reporting system. Over the years, the fire reporting system has proven to be consistently accurate. FMIS creates reports that do not require interpretation; therefore, data queried from the database system will return the same numbers for the same time period each time a report is generated.

This number/percent of wildfires caused by humans is monitored and reported quarterly during the fiscal year by the Forest Protection Bureau for the Department. Reporting the data quarterly helps assure the reliability of the data due to the frequency for which the data is compiled and reviewed prior to submission.

## LRPP EXHIBIT IV: PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY

**Department:** Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services  
**Program:** Forest and Resource Protection  
**Service:** Wildfire Prevention and Management  
**Measure:** Number of wildfires suppressed  
(DOACS approved measure # 30)

**Action** (check one):

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

### **Glossary:**

Wildfire - any wildland fire of either natural or man-caused origin that is or has become uncontrolled (e.g., an escaped control burn becomes a wildfire when it is no longer controlled).

Fire Report - A report that the Division of Forestry firefighters complete to record the details of a wildfire. The report includes fire cause and origin, weather, fire location, fire resources used and time information.

Fire Management Information System - A computer database residing within the Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services' Information Technology Section that stores and processes information related to wildfires responded to by the Division of Forestry.

Unit Manager - A Division of Forestry District or Center Manager

### **Data Sources and Methodology:**

The number of wildfires is collected from the Division's Fire Report and is entered each month into the Fire Management Information System database, which resides within the Department's Information Technology Section. The fire data can be summarized on both a fiscal and calendar year basis. The data recorded in the Division's Fire Management Information System includes those fires the Division detects and suppresses and some of the more significant fires that we know about that are suppressed by Structural Fire Departments. The report that is used to generate the number of wildfires suppressed is the "Fire Activity" report of the Forest Protection Bureau, and the specifications for this report are stored in the FMIS documentation. This Fire Activity report allows for staff to make queries by setting parameters such as where and when wildfires were suppressed.

**Validity:**

This measure is a valid measure of performance as it indicates the workload of the Division of Forestry in terms of wildfires suppressed as well as the more significant fires suppressed by fire departments. The Division strives to effectively and efficiently detect, suppress and extinguish wildfires by accomplishing such tasks as pre-suppression fire line plowing, prescribed burning, wildfire management training, issuing burning authorizations, wildfire prevention, wildfire mitigation and Volunteer Fire assistance. The Division is also attempting to keep statewide statistics on wildland fire activity, so it includes fire reports concerning more significant fires detected and suppressed by fire departments.

Each Unit Manager is responsible for ensuring the completeness and accuracy of their units' fire reports and the timely submission of the reports into the Fire Management Information System. This process ensures the best possible validity and accuracy of the fire report data. In addition, the Forest Protection Bureau has a Quality Assurance Coordinator that audits fire reports during field unit reviews to help ensure the validity and accuracy of the fire report information.

**Reliability:**

The Fire Management Information System creates reports that do not require interpretation; therefore, the same conclusions would be reached by anyone because data queried will return the same results for the same time period each time a report is generated. Over the years, the fire reporting system has proven to be consistently accurate.

This number of wildfires figure is monitored and reported quarterly during the fiscal year by the Forest Protection Bureau for the Department. Reporting the data quarterly helps assure the reliability of the data due to the frequency for which the data is compiled and reviewed prior to submission.

**LRPP EXHIBIT IV: PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY**

**Department: Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services**

**Program: Forest and Resource Protection**

**Service: Wildfire Prevention and Management**

**Measure: Number of acres authorized to be burned through prescribed burning  
(DOACS approved measure # 31)**

**Action (check one):**

- Requesting Revision to Approved Measure
- Change in Data Sources or Measurement Methodologies

- Requesting New Measure
- Backup for Performance Outcome and Output Measure

### **Glossary:**

Open Burning Authorization Program - a centralized computer database residing within the Department's Information Technology Section on the Fire Management Information System (FMIS), that stores and processes information related to the issuance of burning authorizations.

Fire Management Information System - A computer database residing within the Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services' Information Technology Section that stores and processes information related to wildfires responded to by the Division of Forestry.

### **Data Sources and Methodology:**

The Duty Officers within each Forestry District issue burn authorizations and put this information into the Fire Management Information System (FMIS) formatted to collect the name of the person requesting authorization, location, type of burn and number of acres. This data represents the sum of all prescribed burning acres from authorizations issued by the Division of Forestry. This system is used by the Forest Protection Bureau to determine the number of authorized prescribed fires in Florida by running summary reports of prescribed burns in all the Districts within the FMIS program. This data can be calculated on a fiscal or calendar year basis. Personnel that need this information can specify reporting parameters such as date and location to generate the number of acres authorized to be burned through prescribed burning via the "Open Burn Authorization Summary" of the FMIS reporting section, and the specifications for this report are stored in the FMIS documentation.

### **Validity:**

Measuring the number of acres authorized to be prescribed burned is a valid measurement of efforts being accomplished to minimize the impacts of wildfire as well as effectively manage those forest areas such as Long Leaf Pine Tree stands that are enhanced by burning. A ten-year plus history of utilizing this data collection system, and the FMIS program which was based on the mainframe program, has proven to be quite accurate in measuring the increase or decrease in number of acres authorized to be prescribed burned in Florida each year.

However, a lower number for this measure may be the result of a decreased need for prescribed burns during a specific time period and is therefore, not necessarily indicative of Division performance. For example, a recent wildfire that impacts a large area would result in that area not needing prescribed burning for some period of time. Another example of a justified decrease in the number of acres prescribed burned would be dry conditions, which could cause the Division of Forestry to deny requests for burn authorizations due to safety and wildfire concerns.



**Reliability:**

The FMIS Open Burning Authorization Program does not require interpretation; therefore, the same conclusions would be reached by anyone generating a report on the data. Data queried at various times for the same date ranges has returned the same numbers. Reports are self-explanatory.

The number of acres authorized to be prescribed burned is monitored and reported quarterly during the fiscal year by the Forest Protection Bureau for the Department. Reporting the data quarterly helps assure the reliability of the data due to the frequency for which the data is compiled and reviewed prior to submission.

**LRPP EXHIBIT IV: PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY**

**Department: Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services**  
**Program: Forest and Resource Protection**  
**Service: Wildfire Prevention and Management**  
**Measure: Number of acres of forestland protected from wildfires**  
**(DOACS approved measure # 32)**

**Action** (check one):

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

**Glossary:**

Forestland protected - All wildlands in Florida that are either under Cooperative County Fire Protection Agreements with the Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services/Division of Forestry as authorized by Florida Statutes 125.27, or State Parks under 590.02(1)(f) or other Federal, State and local governments lands for which fire protection is provided for by the Division of Forestry.

Cooperative County Fire Protection Agreements – Agreements between the Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services, Division of Forestry, and a Board of County Commissioners for the establishment and maintenance of countywide fire protection of all forest and wildlands within said county assessed at .07 per acre.

"Wildland" means any public or private managed or unmanaged forest, urban/interface, pasture or range land, recreation lands, or any other land at risk of wildfire.

**Data Sources and Methodology:**

The Division has recently completed and validated a Geographic Information System for providing data for this measure. The Protected Areas report generated from this system by the Forest Protection Bureau determines which areas of a Florida county will need assistance in protection from wildfires by the Division of Forestry. Areas in counties excluded from protection are those areas managed by federal, state, or local government, as well as impervious areas that would not normally be considered burnable and permanent water bodies.

The most current data from the following sources are used in the Geographic Information System used to identify the number of acres of forestland protected from wildfires:

State/Federal/Local lands = Florida State University Florida Natural Areas Inventory  
County Boundaries = Florida Department of Environmental Protection  
Hydrography = U. S. Geological Survey  
Impervious Areas = U.S. Geological Survey National Land Cover Database

This data is input into the Geographic Information System which clips all the data together that is to be excluded (federal land, state land, water bodies, urban areas) to each county boundary. What results after excluding all the various land areas and water bodies in Florida is the number of acres of forestland in Florida protected from wildfires. This number of protected acres figure can be updated annually as the number of acres will change as the data from the various sources is updated. The use of updated data in the new Geographic Information System has resulted in increasing the number of acres the Division reports as protected from 21,632,261 in Fiscal Year 2008-09 to 26,329,082 in Fiscal Year 2009-10.

**Validity:**

This measure is a valid measure of the amount of land in Florida that the Division of Forestry is charged with protecting from wildfire. The Division strives to effectively and efficiently prevent, detect, suppress and extinguish wildfires by accomplishing such tasks as pre-suppression fire line plowing, prescribed burning, wildfire management training, issuing burning authorizations, wildfire prevention, wildfire mitigation and Volunteer Fire assistance. The validity/accuracy of the figure the Division reports as “acres of forestland protected” is dependent upon the accuracy of those outside data sources from which the Division’s data is obtained.

**Reliability:**

The Division’s Geographic Information System (GIS) can be used by anyone familiar with GIS/Spatial imaging tools to reproduce the protected forestland acreage figures the Division reports. This is the most accurate and up-to-date methodology to determine this figure at this time.

The number of acres of forestland protected from wildfires is monitored and reported quarterly during the fiscal year by the Forest Protection Bureau for the Department.

Reporting the data quarterly helps assure the reliability of the data due to the frequency for which the data is compiled and reviewed prior to submission.

## **LRPP EXHIBIT IV: PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY**

**Department:** Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services

**Program:** Forest and Resource Protection

**Service:** Wildfire Prevention and Management

**Measure:** Number of person-hours spent responding to emergency incidents other than wildfires  
(DOACS approved measure # 33)

**Action** (check one):

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

### **Glossary:**

Person-hours - The number of employees times the number of work hours performed on non-fire emergencies.

Emergency incidents other than wildfires - Are such emergencies as hurricane, flood, tornado, insect or plant disease outbreak, storms, drought, etc.

### **Data Sources and Methodology:**

The Florida Division of Forestry maintains a custom software application which resides on the Division's Internal Application Server and utilizes data on the Department's UNIX Computer hosting the Oracle database "DOF". This software named "TAARS" (Time Allocation and Accomplishment Reporting System) is available to Forestry staff.

The Division's Application Support Section and Database Administrator maintain the software application code, verify the authenticated forestry users with access permissions to database information, and follow Department Information Technology Change Management Rules for program updates and documentation of the procedures required to produce needed reports. The Division's Application Support Section is responsible for setting-up the pay period access and running queries and other summaries as requested.

Forestry staff report or track all hours worked during each pay period and allocate them to one of several activities. Personnel record their work activities, recipient of each activity, as well as hours spent performing the activity, directly into TAARS via a browser based Web Form data collection screen choosing the correct activity and

recipient codes for the measure's description. Any employee that has spent time responding to emergency incidents other than wildfires should record that activity and indicate how much time they spent doing the activity.

To determine how many hours are spent responding to emergency incidents other than wildfires, the TAARS database is queried by a Planner in the Division's Forest Resource Planning and Support Services Bureau to obtain the number of hours reported by Division on non-fire emergencies during a specific time period. An Excel report is generated from this query to obtain the sum of the number of hours spent responding to emergency incidents other than wildfires. This report is located on the Division's computer "I" Drive.

### **Validity:**

This measure is valid in that we do count what the measure states we are counting, the number of person hours spent responding to emergency incidents other than wildfires. It reflects how much time is being spent throughout the fiscal year by staff on non-Forestry related activities. It does not specifically measure what work is performed or how well we perform it. An increase or decrease in this measure is not indicative of how well we perform our job because the number of hours spent responding to emergencies is dictated by such things as demand and management decision-making.

TAARS is an automated web-based data recording application that serves as the bank where the data concerning the number of person-hours spent responding to emergency incidents other than wildfires is recorded and stored. Data is validated by each employee, by that individual viewing the records they enter, prior to transmitting the data to the TAARS database. They may review or correct their inputted data throughout the fiscal year. Staff also has access to a web-based document which explains how to associate specific work tasks to the correct activity code and use the online system. Supervisors are also responsible for their employees providing accurate data and can view employee data on-line or can screen print for review, each employee's data, or their whole work unit's TAARS data.

### **Reliability:**

The reliability of the data from the TAARS system is dependent on the persons recording data into the system as well as the persons reviewing the data recorded into the system. To ensure the best possible reliability of the data, training sessions reviewing activity definitions and discussing examples and problems have been conducted for employees. The data collection screen has predefined activities and recipients in drop-down box selection format to reduce input errors. Management emphasis is placed on timely entering of data. When persons reviewing recorded data find discrepancies, they are quickly addressed. All reports generated are also reviewed for accuracy by appropriate Division staff prior to release.

The Division's Application Support Section maintains Information Technology documentation on the procedures required to produce the reports. The procedures are stored in the Information Technology Production Control Support folder with the

Information Technology Section of the Forest Resource Planning and Support Services Bureau.

This number of hours spent responding to emergency incidents other than wildfires is monitored and reported quarterly during the fiscal year by the Forest Resource Planning and Support Services Bureau for the Department. Reporting the data quarterly helps assure the reliability of the data due to the frequency for which the data is compiled and reviewed prior to submission.

## LRPP EXHIBIT IV: PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY

**Department:** Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services

**Program:** Food Safety and Quality

**Service:** Dairy Facilities Compliance and Enforcement

**Measure:** Percent of Florida Milk Regulatory Program Samples analyzed that meet standards  
(DOACS approved measure # 34)

**Action** (check one):

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

### **Glossary:**

Florida Milk Regulatory Program Samples Analyzed - Those items regulated by Chapters 502 and 503, Florida Statutes, of which samples are submitted to the State Dairy Laboratory for testing to insure requirements are being met.

Florida Milk Regulatory Samples which Meet Standards - Those milk, milk product, frozen dessert, cheese and dairy water samples analyzed and found to meet all standards set forth in Chapters 502 and 503, Florida Statutes, and Chapter 5D-1, Florida Administrative Code.

NOTE: Samples recorded in the General Laboratory category of the Biweekly Laboratory Activity Report are not included in determining this measure. These samples do not pass/fail standards. They are control samples required to maintain the Central Dairy Laboratory's federal certification. Temperature Control Samples are not included in determining this measure. They are samples used to determine if a batch of samples are acceptable for further testing. Failure is not counted against the dairy establishments where the sample was collected.

### **Data Sources and Methodology:**

The data source for this output is agency records of dairy laboratory activity, which are maintained as an agency custom desktop application.

Through Fiscal Year 2008-09, sample analysis records have been compiled on a biweekly basis into a spreadsheet located on the Division's I-drive, which is access-restricted to key management. Sample analysis records were manually entered into both the current system and Regulatory Information Management System (RIMS). Until reports for RIMS can be developed, the current system will remain the official reporting method.

Methodology is based on spreadsheet compilation of laboratory activity records to obtain the number of analyses of milk and milk products that are performed and the

number of milk and milk products analyzed. Instructions for using the spreadsheet can be found on the Division's H-drive, which is access-restricted to key management. Development of a server-based data management program has been 99% completed and is currently being used for issuing all permits, entry of all inspections and entry of all sample analysis results. Reports for RIMS have not been finalized yet and no documentation is available. This program will be used to compile dairy establishment inspections, sample collection and sample analysis totals.

### **Data Computations**

# of Florida Milk Regulatory Program Samples (Element A) Analyzed (derived from laboratory activity records)

# of Florida Milk Regulatory Program Samples which Meet Standards (Element B) (derived from laboratory activity records)

$$\% \text{ which meet standards} = \frac{\text{Element B} \times 100}{\text{Element A}}$$

### **Validity:**

This measure reflects actual program performance since it is taken directly from program records and represents milk and milk products consumed in Florida. The chemical, physical, bacteriological and organoleptical analyses performed as standards for products are appropriate food safety and quality requirements. Maturation of the program may require that different parameters be examined in the future. This measure is appropriate since it is an indicator of public exposure to milk and milk products that may be contaminated or adulterated.

### **Reliability:**

The laboratory activity reports are required to be completed biweekly and are reviewed by division office personnel. The number of milk and milk products sampled and the analyses performed on them are fully accounted for by the records of the Central Dairy Laboratory. During each quarter of the fiscal year, the spreadsheet is reviewed for accuracy by management personnel. After the final review, the spreadsheet is locked and password protected to prevent any unauthorized changes. All laboratory technicians and the biological scientist are required to be certified by the Food and Drug Administration's Laboratory Quality Assurance Team.

The spreadsheet used to produce the measure is documented and is highly reproducible.

## **LRPP EXHIBIT IV: PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY**

**Department: Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services**  
**Program: Food Safety and Quality**  
**Service: Dairy Facilities Compliance and Enforcement**  
**Measure: Percent of dairy establishments meeting food safety and sanitation requirements (DOACS approved measure # 35)**

**Action** (check one):

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

### **Glossary:**

Dairy Establishments - Grade A Plants, Farms, Single Service Plants, Cheese Plants and Frozen Dessert Plants regulated under authority of Chapters 502 or 503, Florida Statutes. For the purpose of this measure, a count of only those establishments receiving an inspection during the period is utilized.

Inspection of a Dairy Establishment - Visits by authorized agents of the department to dairy establishments, which result in an inspection report.

Failure to meet food safety and sanitation requirements - An inspection of a Grade A Plant, Farm, Frozen Dessert Plant or Cheese Plant with an inspection score of 84 or below in a specified quarter. An inspection of a Single Service Plant with an Unsatisfactory score in a specified quarter. If a dairy establishment fails in more than one quarter, that failure will be reported only one time in a fiscal year. Quarters are defined as follows: (07/01/XX – 09/30/XX, 10/01/XX – 12/31/XX, 01/01/XX – 03/31/XX, 04/01/XX – 06/30/XX).

Dairy Establishments which meet food safety and sanitation requirements - Any dairy establishment without a failure to meet food safety and sanitation standards during one or more inspections within a specified period.

### **Data Sources and Methodology:**

Data sources for this output are Agency records of inspections of dairy establishments as recorded in official records for the program area.

Through Fiscal Year 2008-09, inspection records have been continuously updated by manual input into the division's Regulatory Information Management System (RIMS).

Methodology for obtaining the measure is electronic searches of database records to obtain number of inspections and to identify establishments with a score of 84 or below or an Unsatisfactory score in a specified quarter. Instructions for requesting access to RIMS and performing the electronic searches can be found on the Division's H-drive, which is access-restricted to key management.



Development of a server-based data management program has been 99% completed and is currently being used to issue all permits, entry of all inspections and entry of all sample analysis results. Reports for RIMS have not been finalized yet and no documentation is available. This program will be used to compile dairy establishment inspections, sample collection and sample analysis totals.

<b>Data Computations</b>	
# of Dairy Establishments (Element D) which meet standards (derived from RIMS Database)	
# of Dairy Establishments (Element A) (from RIMS Database)	
% of Dairy Establishments which meet standards =	$\frac{\text{Element D} \times 100}{\text{Element A}}$

**Validity:**

Inspection of dairy establishments is one of the primary agency activities required by the Florida Milk and Milk Products Law (Chapter 502, F.S.), the Frozen Desserts Law (Chapter 503, F.S.) and the national standards of the Grade A Pasteurized Milk Ordinance published by the Food and Drug Administration’s Public Health Service. Regular sanitation inspections of dairy establishments reduce the public’s food safety risks so the number of inspections provides an indication of agency efforts to implement the program. Data for this measure are taken directly from program records and provides a valid measure of actual program performance.

The actual number of inspections performed each year will be influenced by other ongoing activities and unanticipated factors which divert inspectors’ time from establishment inspections, but such variation should not detract from validity of this output. Inspectors spend 40-45% of their work time actually performing inspections, 30-35% collecting samples, with training, complaint investigations and administrative activities accounting for other time. The number will vary with the level of these other activities, the number of products offered for sale and with the number of active establishments.

This measure is appropriate since it is an indicator of public exposure to milk and milk products that may be contaminated or adulterated.

**Reliability:**

The output data is highly reliable since it involves actual counts of the number of dairy establishment inspections. Records of all dairy establishment inspections are forwarded to Tallahassee headquarters for database entry. All records are regularly reviewed by program inspectors and program supervisors for accuracy and completeness.

The query to produce the measure is documented and is highly reproducible since the data set does not change.

## LRPP EXHIBIT IV: PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY

**Department:** Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services  
**Program:** Food Safety and Quality  
**Service:** Dairy Facilities Compliance and Enforcement  
**Measure:** Number of analyses conducted on Florida Milk Regulatory Program Samples  
(DOACS approved measure # 36)

**Action** (check one):

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

### **Glossary:**

Analyses - Laboratory procedures performed on Florida Milk Regulatory Program Samples as regulated by Chapters 502 and 503, Florida Statutes.

NOTE: Analyses which are reported in the General Laboratory category and analyses reported as Sample Temperature Controls are not included in determining this measure. These analyses are performed on control samples, which are required to maintain the Central Dairy Laboratory's federal certification.

### **Data Sources and Methodology:**

The data source for this output is agency records of dairy laboratory activity, which are maintained as an agency custom desktop application.

Through Fiscal Year 2008-09, sample analysis records have been compiled on a biweekly basis into a spreadsheet located on the Division's I-drive, which is access-restricted to key management. Sample analysis records were manually entered into both the current system and the Regulatory Information Management System (RIMS). Until reports for RIMS can be developed, the current system will remain the official reporting method.

Methodology is based on spreadsheet compilation of laboratory activity records to obtain the number of analyses of milk and milk products that are performed and the number of milk and milk products analyzed. Instructions for using the spreadsheet can be found on the Division's H-drive, which is access-restricted to key management.

Development of a server-based data management program has been 99% completed and is currently being used to issue all permits, entry of all inspections and entry of all sample analysis results. Reports for RIMS have not been finalized yet and no

documentation is available. This program will be used to compile dairy establishment inspections, sample collection and sample analysis totals.

<b>Data Computations</b>	
# of Analyses conducted on Florida Milk Regulatory Program Samples (derived from laboratory activity records)	

**Validity:**

This measure reflects actual program performance since it is taken directly from program records and represents milk and milk products consumed in Florida. It is a good indicator of the workload for the analyses activity. The chemical, physical, bacteriological and organoleptical analyses performed, as standards for products, are appropriate food safety and quality requirements. Maturation of the program may require that different parameters be examined in the future.

**Reliability:**

The laboratory activity reports are required to be completed biweekly and are reviewed by division office personnel. The number of Florida Milk Regulatory Program Samples collected and the analyses performed on them is fully accounted for by the records of the laboratories involved. During each quarter of the fiscal year, the spreadsheet is reviewed for accuracy by management personnel. After the final review, the spreadsheet is locked and password protected to prevent any unauthorized changes. All laboratory technicians and the biological scientist are required to be certified by the Food and Drug Administration's Laboratory Quality Assurance Team.

The spreadsheet used to produce the measure is documented and is highly reproducible.

**LRPP EXHIBIT IV: PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY**

**Department: Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services**  
**Program: Food Safety and Quality**  
**Service: Dairy Facilities Enforcement and Compliance**  
**Measure: Number of dairy establishment inspections**  
**(DOACS approved measure # 37)**

**Action** (check one):

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

**Glossary:**

Inspection of a Dairy Establishment - Comprehensive review of a Milk Processing Plant, Farm, Single Service Plant, Cheese Plant, Distributor, Wash Station, Depot, Receiving Station, Transfer Station or Frozen Dessert Plant, which results in an inspection report (includes weight checks of product).

NOTE: Inspections as defined for this output measure only include inspections wherein an inspection report or equipment check report results and does not include activities such as visits to establishments for complaint investigations or administrative purposes.

**Data Sources and Methodology:**

Data sources for this output are Agency records of inspections of dairy establishments as recorded in official records for the program area.

Through Fiscal Year 2008-09, inspection records have been continuously updated by manual input into the division's Regulatory Information Management System (RIMS).

Methodology for obtaining the measure is electronic searches of database records to obtain number of inspections. Instructions for requesting access to RIMS and performing the electronic searches can be found on the Division's H-drive, which is access-restricted to key management. Development of a server-based data management program has been 99% completed and is currently being used to issue all permits, entry of all inspections and entry of all sample analysis results. Reports for RIMS have not been finalized yet and no documentation is available. This program will be used to compile dairy establishment inspections, sample collection and sample analysis totals.

<b>Data Computations</b>
# of Inspections = Element A

**Validity:**

Inspections are one of the primary agency activities required by the Florida Milk and Milk Products Law (Chapter 502, F.S.), the Frozen Desserts Law (Chapter 503, F.S.) and the national standards of the Grade A Pasteurized Milk Ordinance published by the Food and Drug Administration's Public Health Service. Regular sanitation inspections of dairy establishments reduce the public's food safety risks so the number of inspections provides an indication of agency efforts to implement the program. Data for this measure is taken directly from program records and provides a valid measure of workload.

The actual number of inspections performed each year will be influenced by other ongoing activities and unanticipated factors which divert inspectors' time from establishment inspections, but such variation should not detract from validity of this

output. Inspectors spend 40-45% of their work time actually performing inspections, 30-35% collecting samples, with training, complaint investigations and administrative activities accounting for other time. The number will vary with the level of these other activities, the number of products offered for sale and the number of active establishments.

**Reliability:**

The output data is highly reliable since it involves actual counts of the number of dairy establishment inspections. Records of all dairy establishment inspections are forwarded to Tallahassee headquarters for database entry. All records are regularly reviewed by program inspectors and program supervisors for accuracy and completeness.

The query to produce the measure is documented and is highly reproducible since the data set does not change.

## LRPP EXHIBIT IV: PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY

**Department:** Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services

**Program:** Food Safety and Quality

**Service:** Food Safety Inspection and Enforcement

**Measure:** Percent of food establishments meeting food safety and sanitation requirements  
(DOACS approved measure # 38)

**Action** (check one):

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

### **Glossary:**

Food establishment - Those food establishments (including water vending machines, WVM) regulated under authority of Chapter 500, Florida Statutes. For the purpose of this measure, only those establishments receiving a rated sanitation inspection during the period are considered.

Inspection of food establishment - Visit by authorized agent of the department to a food establishment during which a review of conditions is made that results in an inspection rating.

Meet food safety and sanitation standards - An inspection of a food establishment or WVM with a sanitation inspection rating other than poor (i.e., good or fair).

Food establishments that meet food safety and sanitation standards - Those food establishments that meet food safety and sanitation standards during all inspections within the specified period.

### **Data Sources and Methodology:**

Data source is Division of Food Safety records which include all inspections of food establishments and water vending machines, maintained in an Oracle® database.

Inspection personnel enter inspection results into a portable computer as each inspection is completed, and electronically transfer all results to the Oracle® database on a daily basis. Food establishment and water vending machine information is maintained on a server platform.

Computation methodology is based on electronic query of database records to obtain (a) The total number of establishments inspected during the year, and (b) the number of food establishments that met sanitation requirements (during each inspection of that establishment conducted during the year).

### **Data Computations:**

A = number of food establishments with one or more inspections (during the period) -- derived from Food Safety Oracle® Database

B = number of food establishments which meet food safety and sanitation requirements (during each inspection within the period) -- derived from Food Safety Oracle® Database

$$\text{Percent of food establishments which meet standards} = \frac{\text{Value of B} \times 100}{\text{Value of A}}$$

### **Validity:**

This measure is directly related to program performance through a strong intuitive correlation of establishments that meet sanitation requirements during each inspection with decreased food safety risks to the public.

This measure is an appropriate measuring instrument since it directly reflects a primary outcome of the priority activity and is derived directly from program records. Changes in the total number of inspections conducted may influence the pass/fail percentage. In addition to inspection activities, the rate of passing/ failing establishments may be influenced when new food safety risks are recognized, when regulations or procedures are changed, or with improved training programs.

### **Reliability:**

All food establishment inspectors receive ongoing training to accomplish uniformity of inspection decisions. They also undergo standardization by an FDA-certified standardization officer upon employment and again every three (3) years. All inspection findings are subject to review by supervisors to further assure reliability of inspections. A program of systematic quality assurance inspections to evaluate the inspection conclusions is also in use. These checks and balances are designed to best assure consistency and reliability of inspection conclusions.

Inspection findings are entered in laptop computers at completion of each inspection and a printed report of findings is discussed with the food establishment manager. The finding is then electronically transmitted to the central database, with security, through Department of Management Service (DMS) or approved broadband upload. The query to produce the measure is documented, and is highly reproducible since the data set is maintained within a

secure database platform.

Queries for information which directly support/generate this GAA/LRPP measure are stored on a Division of Food Safety I-drive location which is access-restricted to key management and IT staff. These queries interact directly with mission-critical data support applications.

**Related Output Measures(s):**

“The number of inspections of food establishments and water vending machines” is a related output that influences this outcome.

**LRPP EXHIBIT IV: PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY**

**Department: Agriculture and Consumer Services**

**Program: Food Safety and Quality**

**Service: Food Safety Inspection and Enforcement**

**Measure: Percent of food products analyzed that meet standards  
(DOACS approved measure # 39)**

**Action** (check one):

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

**Glossary:**

Food product analyzed - Food product sample submitted to Food Laboratory, whereupon the analysis for one or several components, contaminants or other pertinent characteristics of the product is completed.

Analysis (plural analyses) - Determination of the presence, amount or absence of a component or contaminant of a food product, or the determination of a pertinent characteristic of a food product, by established chemical, microbiological, biochemical or physical methods of evaluation.

Food product analyzed which meets standards - Food product analyzed for which none of the analyses conducted result in finding of a violation of food safety or quality standards (i.e. a finding that would cause the product to be declared “adulterated”, “misbranded”, etc.)

NOTE: Samples analyzed specifically for purpose of providing data to the national Microbiological Data Program are congressionally mandated to be analyzed as “blind” samples and are not included in determining this measure. Also not included are samples analyzed which were submitted under circumstances which will not support a regulatory



response within the Division of Food Safety.

Prior to FY 2004-2005, Food Laboratory samples submitted from sources outside the Division were included in this measure. Generally, results of such samples are supplied to the submitting entity for evaluation and potential action. Beginning in FY 2004-2005 samples which are not subject to regulatory follow-up by the Division of Food Safety will be excluded. The approved GAA standard for FY 2004-2005 was adjusted, based on data from the prior three years, to assess the impact of this change in determination of a food product that meets standards.

### **Data Sources and Methodology:**

Data source is the Laboratory Information Management System (LIMS) of the Division of Food Safety/Food Laboratory. This system is maintained by the Laboratory and Division IT staff.

Information on all samples received by the laboratory is entered into the LIMS on receipt, and information on analytical findings is added as completed. Laboratory managers review records of completed samples to determine if applicable standards are met, or, in some cases, if further testing is needed. Standards include federal regulations adopted by reference. A thorough review of label information to ascertain compliance with the Food Labeling Act is a recorded analysis. The final determination of sample status is made and a report of findings is created when testing is complete.

Computation methodology is based on electronic query of database records to obtain the total number of samples for which analyses are completed during the year, along with counts of the number meeting and not meeting standards.

### **Data Computations:**

A = number of food products analyzed -- derived by query of LIMS data

B = number of food products analyzed that meet standards -- derived by query of LIMS data

$$\% \text{ of food products analyzed that meet standards} = \frac{\text{Value of B} \times 100}{\text{Value of A}}$$

### **Validity:**

This outcome tracks activity in identification through chemical, microbiological or other testing, of food products which are in violation of the Florida Food Safety Act, Chapter 500, F.S., or other pertinent laws or rules. Identification of products that do not meet standards assists in removing unsafe foods from the market and in identifying product types needing increased surveillance. This measure is derived directly from program records. This measure is based on a wide variety of products analyzed during the measurement period, but it does not necessarily represent the overall percentage of food products on the market

that may meet or not meet standards. The program does not purport to randomly select products for analysis, but focuses on food products more likely to have associated risks. Targeted sampling better contributes to the objective of decreasing the number of food products that are adulterated or otherwise unsafe.

Samples tested which are based on contract requirements, or otherwise produce results which are not subject to regulatory action by the Division of Food Safety are not included in this measure.

This measure is an appropriate measuring instrument since it is an indicator of public exposure to foods that present health risks through contamination, adulteration, or mislabeling. Products analyzed originate from food establishments throughout the state. However, since different products may be analyzed each year, a change from one year to the next does not necessarily indicate a trend.

**Reliability:**

The data is highly reliable for this outcome since documented records of each food product analyzed are maintained electronically in the Food Laboratory LIMS. Finding for each sample are reviewed by the analyst, and then independently validated by the supervisor, quality assurance officer, and laboratory manager.

The query to produce the measure is documented, and is highly reproducible since the data set does not change.

Queries for information which directly support/generate this GAA/LRPP measure are stored on a Division of Food Safety I-drive location, which is access-restricted to key management and IT staff. These queries interact directly with mission-critical data support applications.

**Related Output Measures(s):**

The number of food analyses is a directly related output measure, since (1) food analyses are performed on the same population of samples from which this measure is derived, and (2) performing fewer or greater number of analyses on a given sample may increase or decrease the possibility of a finding that the sample meets standards.

**LRPP EXHIBIT IV: PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY**

**Department: Agriculture and Consumer Services**

**Program: Food Safety and Quality**

**Service: Food Safety Inspection and Enforcement**

**Measure: Percent of produce or other food samples analyzed that meet chemical residue standards (DOACS approved measure # 40)**

**Action** (check one):

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

**Glossary:**

Product analyzed for chemical residues or pesticide data - Produce or other food samples submitted to Chemical Residue Laboratory, whereupon analyses are completed to determine the amount or absence of one or more pesticides or other chemical compounds of concern.

Chemical residue analysis (plural analyses) - An official determination of the presence, amount or absence of a specific pesticide or other chemical component in produce or other food products, by use of valid analytical methodology.

Produce or other food samples analyzed that meet chemical residue standards - Samples analyzed for which each determination of a pesticide or other chemical residue results in a finding within applicable regulatory levels.

NOTE: Samples analyzed specifically for purpose of providing data to national Pesticide Data Program and multiple samples from the same lots are not included in determining this measure.

**Data Sources and Methodology:**

Data source is a dedicated Access® database application, designed and maintained by the Chemical Residue Laboratory and Division IT staff.

Each sample submitted for analysis undergoes a series of analytical processes to determine the presence, amount or absence of designated pesticides or other chemical compounds. As the analytical processes are completed, results are entered or uploaded into the database. Laboratory managers review records of analyses to ascertain that each analysis result meets applicable quality assurance standards. Staff also determines if each result meets applicable pesticide or other chemical residue standards, as adopted in the Florida Administrative Code (FAC). Samples are classed as not meeting standards if a finding for any pesticide or other chemical exceeds applicable standards for the food. A standard may be the tolerance established by State or Federal rule, or the presence of any amount of an unapproved chemical in a food.

Computation methodology is based on standardized queries of database records to determine number of products analyzed and number that meet applicable standards.

**Data Computations:**

A = number of products analyzed for pesticide or chemical residues – determined by database query

B = number of produce or other food products analyzed that meet standards – determined by database query.

$$\% \text{ of samples analyzed that meet residue standards} = \frac{\text{Value of B} \times 100}{\text{Value of A}}$$

**Validity:**

The number of samples that meet standards is a valid measure of the outcome of activities by the Chemical Residue Laboratory. This performance measure tracks the accomplishments of this activity in assuring that produce and other foods meet food safety and pesticide residue standards. Remaining portions of products that do not meet standards are removed from sale, and prior findings direct future surveillance efforts. The regulatory surveillance component of the activity does not attempt to randomly select products for analysis, but focuses where possible on produce and other food product more likely to have chemical residues of concern. Such targeted sampling better contributes to the objective of reducing potential health effects from exposure to pesticide or other chemical residues in foods.

This measure is an appropriate measuring instrument since it is an indicator of progress toward reducing public exposure to health risks from pesticide residue levels. Products included in this measure originate from farms, packinghouses, import or other food warehouses, or retail markets throughout the state. Laboratory samples analyzed as part of the statistically based national Pesticide Data Program are not included in this measure.

**Reliability:**

The data is highly reliable for this output since official records for each chemical residue sample are maintained in the Chemical Residue Laboratory electronic database. Results of each analysis are reviewed by the analyst, and then independently approved by the supervisor, the quality assurance officer and the laboratory manager.

The query to produce the measure is documented, and is highly reproducible since the result is derived from an entire data set of chemical residue and pesticide data analyses within the time period of interest.

Queries for information which directly support/generate this GAA/LRPP measure are stored on the Chemical Residue Server, TLHRES002, in a subdirectory which is restricted to key

management and IT staff. These queries interact directly with this mission critical support application.

**Related Output Measures(s):**

The number of chemical residue analyses conducted is a related output measure, since chemical residue analyses are performed on the same population of samples from which this measure is derived, and number of analyses conducted on a given sample may increase or decrease the possibility of a finding that the sample meets standards.

**LRPP EXHIBIT IV: PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY**

**Department: Agriculture and Consumer Services**

**Program: Food Safety and Quality**

**Service: Food Safety Inspection and Enforcement**

**Measure: Number of inspections of food establishments and water vending machines  
(DOACS approved measure # 41)**

**Action** (check one):

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

**Glossary:**

Inspection of food establishment – Visit of an authorized agent of the Department to a food establishment during which a review of conditions is made that results in an inspection rating.

Inspection of water vending machine - Comprehensive review of sanitation of a water vending machine, which results in a written report stating an inspection rating.

Hazard Analysis Critical Control Point (HACCP) records inspection - Comprehensive review of certain food establishments to determine compliance with HACCP requirements, as documented by completing specific fields of an inspection report form.

Note: Inspections as defined for this output measure does not include activities such as visits to establishments for complaint investigations, administrative purposes, sample collection, follow-up on actions such as placement or removal of stop sale or stop use orders.

## **Data Sources and Methodology:**

Data sources are Division of Food Safety records of inspections of food establishments, water vending machines and HACCP records, maintained in an Oracle® database.

Food Inspection personnel electronically transfer inspection results to a central database on a daily basis. Food establishment, water vending machine and HACCP review information is maintained on a server platform.

Computation methodology is based on electronic query of database records to obtain

- (a) total number of food establishment inspections,
- (b) total number of water vending machine inspections, and
- (c) total number of inspections to determine HACCP compliance.

## **Data Computations:**

Derive number of each type of inspection from Food Safety Oracle® Database:

- A = number of food establishment sanitation inspections,
- B = number of water vending machine sanitation inspections,
- C = number of HACCP records inspections.

$$\text{Number of inspections} = A + B + C$$

## **Validity:**

Inspections of food establishments, water vending machines, and HACCP records are a primary agency activity in carrying out the Florida Food Safety Act (Chapter 500, F.S.).

This measure is an appropriate measuring instrument since the number of sanitation inspections of food establishments provides an indication of agency efforts to reduce the public's food safety risks. Data for this measure is taken directly from program records and provides a valid measure of actual program performance. The actual number of inspections performed each year will be influenced by other activities that may divert inspectors' time from establishment inspections, but such variation should not detract from validity of this output. Inspectors spend approximately 50-60% of their work time doing on-site inspections, with other projects and activities such as training, complaint investigations, travel, sample collections and administrative activities accounting for other time. The output can vary with the level of these other activities and with the number of active establishments.

## **Reliability:**

The output data is highly reliable since it involves counts of the number of official food establishment; water vending machine and HACCP review inspection records that have been electronically transferred to Food Safety Oracle® database. Only inspections that result in assignment of a sanitation rating or document HACCP record review are included in this measure. Inspection activities are reviewed by program supervisors.

Inspection findings are entered in laptop computers at completion of each inspection and a report is printed and discussed with the food establishment manager. The finding is electronically transmitted with security through DMS or broadband upload. The query to produce the measure is documented, and is highly reproducible since the data set does not change.

Queries for information which directly support/generate this GAA/PBB measure are stored on a Division of Food Safety I-drive location which is access-restricted to key management and IT staff. These queries interact directly with mission-critical data support applications.

**Related Outcome Measures(s):**

The percent of food establishments meeting food safety and sanitation requirements is an outcome measure that is related to this output.

**LRPP EXHIBIT IV: PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY**

**Department: Agriculture and Consumer Services**

**Program: Food Safety and Quality**

**Service: Food Safety Inspection and Enforcement**

**Measure: Number of food analyses conducted  
(DOACS approved measure # 42)**

**Action (check one):**

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

**Glossary:**

Food product analyzed - Food product samples submitted to Food Laboratory, where the analysis for one or several components, contaminants or other pertinent properties or characteristics of the product is completed. (For purposes of this measure all samples analyzed by the Food Laboratory are included.)

Analysis (plural analyses) - Determination of the presence, amount or absence of a

component or contaminant of a food product, or the determination of a pertinent characteristic of a food product, by established chemical, microbiological, biochemical, molecular, or physical methods of evaluation.

### **Data Sources and Methodology:**

Data source is the Laboratory Information Management System (LIMS) of the Division of Food Safety/Food Laboratory. Products analyzed include food samples submitted for regulatory food safety testing; those collected to obtain data for the national Microbiological Data Program (MDP), managed by the USDA; samples tested to assess risks or other properties, and a small number of samples analyzed to assist other program areas.

Information on number of analyses conducted during the process of sample evaluation in the laboratory is entered into the LIMS as results are obtained. Laboratory managers review records of analyses to determine if each result meets applicable quality assurance standards. The number of analyses completed per sample is variable.

Computation methodology is based on a standard electronic query of database records to obtain the total number of unique analyses completed during the year.

### **Data Computations:**

A = number of analyses is determined by a LIMS query to count total analyses conducted on samples completed within specified period, and includes regulatory samples, samples collected under MDP statistical protocols, samples undergoing risk assessments, and samples for which the analysis is reported to another laboratory/agency for possible action.

Number of food analyses conducted = A

### **Validity:**

The number of analyses conducted is a valid measure of the output of the Food Laboratory. This output reflects the number of different components, contaminants or other property of interest for which analyses are conducted and a value obtained, recorded and reported on a laboratory analysis report. The analyses may be conducted by chemical, microbiological, instrumental, physical or other analytical procedures. An official label review is also an analysis. Each analysis reflects a food safety or quality parameter for which a standard has been established. This measure will be inclusive of a large number of different types of analyses performed during the year on a wide variety of products. However, every component of each sample is not tested. Targeted analyses better contribute to the objective of decreasing the number of food products that are adulterated or otherwise



unsafe.

This measure is an appropriate measuring instrument since it is an indicator of laboratory output toward identifying food safety violations resulting from contamination, adulteration, or mislabeling. Most of the products analyzed are submitted by the Bureau of Food and Meat Inspection and originate from food establishments throughout the state. Other possible sources of samples include, by contract with the FDA, under cooperative agreement with the USDA, and from within the agency or from other agencies to provide information they request. Since products tested and food safety priorities vary from one year to the next, some annual variation in this measure is to be expected.

**Reliability:**

The data is highly reliable for this output since documented records of all analyses are maintained by the Food Laboratory's LIMS. Results of each analysis are reviewed by the analyst, and then independently validated by the supervisor and laboratory managers.

The query to produce the measure is documented, and is highly reproducible since the result is derived from the entire data set of food analyses.

**Related Outcome Measures(s):**

The percent of food products analyzed that meet standards is a related outcome measure, since (1) food analyses are performed on the same population of samples from which this measure is derived, and (2) performing fewer or greater number of analyses on a given sample may increase or decrease the possibility of a finding that the sample meets standards.

Queries for information which directly support/generate this GAA/LRPP measure are stored on a Division of Food Safety I-drive location, which is access-restricted to key management and IT staff. These queries interact directly with mission-critical data support applications.

**LRPP EXHIBIT IV: PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY**

**Department: Agriculture and Consumer Services**

**Program: Food Safety and Quality**

**Service: Food Safety Inspection and Enforcement**

**Measure: Number of chemical residue analyses conducted  
(DOACS approved measure # 43)**

**Action (check one):**

- Requesting Revision to Approved Measure
- Change in Data Sources or Measurement Methodologies
- Requesting New Measure

☒ Backup for Performance Outcome and Output Measure

### **Glossary:**

Product analyzed for chemical residues or pesticide data - Produce or other food sample submitted to Chemical Residue Laboratory, whereupon analyses are completed to determine the amount or absence of one or more pesticides or other chemical compounds of concern.

Chemical residue analysis (plural analyses) - An official determination of the presence, amount or absence of a specific pesticide or other chemical component in produce or other food products, by use of valid analytical methodology.

### **Data Sources and Methodology:**

Data source is a dedicated Access® database application, designed and maintained by the Chemical Residue Laboratory staff. This application includes all regulatory samples, samples for the Pesticide Data Program (PDP), and samples which may be analyzed for other reasons.

Each sample submitted for analysis undergoes a series of analytical processes to determine the presence, amount or absence of designated pesticides or other chemical compounds. As the analytical processes are completed, results for each analysis are entered or uploaded into the database or spreadsheet report. Laboratory managers review records of analyses to ascertain that each analysis result meets applicable quality assurance standards. The number of analyses conducted on each sample is determined by circumstances under investigation, and may vary from 1 to over 100.

Computation methodology is based on a standard electronic query of database records to obtain the total number of unique analyses completed during the year (component A) on all samples analyzed for the regulatory pesticide and antibiotic residue programs.

### **Data Computations:**

A = number of analyses for chemical residues, as determined by a database query to count total analyses conducted on all samples completed within a specified period. Samples include regulatory/consumer-protection samples, samples completed under terms of Federal contracts, and other non-regulatory or risk-assessment samples.

Number of chemical residue analyses conducted = A

### **Validity:**

The number of analyses conducted is a valid measure of the output of the Chemical Residue Laboratory. This output reflects the overall number of different pesticides or other chemicals for which analyses with appropriate quality assurance controls are conducted. The amount or other indication (such as none detected, below quantitation limit, etc.) is recorded for each chemical analyzed, and reported on a laboratory analysis report. The analyses may be conducted by multiple instrumental or other analytical procedures. This measure includes a large number of different validated chemical compounds for which analyses are performed on a wide variety of products.

This measure is an appropriate measuring instrument since it indicates laboratory output toward identifying chemical residue violations and other significant pesticide-related data. Products analyzed originate from farms, packinghouses and food warehouses or markets throughout the state. Some products analyzed are part of the statistically based national Pesticide Data Program, and may have originated from other participating states of this program.

**Reliability:**

The data is highly reliable since a database of records of each chemical residue analysis is maintained electronically in the Chemical Residue Laboratory. Results of each analysis are reviewed by the analyst, and then independently approved by the supervisor, the quality assurance officer and the laboratory manager before the results are validated.

The query to produce the measure is documented, and is highly reproducible since the result is derived from an entire data set of chemical residue and pesticide data analyses, including results reported for the PDP, within the time period of interest.

Note: A database change to permit storage of PDP sample information in a manner similar to regulatory samples was implemented during FY 2004-05. This eliminated the need for a separate query for PDP samples.

Queries for information which directly support/generate this GAA/LRPP measure are stored on the Chemical Residue Server, TLHRES002 in a subdirectory which is restricted to key management and IT staff. These queries interact directly with this mission critical support application.

**Related Outcome Measures(s):**

The percent of produce or other food products analyzed that meet chemical residue standards” is a directly related outcome measure, since those analyses are performed on a population of samples included in the samples from which this measure is derived, and number of analyses on a given sample may increase or decrease the possibility of a finding that the sample meets standards.

## LRPP EXHIBIT IV: PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY

**Department: Agriculture and Consumer Services**

**Program: Consumer Protection**

**Service: Agricultural Environmental Services**

**Measure: Percent of feed, seed, and fertilizer inspected products in compliance with performance/quality standards (DOACS approved measure # 44)**

**Action** (check one):

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

### **Data Sources and Methodology:**

Inspection case files are primary data collected and evaluated by program staff. These files include descriptive information about fertilizer, seed and pesticide and residue products inspected in the marketplace. From these data, it can be determined whether performance/quality standards are being met.

Data is entered into a database from inspection reports into the databases Fertilizer Enforcement Activity (FEA) data base and the Laboratory Information Management System (LIMS). The reports generated are the Feed, Seed and Fertilizer Quarterly/Annual activity reports.

The number of feed, seed and fertilizer inspected products in compliance is divided by the total number of feed, seed and fertilizer inspected products and then multiplied by 100.

### **Validity:**

This measure is valid in that we are counting what the measure says we are counting. The field inspection process is standardized and the data collected relate directly to the measure. Both internal and external audits have been performed and, as a result, process improvements are continually evaluated and, if appropriate, implemented.

The measure is indicative of our performance because our quality assurance processes ensure product compliance.

**Reliability:**

Standardized data are collected and reported. These data are compared to the feed, seed and fertilizer product label guarantee to assess compliance with State law / rules. Some data interpretation is required. However, reliability is maximized through extensive staff training and internal review processes, making it probable that another trained individual would reach the same conclusion as to whether the product is in compliance.

Our reports/calculations are database generated. It has come to our attention in generating our annual report that there are discrepancies in numbers generated from previous quarterly reports in the Feed and Seed databases. Therefore, the probability of a reproducible conclusion is not 100%. Administration of these databases is not our responsibility and the accountability for the reproducibility of these reports is delegated to the Division's Information Technology section. The hard copy of these reports is saved in our "Budget" file located in the front office under "Activity Reports".

**LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability**

**Department: Agriculture and Consumer Services**

**Program: Consumer Services**

**Service: Agricultural Environmental Services**

**Measure: Percent of pesticide ingredients evaluated and/or managed that are in compliance with regulations (DOACS approved measure # 45)**

**Action (check one):**

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

**Glossary:**

Pesticide - Any substance or mixture or substances intended for preventing, destroying, repelling or mitigating any insects, rodents, nematodes, fungi, weeds or other forms of plant or animal life or viruses, except viruses, bacteria or fungi on or in living man or other animals which the Department by rule declares to be a pest and any substance or mixture of substances intended for use as a plant regulator, defoliant or desiccant.

Brand - The name, number, trademark or any other designation, which distinguishes one pesticide product from another.

Section 3 product registration - Those unique pesticide labels assigned by the U.S Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) under the authority of the federal pesticide law: Federal Insecticide, Fungicide and Rodenticide Act (FIFRA).

Specialty product registration - Those unique pesticide labels issued by Florida after individual evaluation of possible impacts on Florida's environment and human health. These include: New Active Ingredients (NAI), Significant New Uses (SNU), Experimental Use Permits (EUP), Special Local Need (SLN) and Emergency Exemptions under FIFRA (Section 18).

### **Data Sources and Methodology:**

Data sources are Bureau of Pesticides database records of pesticide products registered, pesticide sample analytical results and spreadsheet for tracking pesticides under evaluation/management. The computation and report methodology is described in the section LRPP Reporting Standard Operating Procedure (SOP). In previous years, pesticides for which pesticide usage inventories were compiled by the Department were included as evaluated and managed. This practice has been discontinued.

Pesticide product registration information is currently stored in two databases. The product registration data is currently stored on an oracle database (Registration Tracking System (RTS)) and the specialty product registration information is stored in a local Paradox database. Computations are based on queries against RTS and the Paradox database.

The information for pesticides under evaluation/ management is tracked in an Excel spreadsheet as outlined in the Scientific Evaluation Section's LRPP reporting SOP. Information is compiled from RTS – located in FDACS DOA server; RegPREC (paradox database) – located in: TLES\_Share on 'File Server in Conner Complex TLES\_Share on 'tlhadm010')/REG/RegPREC directory; and Excel Spreadsheet – located in: 'TLES\_Share on 'File Server in Conner Complex (TLES\_Share on 'tlhadm010')/PESTICIDES/SES/ SES Tracking Form directory. The information from the Registration Section is entered in the SES Excel spreadsheet for this measure.

The report generated is the Excel spreadsheet and the file name is titled with the fiscal year follow by SES-tracking, example: "FY2003-2004 SES-tracking.xls" for the fiscal year 2003-2004.

FDACS Registration Section and the Scientific Evaluation Section follow a SOP for determining what active ingredients are to be considered evaluated/managed. In addition, the criteria for compliance and non-compliance are provided in this same SOP. The Excel spreadsheet automatically compiles the number of active ingredients evaluated and calculates the percent compliance. With regard to ensuring that data is accurately transcribed into the Excel program, the numbers are reviewed to ensure accuracy. To ensure all calculations are accurate, the equations in the spreadsheet have been double-checked during the development of the spreadsheet and as a further

measure the number evaluated and the percent compliance are calculated by hand to verify accuracy of figures.

**Validity:**

This measure is valid in that we are counting what the measure says we are counting. Registration, evaluation and management activities for pesticide products are needed to protect citizens and the environment from possible adverse effects of pesticides that can enter and degrade water quality, impact food quality or cause other non-target and ecological effects in Florida. There are over 800 pesticide active ingredients with over 12,000 pesticide product brands registered for use in Florida, and any of these has the potential to require evaluation and management in the future. The number of pesticide active ingredients under evaluation and management will vary from year to year, with oversight varying from activities such as review of supporting registration information, supporting studies & investigations and analysis of pesticide products to active water quality monitoring and management plans under continuous development with federal, state, and local work groups.

The measure is indicative of the program's performance in that it lists the number of active ingredients that the program actively assessed. However, the measure is somewhat limited in that it assumes equal effort for each active ingredient and many of the criteria that lead to the inclusion of an active ingredient are not directly controlled by the Bureau of Pesticides staff. These include but are not limited to the following: 1) - the number of active ingredients detected in ground water and/or surface water that exceed an acceptable water standard; 2) - the number of instances where an ecological incident may be due to a pesticide; 3) - the number of potential worker exposures or complaints of symptoms due to a pesticide; 4) - the number of registration applications; 5) - the number of Section 18 requests; and 6) - the number of pesticide formulations tested that do not meet specifications.

**Reliability:**

Data is assembled following the appropriate reporting SOP and reviewed at different levels according to the Bureau reporting process to ensure consistency and accuracy. Section 3 product registration applications are reviewed following procedures outlined in the Pesticide Registration Section's pesticide registration procedures. Specialty product registration requests are processed following the evaluation procedures outlined in the Procedural Guidelines and Standards, making it probable that another trained individual would reach the same conclusion as to whether the product is in compliance.

There is a high probability that the same conclusion would be reached by anyone repeating the calculations. The data input of staff members is reviewed by the Section Administrators and spot-checked by the Bureau Chief. The calculation on the spreadsheet is reviewed by the Scientific Evaluation Section Administrator and each calculation field's formula is verified by the Bureau's Environmental Manager. The review process is documented in the Section's LRPP Reporting SOP.

## LRPP EXHIBIT IV: PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY

**Department: Agriculture and Consumer Services**

**Program: Consumer Protection**

**Service: Agricultural Environmental Services**

**Measure: Percent of commercial pest control businesses and applicators inspected who are in compliance with regulations (DOACS approved measure # 46)**

**Action** (check one):

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

### **Data Sources and Methodology:**

Field staff routinely makes unannounced inspections of commercial pest control applicators and businesses to evaluate compliance with the law. In addition, the Department responds to and investigates complaints from consumers about pest control licensees. Inspection case files consist of data collected and evaluated by Program staff. These case files include standardized descriptive information regarding applicators and companies' compliance with applicable statute and rules.

Case files are reviewed by case review staff to determine if the inspection or investigation contains information that indicates that the commercial pest control business or applicator has committed one or more violations of the statute or rules. If there is no information that indicates a violation, the case is designated as a "pass". If there is information that indicates a violation, the case is designated as a "fail" and the file is entered into the process for determining the appropriate administrative action.

Information that indicates a violation includes evidence or observation of a violation of statute or rule, lack of appropriate licensure, evidence of possession of pesticides or application equipment by unlicensed individuals, records obtained by an inspector that document a violation of statute or rule, admissions of a violation, or other evidence.

Case file information is entered into an Access database, the pest control "BEPCTracking" Program – actual table that holds case file information is named "Log sheet". Crystal Report writer is then used to extract the number of inspection case files out of the database to create a report containing information on the case's classification. Then the numbers of commercial pest control applicators inspected who are in compliance is divided by the total number of commercial pest control applicators inspected and then multiplied by 100.



**Validity:**

This measure is valid in that we are counting what the measure says we are counting. The field inspection process is standardized and the procedures are very comprehensive. Specific data is recorded on approved forms and submitted as part of a case file. The data collected relates directly to the measure. The process is continually reviewed and improved. The only limitation in the Program is that staffing ratios do not allow for all licensed applicators and card holders to be inspected annually.

This is the measure of actual work performed by the pest control investigative branch as of the date of the report run. Although the Bureau cannot directly control the number of consumer complaints which might be received during any particular year, the active inspection program assists in informing the licensee's of their obligations, which aids in reducing the number of consumer complaints generated.

**Reliability:**

Standardized data is collected and reported. Some interpretation of regulatory requirements is required. Extensive training of case file reviewers maximizes uniformity of interpretation and case classification. Multiple internal review procedures and standardized enforcement response guidelines also serve to maximize uniformity, making it probable that another trained individual would reach the same conclusion as to whether the applicator is in compliance.

There is there a high probability that the same conclusion would be reached by anyone repeating the calculation. The report is drawn directly from live data. Reported case numbers are highly replicable. The possibility of records arriving subsequent to the reported numbers, resulting in a change in previously reported values, is minimal, based on audit findings.

The report and report specifications are kept in a file so we can request information the same way next time. The Division Quarterly reports are stored in the administrative assistant's office.

**LRPP EXHIBIT IV: PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY**

**Department: Agriculture and Consumer Services**

**Program: Consumer Protection**

**Service: Agricultural Environmental Services**

**Measure: Percent of licensed pesticide applicators inspected who are in compliance with regulations  
(DOACS approved measure # 47)**

**Action** (check one):

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

**Glossary:**

Pesticide - Any substance or mixture or substances intended for preventing, destroying, repelling or mitigating any insect, rodents, nematodes, fungi, weeds or other forms of plant or animal life or viruses, except viruses, bacteria or fungi on or in living man or other animals which the Department, by rule, declares to be a pest and any substance or mixture of substances intended for use as a plant regulator, defoliant or desiccant.

**Data Sources and Methodology:**

Inspection case files are primary data collected and evaluated by Program staff. These case files include standardized descriptive information regarding licensed applicators and their employees as well as specific information about their use of chemicals. From these data, it can be determined whether chemicals are used properly.

The data is entered from the inspection reports into the CATS 2 data base which is maintained in the Bureau of Compliance Monitoring; the name of the report generated out of this data base is the EPA quarterly report.

The number of licensed pesticide applicators inspected, who are in compliance, is divided by the total number of licensed pesticide applicators inspected and then multiplied by 100.

**Validity:**

This measure is valid in that we are counting what the measure says we are counting. The field inspection process is standardized. Specific data are recorded on approved forms and submitted. The data collected relate directly to the measure. Both internal and external audits have been conducted. The process is continually reviewed and improved.

The measure is a good indicator of our performance because it is a direct count of applicators inspected.

**Reliability:**

Standardized data are collected and reported. Chemical use information from the field inspection data is compared with Federal and State chemical use requirements. Discrepancies between reported data and use requirements result in a determination of

proper/improper chemical use. Some interpretation of chemical use requirements is required. Extensive training of case file reviewers maximizes uniformity of interpretation. Multiple internal review procedures and standardized enforcement response guidelines also maximize uniformity. The training, review procedures and standardized response guidelines make it probable that another trained individual would reach the same conclusion as to whether the pesticide applicator inspected is in compliance.

There is a very high probability that the same conclusion would be reached by anyone repeating the calculation because the parameters and queries used are consistent from one calculation to the next. The report is kept in a file for the record, the name of the data base is CATS2 located in the Bureau of Compliance Monitoring Pesticide Compliance section.

#### **LRPP EXHIBIT IV: PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY**

**Department: Agriculture and Consumer Services**

**Program: Consumer Protection**

**Service: Agricultural Environmental Services**

**Measure: Number of reported human/equine disease cases caused by mosquitoes  
(DOACS approved measure # 48)**

**Action** (check one):

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

#### **Data Sources and Methodology:**

Primary mosquito borne human disease data are provided by County Health Departments statewide. The Health Department provides both imported and endemic statistics. Our numbers for this measure reflect the cases that were acquired in Florida only. Equine disease cases are reported by the Department's Division of Animal Industry. Reporting procedures have been to contact the Health Department and the Department's Division of Animal Industry to request the numbers.

#### **Validity:**

Reporting procedures and disease incident monitoring procedures are continually evaluated and revised as necessary to assure that cases are reported and that data is accurate.

This measure is not necessarily indicative of our performance. This measure can be affected by factors not under Program control. Tropical depressions and hurricanes typically generate regionally heavy rainfall, which results in significant increases in mosquito populations that carry disease. In addition, horse owners who do not assure that their animals are vaccinated against mosquito borne disease can significantly impact the Department's ability to move this outcome.

**Reliability:**

The reported data require no interpretation, thus the same conclusion would be reached regardless of reader. Data are highly reliable. The current contact person to obtain this information is Caroline Collins. Her e-mail address is: [Caroline.Collins@doh.state.fl.us](mailto:Caroline.Collins@doh.state.fl.us) and phone number is (850) 245-4444, ext. 2437.

**LRPP EXHIBIT IV: PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY**

**Department: Agriculture and Consumer Services**

**Program: Consumer Protection**

**Service: Agricultural Environmental Services**

**Measure: Number of pest control, feed, seed, and fertilizer and pesticide inspections conducted (DOACS approved measure # 49)**

**Action** (check one):

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

**Data Sources and Methodology:**

Department field staff performs routine marketplace inspections to measure on-going compliance with feed, seed and fertilizer laws, and routine and complaint-based inspections of pesticide applicators and pest control businesses. Data from these inspections are derived directly from files. No data manipulation is necessary. Following are definitions for the various Fertilizer, Feed and Seed inspections conducted and the procedure for data handling by the Bureau staff:

**Fertilizer Sample Inspection** - An inspection conducted by the Department consisting of the physical sampling, evaluation, and reporting of a fertilizer product to assess compliance with state laws and regulations. The sample inspection is counted after the laboratory has performed an analysis. The collection and analysis data are recorded in

the FEA System and are reported on the Fertilizer Laboratory and Compliance Monitoring Quarterly Summary Reports. Source documentation consists of laboratory analysis reports. Supporting documentation includes fertilizer sample collection reports, any associated product documentation, and warning letters (for violative samples).

\*The Environmental Manager of the Fertilizer Section is responsible for maintaining Fertilizer Sample Inspection data. The data is entered into the FEA Computer System by the Fertilizer Staff, which consist of a Senior Word Processing Systems Operator and Senior Clerk. The Environmental Manager thru the Division's Information Technology Section requests reports.

**MKP** - (Marketplace Inspection) - An inspection conducted by the Department at a manufacturer, distributor, or consumer location consisting of a visual evaluation and documentation of a fertilizer product to determine compliance with state fertilizer laws and regulations. Each product evaluated on the marketplace inspection report constitutes, and is counted as a separate inspection. The marketplace inspection is counted after it is reviewed and recorded by fertilizer section personnel in the Bureau office. The product labeling and guarantor data are maintained on the Environmental Manager's PC and hard copies are filed manually. Applicable data is reported on Bureau of Compliance Monitoring, Quarterly Activity Memoranda. Source documentation consists of fertilizer marketplace inspection reports. Supporting documentation includes any associated product documentation and warning letters (for violative samples).

\*The Fertilizer Marketplace Inspection data is maintained by the Environmental Manager in the Fertilizer Section. The inspection data is maintained on the Environmental Manager's PC and hard copies are filed manually.

**FEI** - (Fertilizer Establishment Inspection) An inspection conducted by the Department at an establishment involved in the manufacture, distribution, or consumption of fertilizer to determine the firm's level of compliance with state fertilizer laws and regulations. In general these include, but not limited to BMP Inspections. The establishment inspection is counted after it is reviewed and recorded by Fertilizer section personnel in the Bureau office. The inspection data is maintained on the Environmental Manager's PC and hard copies are filed manually. Applicable data is reported on Bureau of Compliance Monitoring, Quarterly Activity Memoranda. Source documentation consists of applicable inspection forms.

\*The Environmental Manager in the Fertilizer Section maintains the Fertilizer Establishment Inspection data. The data is maintained by the Environmental Manager's PC and hard copies filed manually.

### **Feed Inspection Type Definitions**

Feed Sample Inspection – An inspection conducted by the Department consisting of the physical sampling, evaluation, and reporting of a feed product to assess compliance with state and federal feed laws and regulations. These inspections do not include routine “registrant-submitted” compliance sample evaluations conducted by Department

certified laboratories. The sample inspection is counted after the laboratory has performed an analysis. The collection and analysis data are filed and maintained manually and are reported on Bureau of Compliance Monitoring, Quarterly Activity Memoranda. Source documentation consists of laboratory analysis reports.

\*Feed Sample Inspection data is maintained by the Environmental Manager of the Feed Compliance Section. The source data consists of feed laboratory analysis reports. Supporting documentation includes feed sample collection reports, any associated product documentation, and warning letters (for violative samples). Hard copies of inspection forms and supporting documentation are filed and maintained manually.

Feed Marketplace Inspection – An inspection conducted by the Department at a manufacturer, distributor, or consumer location consisting of the visual evaluation and documentation of a feed product to determine compliance with state and federal feed laws and regulations. Each product evaluated on the marketplace inspection report constitutes, and is counted as a separate inspection. The marketplace inspection is counted after it is reviewed and recorded by feed section personnel in the Bureau office. The product labeling and guarantor data are filed and maintained manually and are reported on Bureau of Compliance Monitoring, Quarterly Activity Memoranda. Source documentation consists of feed marketplace inspection reports.

\*Feed Marketplace Inspection data is maintained by the Environmental Manager of the Feed Compliance Section. The source data consists of feed marketplace inspection reports. Supporting documentation includes associated product documentation, and warning letters (for violative samples). Hard copies of inspection forms and supporting documentation are scanned and maintained electronically.

Feed Establishment Inspection – An inspection conducted by the Department at an establishment involved in the manufacture, distribution, or consumption of animal feed to determine the firm's level of compliance with state and federal feed laws and regulations. In general these include, but are not limited to, BSE, Medicated Feed, and BMP inspections. The establishment inspection is counted after it is reviewed and recorded by feed section personnel in the Bureau office. The inspection data is maintained in an Access database on the Feed Compliance Section Manager's PC and hard copies are filed manually. Applicable data is reported on Bureau of Compliance Monitoring, Quarterly Activity Memoranda. Source documentation consists of applicable inspection forms.

\*Feed Establishment Inspection data is maintained by the Environmental Manager of the Feed Compliance Section. The source data consists of applicable inspection forms. Supporting documentation includes associated documentation, and warning letters (for violative inspections). Hard copies of inspection forms and supporting documentation are filed and maintained manually and data is summarized in an Access database and stored electronically.

### **Seed Inspection Type Definitions**

Seed Marketplace Inspection – An inspection conducted by the Department at a manufacturer, distributor, or consumer location consisting of the visual evaluation and documentation of a seed product to determine compliance with state and federal seed laws and regulations. Each product evaluated on the marketplace inspection report constitutes, and is counted as a separate inspection. The marketplace inspection is counted after it is reviewed and recorded by seed section personnel in the Bureau office. The product labeling and guarantor data are filed and maintained manually and are reported on Bureau of Compliance Monitoring, Quarterly Activity Memoranda. Source documentation consists of seed marketplace inspection reports.

\*Seed Marketplace Inspection data is maintained by the Environmental Manager of the Seed Section. The source data consists of seed marketplace inspection reports. Supporting documentation includes associated product documentation, and warning letters (for violative samples). Hard copies of inspection forms and supporting documentation are scanned and maintained electronically.

Seed Sample Inspection – An inspection conducted by the Department consisting of the physical sampling, evaluation, and reporting of a seed product to assess compliance with state and federal seed laws and regulations (= “*number of seed inspections conducted*” component of LRPP Measure #59) The sample inspection is counted after the laboratory has performed an analysis. The collection and analysis data are recorded in the Sralims System and are reported on the Bureau of Feed, Seed, and Fertilizer, Seed Laboratory Quarterly Summary Reports. Source documentation consists of seed laboratory analysis reports.

\*Seed Sample Inspection data is maintained by the Bureau of Feed, Seed, and Fertilizer Laboratories, Seed Laboratory. The source data consists of seed laboratory analysis reports. Supporting documentation includes seed sample collection reports, any associated product documentation, and warning letters (for violative samples). The data is summarized and entered into the Seed Registration and Analysis Laboratory Information Management System (Sralims on 'Tlhaesdata') (W:) by personnel in the Bureau of Feed, Seed, and Fertilizer Laboratories. The Environmental Manager of the Seed Compliance Section generates standard reports from this database. Non-standard reports are developed by the Division's Information Technology Section upon request. Hard copies of documentation for all samples reported as legal are filed and maintained manually by the Bureau of Feed, Seed, and Fertilizer Laboratories, Seed Laboratory. Hard copies of documentation for all samples reported as illegal or mislabeled are filed and maintained manually by the Environmental Manager of the Seed Compliance Section.

Seed Establishment Inspection – An inspection conducted by the Department at an establishment involved in the manufacture, distribution, or consumption of seed (intended for planting purposes) to determine the firm's level of compliance with state and federal seed laws and regulations. In general these include, but are not limited to, seed complaint and BMP inspections. The establishment inspection is counted after it is reviewed and recorded by seed section personnel in the Bureau office. The hard copy inspection data is maintained and filed manually. Applicable data is reported on Bureau

of Compliance Monitoring, Quarterly Activity Memoranda. Source documentation consists of applicable inspection forms.

\* Seed Establishment Inspection data is maintained by the Environmental Manager of the Seed Section. The source data consists of applicable inspection forms. Supporting documentation includes associated documentation, and warning letters (for violative inspections). Hard copies are filed and maintained manually.

### **Pesticide Inspection Type Definitions**

**UAF** – (Agricultural Use For Cause Investigation) An investigation conducted by the Department at an establishment involved in the production of an agricultural commodity in response to a report that pesticides have been misused. In general, these establishments include but are not limited to farms, forests, nurseries, and greenhouses.

**UAG** – (Agricultural Use Inspection) An inspection conducted by the Department at an establishment involved in the production of an agricultural commodity to determine compliance with state and federal pesticide laws.

**WPS** – (Worker Protection Standard Inspection) An inspection conducted by the Department during an agricultural use inspection/investigation at a farm, forest, nursery, or greenhouse to determine compliance with the Worker Protection Standard. If a farm, forest, nursery, or greenhouse uses a WPS labeled pesticide for the production of agricultural plants within thirty days of having agricultural workers and/or handlers present at the firm, then the firm falls under the scope of WPS.

**UNF** – (Non-Agricultural Use For Cause Investigation) An investigation conducted by the Department at an establishment that is **not** involved in the production of an agricultural commodity in response to a report that pesticides have been misused. In general, these establishments include, but are not limited to right-of-way applicators, aquatic applicators, and golf courses.

**UNA** – (Non-Agricultural Use Inspection) An inspection conducted by the Department at an establishment that is **not** involved in the production of an agricultural commodity to determine compliance with state and federal pesticide laws.

**EUP** – (Experimental Use Permit Inspection) An inspection conducted by the Department at either an agricultural or non-agricultural establishment (a/k/a a cooperator) to determine if the use of a pesticide, which was granted an experimental use permit, was used in accordance with the conditions stated in the permit.

**CAR** – (Certified Applicator Records Inspection) An inspection conducted by the Department during all use inspections/investigations involves the review of pesticide applicator records for pesticide applicators licensed under Chapter 487, Florida Statutes (F.S.). The records may contain applications of general use pesticides, but applications of all restricted use pesticides must be recorded by each licensed applicator.



**CHM/GW** – (Antisiphon Device Inspection) An inspection conducted by the Department at a facility that injects chemicals (fertilizers and pesticides) into their irrigation system. This inspection verifies that each system has all of the required backflow prevention devices in place and in proper working condition to inject fertilizer and/or pesticides.

**\*PEI** – (Producer Establishment Inspection) An inspection conducted by the Department at a facility that produces, formulates, re-formulates, packages or repackages pesticides or pesticidal devices. In general, these establishments include pool supply stores where bulk chlorine is repackaged into smaller containers and chemical supply stores that manufacture pesticides.

**\*MKP** – (Marketplace Inspection) An inspection conducted by the Department at a facility that sells general use pesticides. In general, these facilities are retail stores that sell pesticides such as Home Depot, Lowe's, and Wal-Mart.

**\*DLR** – (Pesticide Dealer Inspection) An inspection conducted by the Department at a facility that sells restricted-use pesticides as well as general use pesticides. These establishments are licensed by the Department to sell and distribute restricted-use pesticides. In general, these establishments include retail agro/industrial chemical suppliers such as UAP, Lesco, and Helena Chemical Company.

**\*IMP/EXP** – (Import and/or Export Inspection) – An inspection conducted by the Department, usually at a port of entry into Florida or at a warehouse, to determine compliance with the federal pesticide regulations concerning the importation or exportation of pesticides into and out of the United States.

In order for each of the above inspections/investigations to be credited, the inspector must complete the information outlined in Section 1.02 B Output Requirements in the Pesticide Field Procedural Manual.

\*In addition to verifying that the pesticide products reviewed at these facilities are properly labeled and registered with the state of Florida, the manner in which the facility stores and displays its pesticide products is also reviewed.

Protocol:

1. Inspection data is entered into several data tables in Paradox database by the Pesticide Compliance staff, which consists of four Case Processors and a Senior Clerk. The Case Processor are responsible for determining whether the information provided by the Inspectors count as an inspection. This is usually determined by the verifying that the inspection forms filled out by the Inspector are complete and accurate.
2. The Office Manager usually generates any reports associated with program outputs, however, as part of their initial training, Case Processors are shown how

to generate reports in Paradox and have a general knowledge of how to run reports in Paradox.

The data from the Feed, Seed, Fertilizer and Pesticides is entered into a data base from the inspection reports directly; the name of the data base is ACCESS and is located in the Bureau of Compliance Monitoring. Pest Control data is entered into the EPC Tracking System; the data for this measure is a combined measure adding all the programs across bureaus in the division.

The name of the report for the Feed, Seed, Fertilizer and Pesticides is DOI (Division of Inspection) Daily Report. The information for the Pest Control data is entered into the EPC Tracking System.

**Validity:**

Data are derived directly from internal files. There are no known outside impacts on data validity. Staff is responsible for accumulating and verifying the accuracy of the data.

This measure is a good indicator of our performance because it is a direct count of the number of inspections conducted.

**Reliability:**

Data is a direct tabulation of the actual number of pest control, pesticide applicator, feed, seed and fertilizer inspections conducted. Data is not interpreted; therefore, no ambiguity in reporting exists.

There is a high probability that the same conclusion would be reached by anyone repeating the calculation because the parameters and the queries used are consistent from one calculation to the next. The name of the data base for Seed, Feed, Fertilizer and Pesticides is ACCESS, located in the Bureau of Compliance Monitoring and the name of the report is DOI (Division of Inspection) Daily Report, and for Pest Control it is the EPC Tracking System.

**LRPP EXHIBIT IV: PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY**

**Department: Agriculture and Consumer Services**

**Program: Consumer Protection**

**Service: Agricultural Environmental Services**

**Measure: Number of people served by mosquito control activities  
(DOACS approved activity # 50)**

**Action** (check one):

Requesting Revision to Approved Measure

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

### **Data Sources and Methodology:**

The Department gathers data on the number of persons in Florida served by mosquito control programs, under the authority of Chapter 388, F. S., via the Bureau of Business and Economic Research (BBER), University of Florida. Populations of counties served are compiled from population projections made by that entity.

### **Validity:**

Data reflecting persons in Florida living in areas covered by organized mosquito control programs are estimated by BBER.

This measure is not necessarily indicative of our performance. The numbers reported indicate that the vast majority of residents in the State are served by organized mosquito control and this is directly attributable to the availability of start-up and matching funds provided by the Department. Consequently, as funding levels continue to decrease the ability to support district programs and respond to emergency needs for mosquito control diminishes.

### **Reliability:**

These data are maintained and reported by Program staff. Data are highly reliable and require no interpretation, thus the same conclusion would be reached regardless of reader.

The calculations required are highly repeatable. Data are derived by taking the difference between figures reported in the 2000 census and the projected figures for the year 2006, then dividing by six. This result is multiplied by the number of years difference between the year in question and the year 2000 and then added to the 2000 census number to reflect the year in question. The final calculations and results are kept in a notebook labeled "Projected Population Served by Mosquito Control" and are maintained by the Regulatory Supervisor/Consultant's office.

## **LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance MEASURE VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY**

**Department: Agriculture and Consumer Services**

**Program: Consumer Services**

**Service: Agricultural Environmental Services**

**Activity: Register pesticide products**

**Measure: Number of pesticide products registered**

**(DOACS approved measure # 51)**

**Action** (check one):

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

**Data Sources and Methodology:**

Data source is Bureau of Pesticides database records of pesticide products registered. The computation and report methodology are described in each Section's LRPP Reporting Standard Operating Procedure (SOP)

The data from the pesticide registration application are entered into the Registration Tracking System (RTS) and the emergency exemption action data (Section 18) are entered into a paradox database. We plan to incorporate the Section 18 data into RTS in the future.

RTS is located in FDACS DOA (Sunora1) server and the Section 18 data is located in the: File Server in Conner Complex (TLES\_Share on 'tlhadm010')/REG/RegPREC directory. The report generated is the Quarterly Registration Section Activity Report.

Information is in the Section's LRPP Reporting SOP.

**Validity:**

Data are derived directly from internal files. There are no known outside impacts on data validity. Staff is responsible for accumulating and verifying the accuracy of the data.

The measure is a good indication of performance to the extent that it indicates the ability of the program to process all incoming registration applications. However, beyond the capacity to process registrations, the program is not in direct control of the numbers and types of pesticide product brands registered. Rather, these variables are dictated predominately by market conditions and the indirect effects of federal regulations.

**Reliability:**

Files provide data directly, and no interpretation is required, as the measure is a direct tabulation of the actual number of registrations issued.

There is a high probability that the same conclusion would be reached by repeat calculation. The data are entered into a secured database where the level of

permission is granted based on business needs with a historical tracking of product registration status. The report generated is based on queries against the RTS database. In addition, the tracking of the Section 18 action data are reviewed by the Section Administrator and verified by either the Bureau's Environmental Manager and/or Bureau Chief. These reports are stored in the 'TLES\_Share on 'File Server in Conner Complex (TLES\_Share on 'tlhadm010')/REG/ Registration Activity Reports directory.

## **LRPP EXHIBIT IV: PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY**

**Agency: Agriculture and Consumer Services**  
**Program: Consumer Protection**  
**Service: Agricultural Environmental Services**  
**Measure: Number of pesticide sample determinations made in the pesticide laboratory (DOACS approved measure # 52)**

**Action** (check one):

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

### **Data Sources and Methodology:**

Inspection case files are primary data collected and evaluated by program staff in conjunction with samples. These files include descriptive information about pesticide products and residue samples inspected. In addition, samples and data are provided by field studies for environmental risk assessment/management of pesticides. From these data, it can be determined whether performance/quality standards are being met.

Analytical data is generated by instrumental analysis software. Pesticide concentration calculations are performed using standardized formulas for both formulation and residue level analyses. Complete analytical files for all sample analyses are kept in the laboratory front office. Official sample results are entered into the Laboratory Information Management System (LIMS). LRPP numbers are generated from this Oracle database. Calculations for LRPP activity numbers are performed using the reports "PB2Report1\_2 (activities 1 and 2), PB2Report3\_4 (activities 3 and 4) and PB2Report5\_6 (activities 5 and 6)" generated from the database queries. Numbers are then double checked against the EPA quarterly report numbers. All supporting documentation used to generate the LRPP activity report is filed chronologically in the laboratory's administrative files. The LIMS Oracle database is located in Labworks on the 'Tlhaeslims' directory.

**Validity:**

The field inspection process is standardized and the data collected relate directly to the measure. Both internal and external audits have been performed and, as a result, process improvements are continually evaluated and, if appropriate, implemented. Analysis methodologies used are developed internally and/or adopted from the Association of Official Analytical Chemist (AOAC), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), pesticide companies, and peer reviewed scientific journals following established Pesticide Laboratory methods development standard operating procedures.

This is a good indication of the laboratory's performance because it reflects the analysis performed by the laboratory. This is an indicator of the laboratory's performance, to the extent that it reflects the laboratory's ability to increase its capabilities and capacity. However, the measure is somewhat limited in that the laboratory does not have direct control over the numbers of samples submitted by the different program areas.

**Reliability:**

Standardized data are collected and reported. These data are compared to the pesticide product label guarantee to assess compliance with State law/rules. Residue data is compared to current environmental standards. Some data interpretation is required. However, reliability is maximized through extensive staff training and internal review processes.

There is a high probability that the same conclusions would be reached by anyone as the activity numbers are based on set query against the analysis determination made for completed and reported samples entered in the database. These numbers are verified by the Section Administrator against another report generated for the EPA Performance Partnership Grant and the final determination numbers are reviewed by the Bureau's Environmental Manager. The reports are located in the 'TLES\_Share on 'File Server in Conner Complex (TLES\_Share on 'tlhadm010')/PESTICIDES/BOP\_ADMIN/ PestLab Activity Reports directory.

**LRPP EXHIBIT IV: PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY****Department: Agriculture and Consumer Services****Program: Consumer Protection****Service: Agricultural Environmental Services****Measure: Number of pest control businesses and applicators licensed  
(DOACS approved measure # 53)****Action (check one):**

- Requesting Revision to Approved Measure
- Change in Data Sources or Measurement Methodologies

- Requesting New Measure
- Backup for Performance Outcome and Output Measure

### **Data Sources and Methodology:**

Records of pest control businesses and applicators that apply for and are granted licensure are maintained and used to determine the number of pest control businesses and applicators licensed.

Data are entered into a licensing database. The database is known as the Suntrack Program which is maintained on the AGMIC sunbox (6500) server. AGMIC maintains and supports the application and has not developed a specific report for this measure. Therefore is no specific name for this report. The report is generated by batch processing and accounting for each license type over a specific date range. The report that is generated is highly reproducible.

The Bureau issues several different license types which are added together. The types include; Business license, Certified Operator certificates, Special Fumigation ID Card certificates, Employee Identification Cards, Limited Private Applicator and Limited Commercial Landscape licenses.

### **Validity:**

Data are derived directly from internal files. There are no known outside impacts on data validity. Staff is responsible for accumulating and verifying the accuracy of the data.

This is an accurate measure of licensing performance. It relates directly to the number of documents processed (workload) by the Document Issuance section of the Bureau. The measure accurately reflects licensing trends in both good and bad economic times.

### **Reliability:**

Files provide data directly, and no interpretation is required, as the measure is a direct tabulation of the actual number of licenses issued.

The Office of Inspector General performed an audit in 05-06 on the 04-05 data, and determined that the number could not be replicated, since the data base worked with active data and generated a report based on the time of the query. As a result, the Bureau changed the Suntrack program to allow reproducibility of the data through the use of date parameters; therefore the data is consistently reproduced and the reported values are accurate and replicable. These values are obtained through scripted queries using data that is entered directly into the database for each type of license or certificate printed within the reporting time frame.

## LRPP EXHIBIT IV: PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY

**Department:** Agriculture and Consumer Services  
**Program:** Consumer Protection  
**Service:** Agricultural Environmental Services  
**Measure:** Number of fertilizer sample determinations  
(DOACS approved measure # 54)

**Action** (check one):

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

### **Data Sources and Methodology:**

Inspection case files are primary data collected and evaluated by program staff. These files include sample collection forms, label guarantees/analysis tags from fertilizer products inspected in the marketplace. From case files and subsequent analyses, it can be determined whether performance/quality standards are being met. Number of official fertilizer sample determinations, which is an output for the activity "Analyze fertilizer samples," is included in this output measure.

Fertilizer sample determinations data is compiled manually by staff based upon an exact count of samples analyzed. Data is entered monthly into an Excel summary spreadsheet "Fertilizer Summary Report" located on TLH\_Share on "tlhadmn010" I:\BFSFL\Fert-Reports\Summary Report.

### **Validity:**

The field inspection process is standardized and the data collected relate directly to the measure. Both internal and external audits are continually performed and process improvements are continually evaluated and, if appropriate, implemented.

This measure is an accurate indicator of performance because it explicitly documents each analytical determination performed.

### **Reliability:**

Standardized data are collected and reported. These data are compared to the fertilizer product label guarantee to assess compliance with State law/rules. Reliability is maximized through extensive staff training and internal review processes.



The final result is spreadsheet calculated and unless a count has been justifiably updated; the final calculation will remain constant. The hard copy of this report is saved in our "Fertilizer" file located in the front office.

## **LRPP EXHIBIT IV: PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY**

**Department: Agriculture and Consumer Services**

**Program: Consumer Protection**

**Service: Agricultural Environmental Services**

**Measure: Number of official seed sample determinations performed  
(DOACS approved measure # 55)**

**Action** (check one):

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

### **Data Sources and Methodology:**

Inspection case files are primary data collected and evaluated by program staff. These files include descriptive information about seed products inspected in the marketplace. From this data, it can be determined whether performance/quality standards are being met.

Sample determinations of Official, Commercial, and Specialty seed analytical results are entered into the Seed Laboratory Information Management System (LIMS) located at "sralims on thlaesdata". The report "Quarterly Summary" is compiled quarterly detailing the actual number of samples analyzed, sample status, and total sample determinations performed. This report is located on TLH\_Share on "tlhadmn010" I:\BFSFL\Seed Lab\Performance Measures.

### **Validity:**

The field inspection process is standardized and the data collected relate directly to the measure. Both internal and external audits are continually performed and process improvements are continually evaluated and, if appropriate, implemented.

This measure is an accurate indicator of performance because it explicitly documents each analytical determination performed.

**Reliability:**

Standardized data are collected and reported. These data are compared to the seed label guarantee to assess compliance with State law/rules. Reliability is maximized through extensive staff training and internal review processes.

Reliability of this report is assured through the generation and comparison of detailed monthly, quarterly, and annual transaction logs to ensure reported values are accurate and reproducible. Hard copies of these reports are archived in our "Seed" file located in the front office.

## LRPP EXHIBIT IV: PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY

**Department:** Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services

**Program:** Consumer Protection

**Service:** Consumer Protection Service

**Measure:** Percent of regulated entities where an investigation found a violation of consumer protection laws  
(DOACS approved measure # 56)

**Action** (check one):

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

### **Glossary:**

Regulated entities – Those businesses required to file with the Department, or be registered or licensed by the Department, pursuant to Florida Statutes (Motor Vehicle Repair shops, Charitable Organizations, Professional Solicitors, Fundraising Consultants, Sellers of Travel, Telemarketers, Sellers of Business Opportunities, Health Studios, Dance Studios, Pawn Shops, operators of Game Promotions and–Intrastate Moving companies).

Investigation – An examination of factual information by the Department to determine if a violation of law has occurred. Information can be provided to the Department through a variety of sources, including but not limited to complaints, telephone inquiries and the mail.

Violation – A noncompliance with a provision of a statute or promulgated rule.  
Consumer Protection laws - Any law relating to consumer protection.

### **Data Sources and Methodology:**

The measure has three elements: (1) the number of regulated entities that were registered, licensed or filed with the Department at any time during the period reported; (2) the number of regulated entities investigated during the period wherein it was determined that a violation of consumer protection law(s) was committed, and (3) the resulting percentage of regulated entities that violated consumer protection law(s) is calculated by dividing item 2 (above) by item 1 (above) and multiplying that result by 100.

Investigations are entered into the Division of Consumer Services Oracle based application (DOCS) with specific fields to indicate whether the business is regulated or non-regulated, the status of registration, the alleged violation of statute(s) or

promulgated rule and the outcome of the investigation. All regulated entities investigated are counted where the investigation found a violation, even when no legal action is initiated by the Department. Applicable fields are queried to calculate the percentage.

There are two standard reports used to arrive at the percentage. They are: #66 Total Registered Entities and #66 Regulated Entities Where Investigation Found a Violation. Each report is properly documented and can be changed to reflect data for the time period being reported.

The DOCS Oracle database automatically generates these reports. The percentage of regulated entities where an investigation found a violation is determined by dividing the total number on the #66 Regulated Entities Where Investigation Found a Violation report divided by the total number on the #66 Total Registered Entities report. These totals are input onto an Excel spreadsheet that has a division/percentage formula built into the spreadsheet and when input, the formula automatically calculates the percentage. The file names and file locations are:

File Name: #66 Total Registered Entities

File Location: J Drive/Global/DOCS Reports/Quarterly/Fiscal Year/All

File Name: #66 Regulated Entities Where Investigation Found A Violation

File Location: J Drive/Global/DOCS Reports/Quarterly/Fiscal Year/Quarter

File Name: #66 Measure Calculation

File Location: H Drive/Robertsu/PLN-BUDG/Folder #66 Calculation / #66 Measure Calculation Worksheet (Excel)

### **Validity:**

The measure is valid insofar as it provides a highly accurate measure of overall compliance with statutory regulations by affected business entities. However, the measure does not show frequency of violations by those entities in violation. The results of this measure do not necessarily reflect the effectiveness of the enforcement program.

The DOCS system has a case tracking application which requires that certain required criteria be met for input and a footprint of all entries becomes a part of the record. No alleged violations that are determined to be unfounded are counted.

### **Reliability:**

All allegations of violation(s) of applicable statute or promulgated rule are input into the DOCS Oracle system and form the basis for an investigation. The investigation cases are distinguished in the system by "Type – Investigation" and may be separated by regulated and/or non-regulated entity. Only known, regulated entities are included in this measure. The Division is not aware of a valid methodology for determining the number of unknown regulated entities. Additionally, there is a dropdown list of

investigative activities, which helps maintain uniformity in the description of investigative action(s) taken. Only closed cases (investigations) are counted.

There is a historic footprint in the DOCS system of each data entry into the system, including the person performing each update and reports can also be generated repeatedly for given time periods. Quarterly reports are also maintained on the J:\ drive in PDF format.

There is a possibility that a small number of cases might be included in the numerator wherein an administrative action was initiated and it was subsequently determined that no violation existed. Such a case would be excluded from the numerator as soon as the determination was made; however, at any given point a small number of such cases could be included. The possibility of such a determination could exist in approximately one case in two hundred and fifty, and the number of cases inappropriately included in the count would be even smaller.

Anyone accessing the reports reflected under “Data Sources and Methodology” would arrive at the same conclusion.

#### **LRPP EXHIBIT IV: PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY**

**Department: Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services**  
**Program: Consumer Protection**  
**Service: Consumer Protection Services**  
**Measure: Number of Lemon Law assists made to consumers**  
**(DOACS approved measure # 57)**

**Action** (check one):

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

#### **Glossary:**

Assists – Assists to consumers include the number of calls to the Lemon Law Help Line, the number of Lemon Law arbitration requests processed, the number of Informal Dispute Settlement Procedure files processed, and the number of Informal dispute Settlement Procedure audits conducted.

Independent Dispute Settlement Procedure – (hereinafter “IDSP”) an informal Lemon Law dispute resolution procedure established by motor vehicle manufacturers and certified by the Department.

Certified Manufacturer – a motor vehicle manufacturer who has an informal Lemon Law dispute procedure certified by the Department.

### **Data Sources and Methodology:**

This measure is a tabulation of four inputs: (1) the Division's 800 hotline number dedicated to Lemon Law calls received by the Department; (2) the number of requests for state Lemon Law arbitration processed; (3) the number of IDSP applications processed; and (4) the number of IDSP audits conducted.

The Siemens telephone software program captures the number of calls received on the Lemon Law hotline and maintains this information in the system for up to 45 days. At the end of each month the system generates four reports reflecting telephone activity dating back to the first day of the month. The reports are the Monthly Group, Queue, Destination, and User Historical Reports. These source documents are stored in office 145, the Rhodes Building. These statistics are then entered onto an Excel spreadsheet named Call Center Assists Report that is maintained at J:\\Global\\Monthly Report\\Fiscal Year\\Call Center. Standard reports are run on a monthly basis and ad hoc reports run on demand.

A three page Excel report is created using the reports generated from the Siemens HiPath ProCenter Agile system. The reports used from this system are the Monthly Group, Queue, Destination and User Historical Reports. These reports are printed on a monthly basis, and the information in these reports is typed into this Excel spreadsheet.

The number of requests for state arbitration processed each month is the total number of consumers seeking to arbitrate their vehicle dispute before the Arbitration Boards established and maintained by the Florida Office of the Attorney General. If the consumer purchased or leased a motor vehicle from a certified manufacturer, then the consumer is required to go through the manufacturer's IDSP before they can request state arbitration. This information is entered into the DOCS (Division of Consumer Services computer application system) Oracle database by Division staff.

The IDSP files are forwarded to the Division in ASCII format from the Center for Better Business Bureaus, located in Arlington, VA. This information is uploaded to the Division's Access database. Upon receipt by the Division, these files are entered into the DOCS Oracle database by Division staff, and reviewed for further action by the Division.

An audit of IDSP files is conducted by Division staff. This information also is recorded on the DOCS Oracle database.

The information (inputs 3-4) is maintained in the DOCS Oracle database which automatically generates this report. This report is found under the file J:\\Global\\DOCS Reports\\Qrtly\\Actual Fiscal Year/.

The measure is a total of each of the above named processes.

**Validity:**

The four parts of the Lemon Law activity measure the output of those consumers that seek assistance under the Florida Lemon Law. The staff reviews information provided both directly from consumers and through the various arbitrators throughout the state. All IDSP files are sent to the Center for Better Business Bureaus, which then forwards the data directly to the Division, as stated above.

The inputs to this activity provide information from consumers who have successfully gone through the certified Lemon Law procedure, those consumers who have gone through the procedure, but are dissatisfied with the result, those consumers who have a new car not represented by a certified Lemon Law procedure, and those consumers who need information to assist them in making the correct choices to get assistance concerning the Lemon Law process.

This is an appropriate measure of the performance because it indicates the workload of the unit. However the number of assists are dictated by demand, and a lower amount of assists are not indicative of decreased effort but of decreased demand.

**Reliability:**

The primary source data is input without interpretation. Information can be accessed and reports generated at any time through the Access database and/or the telephone reports. All outside source data is uploaded into the database, and additional information is input by staff when received, creating a database complete with all pertinent information about any particular file. Reports can be generated at will, and are always created at the end of each month of activity. The statistics received and input with respect to the measure are deemed reliable. The number of assists varies due to consumer need and requests for assistance.

Each month, surveys are sent to a percentage of consumers assisted. The overall percentage of consumers satisfied with the assist they received from the Division is very high.

Supervision of the data entry process ensures accurate input of primary source information into the computer database and telephone calls are responded to at the time they are received.

**LRPP EXHIBIT IV: PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY**

**Department: Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services**

**Program: Consumer Protection**

**Service: Consumer Protection Services**

**Measure: Number of complaints investigated / processed by the Division of Consumer Services  
(DOACS approved measure # 58)**

**Action** (check one):

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

**Glossary:**

Consumer Protection Laws - any law relating to consumer protection.

Case – a complaint that has been entered into the Division of Consumer Services Oracle based application (DOCS) system and assigned to a staff person to read, analyze, respond to, investigate and/or initiate an enforcement action.

Complaint – Written correspondence or other contact with the Department alleging a dispute with a business entity, a violation of a consumer protection law, an unfair and deceptive trade practice, or any other perceived violation of a law.

Enforcements-registration violations

Investigation – a systematic examination by the Department of facts, including a review of books and records, collection of evidence and other information to determine if a violation of law has occurred.

Processed – the process of entering information received by the Division into the DOCS Oracle database, which produces a record in the system. All complaints received by the Division are processed.

Administrative Complaint – an action initiated by the Department that alleges a violation of a consumer protection law, pursuant to Chapter 120, F.S.

Regulated entity - Those businesses required to file with the Department, or be registered or licensed by the Department, pursuant to Florida Statutes (Motor Vehicle Repair shops, Charitable Organizations, Professional Solicitors, Fundraising Consultants, Sellers of Travel, Telemarketers, Sellers of Business Opportunities, Health Studios, Dance Studios, Pawn Shops, operators of Game Promotions and Intrastate Moving companies).

Non-regulated entities – Those business entities not specifically regulated by the Department; however, such entities are subject to the provisions of unfair and deceptive trade practice laws.

**Data Sources and Methodology:**

The data sources for this measure are all complaints received by the Division. All complaints are entered into the DOCS (Division of Consumer Services Oracle based



application) system and assigned a unique case file number. The system has a number of required input criteria that must be met by the staff person assigned to the case each time an action is taken. The system automatically records the date action is taken and the staff person performing the work. The staff member working the case must enter what action is taken as well as the status of the case. The system records this history in the creation of the record. This information can be accessed on the system at anytime, and a report is generated monthly.

Case information is analyzed by staff in conjunction with the appropriate statutory provisions to determine whether the person or entity is operating in compliance with consumer protection laws.

After providing notice to the business owner, the Division may attempt mediation to achieve compliance or an enforcement action is initiated, where appropriate, to affect compliance. Enforcement actions initiated by the Division include Administrative Complaint, a Settlement Agreement and/or a Final Order.

When an enforcement action is issued, the respondent may accept the Department's proposed action or request a hearing to contest the action, pursuant to Chapter 120, Florida Statutes.

The Department may also file a civil action against a business not regulated by the Division that violates other consumer protection laws. Civil actions are handled by the Department's legal office.

The measure of this output is the total of all complaints processed plus the total of all investigations and enforcement actions taken by the Division for the period.

The DOCS Oracle database automatically generates Report All\_Case\_Types-Complaints\_, Investigations and Enforcements/No Sales on a quarterly basis. The total for the Report Period is the amount used for this measure.

File Name: All\_Case\_Types- Complaints, Investigations and Enforcements/No Sales

File Location: J:\\Global\\DOCS Reports\\Quarterly\\Fiscal Year\\Quarter

**Validity:**

The number of enforcement actions is an extension of the Division's measure of number of complaints processed / investigated by the Division. All complaints received by the Division are processed; some warrant further investigation and some will result in enforcement actions. However, the measure does not necessarily indicate a level of compliance within the program area because violations could occur and not be reported through the complaint process, nor does the Department have scheduled inspections of regulated entities.

Information pertaining to a complaint is entered into the database described herein and the footprint of all actions taken pertaining to the complaint become part of the record.

**Reliability:**

The provisions of Chapter 120, F.S., known as the Administrative Procedures Act, ensure the reliability of the procedure.

Anyone accessing the reports reflected under “Data Sources and Methodology” would arrive at the same conclusion.

**LRPP EXHIBIT IV: PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY****Department: Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services****Program: Consumer Protection****Service: Consumer Protection Services****Measure: Number of “No Sales Solicitation calls” subscriptions processed (DOACS approved measure # 59)****Action (check one):**

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

**Glossary:**

Subscription – Information provided to the Division from the consumer with accompanying subscription fee, requesting their residential telephone number be added to the No Sales Solicitation Calls list.

No Sales Solicitation Calls list - The list that is published quarterly, with all residential telephone numbers of Florida consumers who have submitted their request with the appropriate fee to the Department, to have their phone number placed on the list.

Processed – the process of entering information received by the Division into the DOCS Oracle database, which produces a record in the system. All No Sales Solicitation subscriptions received by the Division are processed.

**Data Sources and Methodology:**

This measure is a tabulation of the total number of “No Sales Solicitation calls” subscriptions processed during a period of time. This includes new subscribers and renewals. The subscription information is input onto DOCS (Division of Consumer Services computer application system) by “No Sales” staff. When the subscription information is complete, a phone number (associated with a name) is added to the No

Sales Solicitation Calls list for a period of between 1 and 5 years, depending upon the amount of money that was submitted with the subscription.

The measure of this output is the total of all subscribers / phone numbers in the system for the period being reported. The subscriber information is compiled and a report is generated quarterly on DOCS, listing all phone numbers that have subscribed. This list is then made available to telemarketers for a fee. Telemarketers are prohibited by law from calling numbers on the list, unless otherwise exempt.

The DOCS computer system records each time a “No Sales Solicitation” call subscription is added or renewed. The DOCS Oracle database automatically generates this report. This report is found under file name: All\_case\_types Complaints, Investigations and Enforcements/No Sales at J:\\Global/DOCS Reports/Quarterly/Fiscal Year/Quarter.

### **Validity:**

Subscriber information, including the fee paid, is received by Finance and Accounting, where the money is recorded and deposited. The subscriber information is then sent to the No Sales program section where the subscription information is updated as required, or added to the DOCS system, if it is an initial application. When all facets of the subscription are reviewed (and deemed to comply with the statute), the subscription is complete. All subscriber information is entered onto the DOCS system and can be retrieved at anytime by subscriber phone number or unique identifying number (DTN), which is assigned by the system when the initial subscription is entered onto the system.

“No Sales Solicitation” activity subscription numbers are reported on Oracle report #69 / No Sales, which reports the number of new applications and renewal applications and the total of both, This report is generated every quarter of the fiscal year.

### **Reliability:**

The primary source document for a subscription is the No Sales Solicitation Application form, or whatever format the subscriber uses to transmit the information and fee. This information is entered onto the DOCS Oracle application system without interpretation. In the case of renewals, the computer screen is already populated with information; therefore, input is limited to any changes indicated by the subscriber. Input onto formatted screens that are stored on the DOCS Oracle application system is considered reliable, and the information can be retrieved upon demand.

This method of accounting for No Sales subscriptions produces data to compile the quarterly list for telemarketers. The database also calculates those consumers who have paid for multiple years, showing the fees that are deferred to future years. The DOCS system maintains historic records of No Sales subscriptions and quarterly reports, which are in PDF format and maintained on the J:\\ drive, under Global.

## LRPP EXHIBIT IV: PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY

**Department:** Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services  
**Program:** Consumer Protection  
**Service:** Consumer Protection Services  
**Measure:** Number of regulated entities licensed by the Division of Consumer Services  
(DOACS approved measure # 60)

Subcategories include:

Number of motor vehicle repair shops licensed by the Division  
Number of solicitors of contributions licensed by the Division  
Number of sellers of travel licensed by the Division  
Number of telemarketers licensed by the Division  
Number of sellers of business opportunity licensed by the Division  
Number of health studios licensed by the Division  
Number of pawnshops licensed by the Division  
Number of dance studios licensed by the Division  
Number of game promoters filed with the Division  
Number of Intrastate Moving companies licensed by the Division

**Action** (check one):

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

### **Glossary:**

Consumer Protection Laws – Laws designed to safeguard Florida consumers against unlawful acts perpetrated by business entities selling goods and/or services to consumers.

Regulated entities – Those businesses required to file with the Department, or be registered or licensed by the Department, pursuant to Florida Statutes (Motor Vehicle Repair shops, Charitable Organizations, Professional Solicitors, Fundraising Consultants, Sellers of Travel, Telemarketers, Sellers of Business Opportunities, Health Studios, Dance Studios, Pawn Shops, operators of Game Promotions and Intrastate Moving companies).

Licensed – the procedure followed by those business entities to be licensed or registered with the Division as provided by Florida Statute.

File – the procedure followed by those business entities to document their activities with the Division as required by Florida Statute

### **Data Sources and Methodology:**

This measure is a tabulation of the total number of regulated entities, including Motor Vehicle Repair shops, Charitable Organizations, Professional Solicitors, Fundraising Consultants, Sellers of Travel, Telemarketers, Sellers of Business Opportunities, Health Studios, Dance Studios, and Pawn Shops, operators of Game Promotions and Intrastate Moving companies that are registered / licensed during a period of time. This includes new registrations, renewals, and filings (where applicable). The registration and/or filing information is input into the Division's Oracle application (DOCS) by staff. When a new filing is input, a unique firm number (DTN) is established for that business, and a footprint of the registration and/or filing process creates a history of the filing on the system. There are established criteria within each program that must be met before a registration certificate / license or filing is complete. Upon completion of the required elements, a registration certificate or letter of acceptance is generated and the process is complete for the designated period.

The registration information for each regulated business is added together for the total number of regulated entities that possess a valid, active registration, license or filing with the Department during the specified period. The DOCS Oracle database automatically generates these reports on a quarterly basis, as well as on a final YTD basis. The name of the report generated is #66 Total Registered Entities and the file location is J:\Global\DOCS Reports\Quarterly/Actual Fiscal Year/All

### **Validity:**

The measure is a valid representation of the number of regulated entities that file and/or register with the Department; however, there is no reliable way to identify the number of entities that should file and do not.

### **Reliability:**

The primary source document for registration is the registration and/or filing form, which is completed by the applicant and received by the Department. Upon receipt by the Department, the information is input into the DOCS Oracle application system. In the case of renewals, the computer screen may already be populated with information; therefore, input is an update function. The system creates an historic record of all activities taken with respect to the registration, therefore, records can be recreated upon demand. Statistics are captured on monthly reports which are put in PDF format and stored on J:\Global/ DOCS reports.

## LRPP EXHIBIT IV: PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY

**Department:** Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services

**Program:** Consumer Protection

**Service:** Consumer Protection Service

**Measure:** Number of assists provided to consumers by the call center  
(DOACS approved measure # 61)

**Action** (check one):

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

### **Glossary:**

Assists to consumers – Information and assistance provided to consumers by the Division of Consumer Services.

Call Center - Calls that are handled by the Division's Call Center staff, including calls to the "800 Spanish Hotline." Call Center staff respond to telephone inquiries from consumers and businesses answering questions, providing information to callers from the Oracle database, and mailing information as requested, including complaint forms, registration packages and consumer educational brochures.

### **Data Sources and Methodology:**

The first input for this activity is the number of calls handled by the Call Center, which are all incoming calls on the 800 hotline, messages in Phone Mail, calls that are directed to the regulated program areas, the No Sales program, the Lemon Law program and the Spanish hotline. Each call that comes into the Call Center is tracked by Siemens HiPath Procenter Agile system, the telephone system software package. This software constantly monitors Call Center phone activity and maintains this information in the system for up to 45 days.

The second input for this activity is the amount of correspondence sent to consumers by Call Center staff. The Call Center sends correspondence such as brochures, complaint forms, and registration forms to consumers.

The third input for this activity is the Survey Cards Statistics that are generated from the returned Survey Cards for the month.

At the end of each month, the system generates four reports reflecting telephone activity dating back to the first day of the month. The reports used from the Siemens HiPath Procenter Agile system are the Monthly Group, Queue, Destination, and User

Historical Reports. These source documents are stored in office 145, the Rhodes building.

For the Call Center consumer correspondence, two reports are automatically generated from the DOCS system. The reports generated are the Call Center Correspondence Statistics Report and all DOCS Call Center Activity Reports. These reports track the amount and type of correspondence that is sent from the Call Center to consumers. These statistics are maintained in the DOCS system under DOCS/Reports/Call Center/Correspondence Statistics.

The Survey Cards Statistics are generated from the returned Survey Cards for the month. The source documents are stored in office 145, the Rhodes Building.

A three page Excel report is created using the reports generated from the Siemens HiPath ProCenter Agile system, DOCS Oracle Database and the Returned Survey Cards. This report is printed on a monthly basis, and the information in this report is typed into this Excel spreadsheet. The report printed is maintained at J:\\Global /Monthly Report/Fiscal Year/Call Center. Standard reports are run on a monthly basis and ad hoc reports on demand.

**Validity:**

This is an appropriate measure of performance because it indicates the workload of the unit. However, calls and correspondence are dictated by demand and a lower number of calls and correspondence is not indicative of decreased efforts, but of decreased demand. The Siemens HiPath Procenter Agile system ensures an accurate count of calls received by the Call Center through the 800 hotline (which exceeds 300,000 calls annually). However, the measure does not include the assists provided to consumers by program staff that receive consumer calls on their direct line.

**Reliability:**

The data sources are standardized reports from the Siemens Telephone Reporting System with detailed reports providing additional supporting documentation regarding telephone volume. These records are considered reliable; however, they cannot be maintained historically. Therefore, the information is maintained on the Excel spreadsheet which is printed out and hardcopy kept in the Supervisor's office in the Call Center, as well as placed on the J:\\ drive. The number of inputs is based on consumer demand, and the monthly demand is accurately counted by the Siemens reporting system.

The Correspondence Statistics information is entered into the DOCS Oracle application system without interpretation. Input onto formatted screens that are stored on the DOCS Oracle application system is considered reliable and the information can be retrieved upon demand.

Anyone accessing the documents and spreadsheet reflected under "Data Sources and Methodology" would arrive at the same conclusion.





## LRPP EXHIBIT IV: PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY

**Department:** Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services

**Program:** Consumer Protection

**Service:** Standards and Petroleum Quality Inspection

**Measure:** Percent of regulated weighing and measuring devices, packages, and businesses with scanners in compliance with accuracy standards during initial inspection/testing (DOACS approved measure # 62)

**Action** (check one):

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

### **Glossary of Terms:**

Regulated weighing - measuring devices are devices used in measuring commodities for commercial sale such as scales, motor fuel dispensers (gas pumps at retail stations), taximeters, timing devices, grain moisture meters, etc.

Packages - commodities in containers or wrapped in any manner for sale in which the measurement of the commodity takes place before the time of sale. Packages are tested in lots, which are multiple packages of the same commodity, brand, lot code, etc. Statistical samples are taken of each lot tested and the disposition of the entire lot is based on the results of tests on the samples.

Businesses with scanners - wholesale or retail businesses that utilize electronic means to charge prices to consumers such as Universal Product Code (UPC) scanners, Price Look-Up (PLU) codes, and Stock-Keeping Unit (SKU) codes.

First tests - any accuracy tests of a device that are not being conducted due to any previous tests in which deficiencies were noted.

Petroleum field measuring devices - petroleum dispensers (gas pumps) that are used to fuel consumer vehicles.

WinWAM – A software application used by the Weights and Measures Program to store data.

## **Data Sources and Methodology:**

This measure is comprised of statistical information derived from the Department's Weights and Measures program and Petroleum Inspection program. The measure indicates the percentage of regulated weighing and measuring devices tested that were found to meet specified accuracy parameters on a first test.

Weights and Measures data is derived from the WinWAM relational database. The data sources are the records of field tests/inspections of devices, packages and businesses with scanners conducted throughout the state. All Weights and Measures inspection information is recorded into the WinWAM relational database by field inspectors on laptops. The information is subsequently synchronized with a central version of the WinWAM database housed on a local server. Performance statistics are derived strictly from the WinWAM database. The Weights and Measures reports generated from WinWam used in compiling data for this measure are Device Inspection Results by Type-First Tests Only, Package Inspection Results by Commodity Class-First Tests Only, and UPC Results by Business Type-First Tests Only.

Gasoline pump inspection information is recorded by field inspectors into laptops running the Bureau of Petroleum Inspection IMS database. The local information is subsequently synchronized with a central version of the database housed on a Department server. Statistical information for this performance measure is derived strictly from this database using the "Device Tests Compliance by Inspector" report within the BPI IMS database.

Ultimately, the statistical information from the two programs (Weights and Measures and Petroleum Inspection) is combined for this measure. The percentage is derived by dividing those devices found in accuracy compliance on the first test by the total number of first tests conducted for accuracy.

## **Validity:**

Standardized national procedures are used in the accuracy testing and inspection of devices, packages and businesses with scanners. Results are entered directly into databases from which the calculations are performed. This measure provides the level of accuracy compliance on devices, packages, and pricing practices found at regulated businesses and indicates the probability that consumers are getting fair measures in transactions. However, the measure tends to be weighted towards the results of motor fuel measuring devices (gas pumps) due to the larger number of those devices tested during a period, and may not be a valid indicator of the accuracy compliance rates of other classes of devices on which fewer tests are able to be performed.

**Reliability:**

Several methods are implemented to ensure reliability in this measure. Close field supervision ensures inspections are conducted properly and data is entered into computers correctly. Inspectors cannot modify electronic reports after 24 hours in the WinWam database and 72 hours in the BPI IMS database. Supervisors conduct daily reviews of inspection reports entered and transferred in the database. Hard copy reports are generated by inspectors, signed by facility personnel, and submitted for comparison with the database by data entry personnel. The data is compared to other reports generated within the databases as a reasonable test.

**LRPP Exhibit IV: PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY**

**Department: Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services**

**Program: Consumer Protection**

**Service: Standards & Petroleum Quality Inspection**

**Activity: N/A**

**Measure: Percent of LP Gas facilities found in compliance with safety requirements on first inspection (DOACS approved measure # 63)**

**Action** (check one):

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

**Glossary of Terms:**

First Inspection - the routine annual inspection of a facility or first inspection prior to licensing.

LP Gas Storage and Handling Facility - any location where liquefied petroleum gas is stored in containers for future sale or use, distributed through pipelines or by vehicle, dispensed to the public, or offered for sale in containers.

**Data Sources and Methodology:**

This outcome has been developed as a measure of assurance regarding safety aspects in the storage, transportation, and transfer of liquefied petroleum gases (propane, propylene, butanes, isobutanes, and related hydrocarbons). Even relatively small volumes of liquefied petroleum (LP) gases have an explosive potential that could have a catastrophic effect on communities and individuals. To reduce the possibility of such an event, Department inspectors perform safety inspections at LP gas storage and handling facilities, which include bulk storage sites, dispensing units, cylinder exchange units, bulk trucks,

transports, pipeline systems and consumer systems. Inspections are conducted to ensure compliance with safety codes and laws pertaining to equipment condition, use and maintenance, qualification of staff, facility licensing, insurance requirements, facility installation, procedures, etc. Data for this measure is first collected in the field by inspectors at the time of inspection when it is recorded on inspection report forms. Data collected is stored in the LPGas database, an Oracle application. The report which provides the data for this performance measure is LPG0600. Data is summarized at the end of each month in each inspector's monthly report that is submitted to the supervisor in the headquarter's office along with the inspector's completed inspection reports. Calculations for percentages are based on number/percentage of first inspections with no violations as compared to total number of inspections (fiscal year basis).

### **Validity:**

The measure is a direct indication of increased public safety, since facilities at which violations are noted are brought into compliance with codes and standards referenced above, which are designed to provide for the safe use and handling of this product for consumers, industry and the public.

The validity of the information is confirmed through monthly computer-generated reports that are verified for accuracy by both the inspector and the supervisor. This measure could be affected by a change in inspection priorities or policies due to a potential threat (such as a report of improper installations at a 500-site mobile home park) that could skew this data to indicate more violations being found in proportion to facilities found in compliance upon first inspection. Additionally, a shift in focus of inspections determined by risk assessments could cause this measure to be re-examined and changed in the future.

It should also be noted that a small number of violations found are the result of mechanical failure or exposure to elements and are not directly associated with any action or activity of the department, and statistical changes could occur due to outside forces, such as hurricanes, flooding, etc.

### **Reliability:**

Data is continually reviewed at different levels of the inspection process to ensure consistency and accuracy. Inspections are primarily based on National Fire Protection Association (NFPA) Standard 58, *Storage and Handling of Liquefied Petroleum Gases*; NFPA Standard #54, *National Fuel Gas Code*; NFPA 1192, *Standard on Recreational Vehicles*; Title 49 of the Federal Code of Regulations governing pipeline systems and hazardous materials transportation (delivery vehicles); Chapter 527, Florida Statutes; and Rule Chapter 5F-11, Florida Administrative Code. Inspection procedures are standardized and reviewed periodically to ensure uniformity. Inspection procedures are set forth in writing and a copy is provided to all staff. Initial data is submitted by the field inspector to the LP Gas Inspector Supervisor in Tallahassee for review. Once reviewed, the data is entered into a database, from which reports are produced and periodically reviewed by both management and inspections staff. Inspections staff verifies monthly reports after data entry for accuracy. The database facilitates collection of data and allows automated production of reports to ensure accuracy and reliability. Any changes made after

performance measure “final” reports are made (due to corrections, additions or deletions to the database) are documented to a file maintained by the Bureau Chief, titled “Audit File – database changes”.

## **LRPP EXHIBIT IV: PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY**

**Department: Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services**

**Program: Consumer Protection**

**Service: Standards & Petroleum Quality Inspection**

**Measure: Percent of amusement attractions found in full compliance with safety requirements on first inspection (DOACS approved measure # 64)**

**Action** (check one):

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

### **Glossary of Terms:**

In full compliance with statutory requirements on first inspection - means that when the ride is initially presented for an inspection, the inspector does not find a deficiency that must be corrected by the owner before the amusement ride is allowed to operate for use by the public.

Deficiencies - mechanical, structural or electrical faults, or some other violation of statutory or rule requirement (such as lapsed insurance) that the owner must correct before the inspector will allow the ride to operate for public use.

### **Data Sources and Methodology:**

The data for this measure are derived by using the results of all inspections for all amusement rides in the state. Permanent amusement rides are inspected twice annually and temporary amusement rides are inspected each time they are moved or set up. The total number of amusement ride inspections performed in the state each year is in excess of 9,000. The total number of amusement rides on which no deficiencies are found during an inspection is divided by the total number of inspections on all amusement devices to determine this percentage. An inspection report is completed on each amusement ride inspection by the field inspectors and sent to the home office in Tallahassee. Each inspection report is entered into and compiled on the Fair Rides Access database.

**Validity:**

This is an accurate measure of the effectiveness of amusement ride inspections and an accurate indicator of the need for those inspections. This measures compliance of the industry with the Florida standards, rules and statutory requirements for amusement rides and indicates trends for compliance. Deficiencies that are noted by the field inspectors upon inspection of an amusement ride may constitute a danger to public safety and must be repaired prior to an amusement ride being allowed to open for public use. Parenthetically, the percentage of amusement rides in full compliance with statutory requirements on first inspection has generally been rising each year. This is a positive indicator of the industry's emphasis on improved ride preparation and an excellent indicator of the effectiveness of the Bureau's inspection program.

**Reliability:**

The reliability of this data could be affected by several variables, such as: the type of device, the stage of assembly of the devices and the competence of employees assembling the rides. The Bureau standardizes inspection techniques and training of field inspectors so as to limit the variability inherent in inspections. This is an outcome measure that serves as a reliable indicator of the performance of the amusement ride inspection program. This measure is fairly illustrative of the regulated industry's ability to consistently conduct safety inspections. The information is also reviewed for consistency as it is entered into the database. Numerical information regarding the total number of amusement rides inspected the first time, i.e., excluding re-inspections, etc., and the total number of amusement rides in full compliance on first inspection is generated from the Fair Rides Access database.

**LRPP EXHIBIT IV: PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY****Department: Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services****Program: Consumer Protection****Service: Standards and Petroleum Quality Inspections****Measure: Percent of petroleum products meeting quality standards  
(DOACS approved measure # 65)****Action** (check one):

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

**Glossary of Terms:**

Quality Analyses - Established test methods and performance standards that are used to evaluate petroleum products. The test methods and performance standards have been adopted into rule from ASTM International, a consensus standards organization and USDOT Motor Vehicle Safety Standard No. 116.

Wholesale Terminals - The facilities generally located in ports for storage of large volumes of petroleum products for further distribution.

Retail Facilities - The local gasoline stations and convenience stores that dispense gasoline to the public. In reference to antifreeze and brake fluid samples, retail facilities can also include department stores, automotive parts stores, grocery stores, and similar locations.

### **Data Sources and Methodology:**

Petroleum products refer to gasoline, diesel fuel, alternative fuels, kerosene, fuel oil, brake fluid, and antifreeze products offered to the public for sale. The quality standards are established by statute and rule and are based on specifications developed by national consensus organizations such as ASTM International.

The Department conducted last fiscal year approximately 143,670 tests on 41,206 petroleum samples, covering gasoline, diesel fuel, alternative fuels, kerosene, fuel oil, brake fluid and antifreeze products. The samples were collected at wholesale terminals and retail facilities by petroleum inspectors, and information pertinent to the collection of the samples was recorded on standardized sample collection forms. Various quality analyses were performed on the petroleum and alternative fuel samples at one of three petroleum laboratories to ensure compliance with established quality standards. Testing information was recorded on the same standardized form used to record sample collection information. Databases have not been established at this time to capture sampling and testing information except for antifreeze and brake fluid products. Sampling and testing information for the other products is currently manually tabulated and recorded in spreadsheets. The measurement percentage is derived by dividing the number of samples that meet quality specifications by the total number of random samples tested.

### **Validity:**

Due to the large number of random samples collected and analyzed, the outcome provides a valid measure of fuel quality representative of the state. In addition, the petroleum products are collected continually throughout the year ensuring representative sampling. The standards, testing procedures, and distribution system for petroleum products are currently undergoing significant change in many areas; therefore, this outcome will have to be re-evaluated as these changes occur to ensure continued meaningful results. The standards and test procedures used are adopted into law and rule from an internationally recognized standards writing organization.

### **Reliability:**

Quality control samples within the laboratories, amongst the laboratories, and amongst various, independent laboratories are exchanged to ensure consistency and reliability with reported data. Individual laboratory results are reviewed by each laboratory manager and then by the laboratory administrator. Sample results are currently tabulated by hand by the individual laboratory managers and tabulated into spreadsheets by the Tallahassee laboratory administrator. Statistics are reviewed monthly by the Bureau Chief for consistency.

## **LRPP Exhibit IV: PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY**

**Department:** Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services

**Program:** Consumer Protection

**Service:** Standards & Petroleum Quality Inspection

**Activity:** Conduct LP gas inspections

**Measure:** Number of LP gas facility inspections and re-inspections conducted (DOACS approved measure # 66)

**Action** (check one):

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

### **Glossary of Terms:**

LP Gas Facility Inspection or Routine Inspection – an inspection conducted to ensure compliance with safety codes and laws pertaining to equipment condition, use and maintenance, qualification of persons engaged in LP Gas-related activities, facility licensing, compliance with insurance requirements, facility installation, procedures, etc.

LP Gas Facility Re-Inspection – a follow-up to a routine inspection to determine whether or not deficiencies identified in a prior inspection have been corrected.

LP Gas Storage and Handling Facility - any location where liquefied petroleum gas is stored in containers for future sale or use, distributed through pipelines or by vehicle, dispensed to the public, or offered for sale in containers.

### **Data Sources and Methodology:**

This measure tracks the number of Liquefied Petroleum (LP) Gas facility inspections and re-inspections conducted by the LP gas inspectors. Liquefied petroleum (LP) gases, even in relatively small volumes, have an explosive potential that could have a catastrophic effect on communities and individuals. To reduce the possibility of such an event, Department inspectors perform safety inspections at LP gas storage and handling facilities, which



include bulk storage sites, dispensing units, cylinder exchange units, bulk trucks, transports, pipeline systems and consumer systems. When a determination of a safety violation is made at a facility, the facility is either red-tagged and placed out of service until repairs are completed or a time frame is given for correction. At the end of the time frame or removal of the red tag, a re-inspection is conducted to determine compliance. The measure is determined by the total inspections and re-inspections conducted on a fiscal year basis.

Collection of data is accomplished by the data entry of inspections information as it is received in the office and after review of the original document by the Inspector Supervisor. After entry onto the database, information is verified by both the Inspector Supervisor and the field staff through the use of monthly automated reports. Data collected is stored in the LPGas database, an Oracle application. The report which provides the data for this performance measure is LPG0600 and contains the total number of inspections and re-inspections conducted.

### **Validity:**

Compliance inspections and re-inspections are necessary to ensure public safety. The measure is a direct indication of increased public safety, since facilities at which violations are noted are brought into compliance with codes and standards designed to provide a safe product for use by industry members and the public. The measure may vary slightly from year-to-year because of the number of facilities inspected prior to the end of the fiscal year that are scheduled for re-inspection *after* the end of the fiscal year, changes in codes, laws or regulations, or due to various other external or internal factors. Additionally, an increase in the number of facilities found in compliance with safety violations at the time of routine inspection will affect the need for re-inspection.

### **Reliability:**

The data is very reliable. Data is continually reviewed at different levels of the process to ensure consistency and accuracy. Inspections are based primarily on National Fire Protection Association (NFPA) Standard 58, *Storage and Handling of Liquefied Petroleum Gases*; NFPA Standard #54, *National Fuel Gas Code*; NFPA 501C, *Standard on Recreational Vehicles*; Title 49 of the Federal Code of Regulations governing pipeline systems; Chapter 527, Florida Statutes; and Rule Chapter 5F-11, Florida Administrative Code. Inspection procedures are standardized and reviewed periodically to ensure uniformity. Initial data is forwarded to the LP Gas Inspector Supervisor for review and to ensure uniformity. Once reviewed, the data is entered into the ORACLE database that produces reports for staff and management review. This database collects inspections information, including maintaining an inspections history. This ensures the reliability of the information as detailed reports are produced monthly for verification by inspectors and management. Any changes made after performance measure “final” reports are made (due to corrections, additions or deletions to the database) are documented to a file maintained by the Bureau Chief, titled “Audit File – database changes”.

## **LRPP EXHIBIT IV: PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY**

**Department: Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services**  
**Program: Consumer Protection**  
**Service: Standards and Petroleum Quality Inspections**  
**Measure: Number of petroleum field inspections conducted**  
**(DOACS approved measure # 67)**

**Action** (check one)

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

### **Glossary of Terms:**

Petroleum Dispensers - Pumps at retail fueling stations open to the general public used by consumers to meter a volume of motor fuel to their vehicles as well as wholesale devices used in the distribution of petroleum products. Although inspections are conducted by request at private facilities such as military bases, municipality fueling stations, and fleet fueling stations, the vast majority of inspections are conducted at those stations open to the general public or engaging in petroleum fuel distribution. This also includes the evaluation of petroleum fuels on-site and said fuels contained in facility or terminal storage tanks.

Inspections of petroleum dispensers - Include tests for measurement accuracy and general maintenance and use. The measurement accuracy test consists of pumping a specified volume of petroleum product through a dispenser into a calibrated test measure. The volume of the pumped fuel is then measured to ensure the dispenser is accurate within specified tolerances. General maintenance inspections ensure that hoses are safe, price and volume indicators are operating properly, valves are not leaking, quality product is being delivered, pricing practices are adhered to, required alternate electricity generation equipment has been installed, etc. In addition, the design of the device is inspected to ensure that petroleum products cannot be fraudulently diverted.

Petroleum Products - Gasoline, diesel fuel, alternative fuels, kerosene, fuel oil or similar products.

Consumer Vehicles refer to vehicles owned by citizens or businesses that operate on petroleum products.

### **Data Sources and Methodology:**

Petroleum field inspections in this measure refer to all inspections performed by the Bureau of Petroleum Inspection (BPI) inspectors on petroleum dispensers (pumps) that are used to fuel consumer vehicles, including storage tanks, product and pricing practice evaluations and alternate electricity generation equipment inspections. Gasoline pump inspection information is recorded by field inspectors into laptops running the BPI IMS database. The information on the laptop is subsequently synchronized with a central version of the database housed on a department server. Statistical information for this performance measure is derived strictly from this database using various report features within the BPI IMS database.

**Validity:**

One of the goals for the petroleum inspection program is to assure consumers that the petroleum dispensers are properly calibrated and function in a mechanically sound and safe manner. To achieve that goal, an objective of inspecting pumps at least once every year and a half (on average) was previously established. The frequency at which a given facility is inspected is based upon a calculated risk factor, which is calculated by the number and type of deficiencies found at a facility during a scheduled inspection combined with the duration between scheduled inspections. The risk factor is calculated by the BPI database, after the inspector enters data from a scheduled inspection. Facilities with a higher risk factor require more frequent inspections than facilities with a lower risk factor. Additionally, consumer complaints also prompt visits to facilities and the results are subsequently entered into the BPI database. Nationally recognized test methods are used for testing petroleum dispensers and nationally recognized tolerances are used for judging the calibration of dispensers.

**Reliability:**

Several methods are implemented to ensure reliability in this measure. Close field supervision and training ensures inspections are conducted properly and data is entered into computers correctly. Inspectors cannot modify electronic reports after 72 hours in the BPI IMS database. Supervisors conduct daily reviews of inspection reports entered and transferred in the database. Hard copy reports are generated by inspectors and submitted for comparison with the database by data entry personnel. The data is compared to other reports generated within the BPI IMS database as a reasonable test.

**LRPP EXHIBIT IV: PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY**

**Department: Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services**

**Program: Consumer Protection**

**Service: Standards and Petroleum Quality Inspections**

**Measure: Number of petroleum tests performed  
(DOACS approved measure # 68)**

**Action (check one):**

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

### **Glossary of Terms:**

Quality Analyses - Established test methods and performance standards that are used to evaluate petroleum products. The test methods and performance standards have been adopted into rule from the ASTM International, a consensus standards writing organization and USDOT Motor Vehicle Safety Standard No. 116.

Wholesale Terminals - The facilities generally located in ports for storage of large volumes of petroleum products for further distribution.

Retail Facilities - The local gasoline stations and convenience stores that dispense gasoline to the public. In reference to antifreeze and brake fluid samples, retail facilities can also include department stores, automotive parts stores, grocery stores, and similar locations.

### **Data Sources and Methodology:**

The Department tests petroleum samples, including gasoline, diesel, kerosene, alternative fuels, fuel oil, brake fluid and antifreeze products against adopted quality standards. The samples are collected at wholesale terminals and retail facilities by petroleum inspectors, and information pertinent to the collection of the sample is recorded on standardized sample collection forms. Various analytical tests are performed on the samples at one of three petroleum laboratories to ensure compliance. Testing information is recorded on the same standardized form used to record sample collection information. Databases have not been established at this time to capture sampling and testing information except for antifreeze and brake fluid products. Sampling and testing information for the other products is currently manually tabulated and recorded in spreadsheets.

### **Validity:**

This activity and output provide a valid measure for the workload of the petroleum inspection laboratories. Historical information will provide information to compute the efficiency of sample testing. Further, sample unit costs will provide comparison information regarding privatization. This activity combined with the associative outcome measure, percentage of petroleum products meeting quality standards, also provides valid information regarding the success of the program.

### **Reliability:**

Quality control samples within the laboratories, amongst the laboratories, and with various independent laboratories are exchanged to ensure consistency and reliability with reported data.. Individual laboratory results are reviewed by each laboratory manager and then by the laboratory administrator. Sample results are currently tabulated by hand by the individual laboratory managers and tabulated into spreadsheets by the Tallahassee laboratory administrator. Statistics are reviewed monthly by the Bureau Chief for consistency.

## **LRPP EXHIBIT IV: PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY**

**Department** Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services  
**Program:** Consumer Protection  
**Service:** Standards & Petroleum Quality Inspection  
**Measure:** Number of amusement ride safety inspections conducted  
(DOACS approved measure # 69)

**Action** (check one):

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

### **Glossary of Terms:**

Temporary amusement rides - Those rides that are regularly relocated with or without disassembly.

Inspection report – A form which is used to record administrative information and information on the condition of an amusement ride each time it is inspected.

Deficiencies - Conditions found on a ride at the time of inspection that are a violation of our standards and, if not corrected, would prevent the ride from operating for public use.

### **Data Sources and Methodology:**

This data is derived by using all inspection results for the amusement rides inspected in the state. Permanent amusement rides are inspected twice annually, and temporary amusement rides are inspected each time they are moved or set up. The total number of amusement ride inspections performed in the state each year is in excess of 9,000. An inspection report is completed for each amusement device inspection by the field inspectors and sent to the home office in Tallahassee. Each inspection report is entered into and compiled on the Access Database, and a hard copy of the inspection report is retained for three years.

**Validity:**

This is an accurate measure of the number of amusement ride inspections and an accurate indicator of the need for those inspections. This output measure also serves as an excellent indicator of the workload of the amusement ride inspection program. The inspections measure compliance by the industry with the standards, rules and statutory requirements for amusement devices and indicate trends for compliance. Deficiencies that are noted by the field inspectors when inspecting an amusement device may constitute a danger to the public and must be repaired prior to the ride being allowed to open for public use. This is a measure of the total effort in the enforcement of law, rules and standards in administering this program. All other functions of the Bureau of Fair Ride Inspections are for the support of these amusement ride inspections.

**Reliability:**

This is an accurate measure because it is an actual record of the number and results of inspections during any given period. This information can be recalled for analysis in many different ways: by ride, by inspector, by owner, by location and by any given time frame.

## LRPP EXHIBIT IV: PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY

**Department:** Department of Agriculture & Consumer Services  
**Program:** Agriculture and Economic Development  
**Service:** Fruit and Vegetable Inspection & Enforcement  
**Measure:** Dollar value of fruit & vegetables that are shipped to other states or countries that are subject to mandatory inspection (DOACS approved measure # 70)

**Action** (check one):

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

### **Data Sources and Methodology:**

The “Bible” for dollar values of farm products is the publication, “Farm Cash Receipts and Expenditures.” This publication is produced annually and covers all crops and livestock.

### **Validity:**

The purpose of inspection is to support the marketing of agricultural products by assuring the quality and condition of produce moving in market channels. Additional inspection prevents lower priced, inferior produce from clogging market channels. The fact that the dollar value of fruits & vegetables requiring inspection and that are exported to other states and countries remains high proves that the program is effective.

### **Reliability:**

The basic data is generated by the Agricultural Statistical Service in cooperation with the USDA’s Agricultural Marketing Service and National Agricultural Statistics Service. The data generated is part of a national program using established and standardized sampling and statistical procedures for all states. This is the best data available.

## LRPP EXHIBIT IV: PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY

**Department:** Department of Agriculture & Consumer Services  
**Program:** Agriculture and Economic Development  
**Service:** Fruit and Vegetable Inspection & Enforcement  
**Measure:** Number of tons of fruits and vegetables inspected (DOACS approved measure # 71)

**Action** (check one):

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

**Glossary:**

Certificates - Federal certification form

Fresh Shipment Reports - Reports of all Fruit and Vegetable Shipments for domestic and international markets

Manifest - Bill of Lading

**Data Sources and Methodology:**

The data is collected by inspectors as a result of certifying the quality and condition of fruit and vegetables. The data is collected daily on inspection certificates and manifests. The data is summarized on an annual basis (August through July for citrus) on certified Fresh Shipment Reports and is distributed to industry representatives. The data is available on a statewide and production area basis.

This measure includes a count of: Number of tons of citrus inspected:

Number of tons of vegetables inspected:

Number of tons of fruits and vegetables inspected at terminal markets.

**Validity:**

The measure is valid because it is an actual account of all inspections made. The quality of the data is attested to by the fact that it is the vehicle used to collect inspection fees, revenue of the Department of Citrus as well as several smaller activities. Each of these entities/activities monitor revenues received against estimates throughout the year.

**Reliability:**

As mentioned above, the data receives considerable scrutiny throughout the year. In addition, all data documents are sequentially numbered and accounted for at the end of each collection year. Inspectors are required to attend annual training sessions, an element of which covers the use and accuracy of inspection documents. Documents received from the field are checked for completeness in the Winter Haven office.



## LRPP EXHIBIT IV: PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY

**Department:** Agriculture and Consumer Services  
**Program:** Agricultural Economic Development  
**Service:** Agricultural Products Marketing  
**Measure:** Florida agricultural products as a percent of the national market  
(DOACS approved measure # 72)

**Action** (check one):

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

### **Data Sources and Methodology:**

The U.S. Department of Agriculture collects this data annually nationwide through its National Ag Statistics Service. It relies on state-federal offices such as the Florida Ag Statistics Service to collect and analyze the information at the state level and it then compiles national statistics. Preliminary data is obtained via email from the USDA in mid-summer, before the data is posted to the following USDA website: <http://www.ers.usda.gov/Data/farmincome/FinfidmuXls.htm> (use the "Annual Cash Receipts, 1924 – 2xxx lookup table). Final data is posted each year in November.

The percent is determined by dividing Florida's dollar value by the national dollar value and multiplying that amount by 100.

### **Validity:**

The measure is a valid comparison of how well the Florida agricultural industry is performing compared with the industry nationwide. However, while the measure accurately reflects and compares Florida's position to the national composite, it should not be used to gauge or measure the overall effectiveness of marketing initiatives. Nor can the national market comparisons be used to speculate regarding economic performance of the state's agricultural industry without marketing, advertising and promotional initiatives. It doesn't necessarily indicate how successful the Department's campaigns have been because there are many factors outside the Department that can impact the outcome measure (weather, foreign competition, over-production, etc.).

Still, favorable weather, prudent international trade strategies on the federal level, and repetitive exposure of Florida's marketing messages are all necessary for the state to retain its position as a national agricultural leader.

Reports are issued on a calendar-year basis. The previous year's data is preliminarily released in early summer, and final numbers are posted in the final quarter of the

calendar year. The Division develops its LRPP using the preliminary numbers, but then updates it when the final information is available.

**Reliability:**

The information is very reliable in that it utilizes data that has been successfully collected for decades using basically the same methodology. And, it's done nationwide using these same techniques. All states use the information to gauge its production against the other states.

A file titled "Calculations for FY xx-xx (indicating the fiscal year) Used in FY yy-yy Budget Preparation" is maintained in the Director's Office.

Note: the file name obviously changes each year to include the current year within the title.

Because it is well documented, there is a high probability that anyone performing the calculation would reach the same conclusion or percent.

**EXHIBIT IV: PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY**

**Department: Agriculture and Consumer Services**  
**Program: Agricultural Economic Development**  
**Service: Agricultural Products Marketing**  
**Measure: Total sales of agricultural and seafood products generated by tenants of State Farmers Markets**  
**(DOACS approved measure #73)**

**Action (check one):**

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

**Definitions:**

Tenant – a person, real or corporate, operating a business and occupying space at a State Farmers' Market under the terms of an executed lease agreement.

Total Sales of agricultural and seafood products – Dollar value of agricultural and seafood products sold by tenants and reported to the state farmers' market offices where their leases reside. Note: Tenants are required to report only those agricultural products sold due to its affiliation with the state farmers' market location. Corporate sales made from other locations are not included in this requirement. The Bureau's

Operations Manual and individual tenant leases provide specific details regarding this requirement.

Agricultural and seafood product – Any fresh or processed horticultural, aquacultural, viticultural, fish or seafood, dairy, poultry, apicultural, or other farm or garden product. Note: A tenant dealing in one or more of these commodities may be exempt from this reporting measure depending on the nature of its activities at the market (i.e., activity is limited to parking). The sale of products not included in this definition (i.e., fertilizer), while beneficial to the local economy in general, are not included in this performance measure which aims to capture the market's direct financial impact of agricultural producers.

### **Data Sources and Methodology:**

The Division of Marketing receives this data from the tenants who lease facilities on the state farmers' markets. Lease agreements with tenants who qualify for this requirement contain specific language indicating what must be reported, when the report is due and to whom it should be provided. Certain leaseholders are exempt because they do not sell products (i.e., food recovery tenants who collect agricultural products and donate them to food distribution agencies). Truck brokers, who lease space on markets for the convenience of close contact with their clients but who do not make direct sales of products, and administrative leaseholders (i.e., food inspectors) are also exempt from the requirement. Each contract spells out whether the leaseholder is required to provide sales data. Once data is collected at the local market, it is forwarded to the Bureau of State Farmers' Markets Administrative Office each month and calculated by the bureau on an annual basis. Concise instructions regarding data collection, including types of agricultural products, which tenants are required to report, and when the reports are due are also included in the Bureau's Operations Manual. All new leases executed in FY 09-10, and renewal leases for FY 2010-11 and beyond will contain specific language regarding reporting requirements.

Our methodology involves entering data into internal automated spreadsheets for statistical compilation, analysis and reporting. "Sales generated on the markets" are calculated in a spreadsheet called "FY *num* qtr market numbers" where "FY" is the fiscal year designated as "xxxx-xxxx" and "num" is the quarter number from monthly reports generated at the markets from commodity reports given them by tenants. The spreadsheet resides on a PC in the Administrative Office.

### **Validity:**

The movement of Florida grown and produced products is the very essence of the State Farmers' Market (SFM) system. The measure is the best identifier of the value of the SFM system, and is an outstanding indicator of the rise and fall of the state's agricultural industry.

The Division of Marketing's goal is to provide distribution facilities around the state which facilitate the sale and movement of Florida-grown commodities, which in turn generates economic benefits to the communities they're serving. Distributing agricultural

commodities requires manpower and resources, both of which contribute to the economies of the place they're occurring. It stands to reason that tracking the volume of sales that occur on these markets serves as a monitor of the use of local manpower and resources, while also providing a barometer of the economic value agriculture generates in the communities.

**Reliability:**

The reliability of the data is high because our tenants are subject to audits by the State (Bureau of Ag Dealer's Licenses), the IRS and other agencies that regulate trade.

The information is submitted to the market manager by the tenant at each state farmers' market and is a requirement of each leaseholder that qualifies by the above definitions. The information is collected monthly at each market and compiled into a market report that shows the value of commodities by commodity type, monthly and year-to-date. Once the report is received in the Bureau's Administrative office, monthly totals are entered into an Excel Spreadsheet and a second individual verifies a print out of the data in comparison with the original reports from the markets. The PC does the computations, so anyone running the program will get the same results.

**LRPP EXHIBIT IV: PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY**

**Department: Agriculture and Consumer Services**

**Program: Agricultural Economic Development**

**Service: Agricultural Products Marketing**

**Measure: Percent of available square feet of State Farmers' Markets leased (DOACS approved measure #74)**

**Action** (check one):

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

**Data Sources and Methodology:**

The source of this data is in-house records of the Bureau of State Farmers' Markets' leased spaces, which are maintained on an automated database (Microsoft Access). The figure that is used as the criteria is the square footage of market space leased (derived from actual leases created on the database) on June 30 each year compared to the total square footage of the Markets (maintained as Space Inventory in the same database) to calculate the percentage of available square footage leased.

The Bureau of State Farmers Markets maintains a database named "State Markets Lease Management" to track data regarding the square feet available for leasing and actual square feet leased in the bureau's Administration Section. Data from this database is entered into a spreadsheet called "FY num qtr market numbers" where "FY" is the fiscal year designated as "xxxx-xxxx" and "num" is the quarter number.

The percent is determined by dividing the total square footage of the market space leased by the square footage of markets on June 30th and then multiplying the answer by 100. This is accomplished automatically via a database report called "Space Inventory and Leased Space".

**Validity:**

As is the case with any entity that leases property, occupied space is an indicator of one of three things: if there is a demand for that type of property, if the property is competitively priced, or if tenant recruitment is effective. The use of this measure ensures that the activity is needed, that it fills a void which private industry is not satisfying and that the Division of Marketing and Development is maximizing its performance. The measure is a viable reflection of the scope of service provided to the state's agricultural community - cost effective, specialized business infrastructure.

However, a decrease in the percent is not necessarily indicative of poor performance. The physical condition of the markets, for example, may deter vendors from leasing space. Generating adequate revenue for maintenance and repairs is critical to providing facilities that attract and retain tenants.

**Reliability:**

The Department creates and maintains lease agreements on an automated database in order to satisfy required state audits. The automated system tracks the amount of square footage leased and is a reliable and efficient system.

There is a high probability that the same conclusion would be reached by anyone repeating the calculation. Each lease agreement is input into the computer based upon information supplied by the market manager. The computer then uses the rate table established for each type of space at each market to calculate the terms for the lease. On the date identified above, the database is queried and generates a report that totals the amount of space actually leased system-wide. That total is compared with the known available square footage (derived from diagrams created at the market level, based on physical measurements and reported to the database manager) to produce the percentage.

**LRPP EXHIBIT IV: PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY**

**Department: Agriculture and Consumer Services**  
**Program: Agricultural Economic Development**  
**Service: Agricultural Products Marketing**  
**Measure: Number of buyers reached with agricultural promotion campaign messages (DOACS approved measure # 75)**

**Action** (check one):

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

**Data Sources and Methodology:**

Sources of the data are:

- Arbitron Company and Nielsen Media Research ratings for radio and television
- Editor and Publisher Yearbook for newspapers
- Magazine Publishers of America (MPA) for magazines
- Florida Outdoor Advertising Federation for outdoor advertising
- Program sponsors for trade shows, exhibitions, meetings and other similar venues
- Division of Marketing automated inventory records for distribution of materials disseminated directly to individual consumers and/or groups
- Florida Department of Health for the number of WIC recipients receiving Farmers Market Nutrition Program tickets good for fresh fruits and vegetables at local farmers markets
- Individual in-store sales flyer distribution counts, store traffic information and corporate customer data supplied by retail markets participating in Division marketing initiatives.

The television, radio, print and outdoor advertising industries all depend upon independent monitors to determine their audiences. This information is readily available, because it is the authority by which they establish their advertising rates. Division of Marketing and Development staff obtain this media data directly from the outlets that create or use the FAPC and related agricultural promotional materials. Trade shows, exhibitions, etc., charge participants on the basis of foot traffic at the event, and this data is provided to the participants following the event. The Division internally records the distribution of materials that go directly to individuals and groups, and uses Internet-based software to determine "hits" to its websites. The WIC – FMNP program is one in which the federal and state governments share the cost to provide WIC recipients with an opportunity to get fresh fruits and vegetables at no cost to them from local farmers markets. It is administered by the Bureau of Food Distribution and the Bureau of State Farmers Markets within the Department of Agriculture and

Consumer Services. The Department of Health hands out coupons worth a total of \$20 per recipient, which can be redeemed at local farmers markets from producers who have been reviewed by the Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services to verify their product is Florida-grown. The recipients are also provided literature explaining the value of including fresh fruits and vegetables in their diets. The Department of Health provides data to the Department of Agriculture regarding the number of recipients who receive coupons. Each recipient is counted as a “buyer” reached by the FAPC Campaign message.

Prior to the start of any promotional or education campaign, return on the anticipated investment is estimated in order to determine its viability. Standardized forms and procedures are utilized. Immediately following conclusion of the campaign/event, data is calculated again using the technique described above to determine the actual ROI. Quarterly benchmark reports are prepared to measure results of all campaigns/projects for the period as well as year-to-date.

The following formula is used to determine funding for this activity:

Bureau of Seafood & Aquaculture Promotion

General Revenue	60%
General Inspection Trust Fund	60%
Saltwater Products Promotion TF	60%
Market Trade Show TF	60%
FAPC TF	60%

Bureau of Development & Information

General Revenue	
Salary	85%
Expense	85%
OPS	85%
Risk Management	85%
Human Resources Transfer	85%
General Inspection TF	
Salary	85%
Market Trade Show TF	85%
FAPC TF	85%
Ag Emergency Eradication TF	
Special Category (FAPC)	100%

**Validity:**

The use of independent monitors by the media ensures the validity of that portion of the measure. The methodology used for non-media consumer contacts is in keeping with standard practices of promotional and educational entities.

Measuring efforts as they relate to the number of buyers exposed to the message is a recognized practice of the advertising industry for evaluating the effectiveness of promotional and educational campaigns in the absence of clear delineation of direct sales data. It is the most suitable methodology for the Division of Marketing and Development because the FAPC and related agricultural campaigns constitute only a part of the overall advertising and promotional effort of Florida's commodity groups.

A formula using estimations is necessary to capture funding information for this activity because of its relationship with another activity in the Department "Number of marketing assists provided to producers and businesses".

Routinely, promotional or educational campaigns conducted by the Department on behalf of agricultural commodity groups contain some components designed to increase profits for the group by influencing consumers, and others that increase profitability by helping the commodity group operate more efficiently. Attempting to capture exact costs of such initiatives into "consumer" and "industry assists" categories are not practical because all of the components are developed simultaneously and by the same personnel; often using common resources.

The Department has closely evaluated the two activities, however, and feels that the Bureau of Development and Information directs approximately 85% of its time and expenditures towards consumers and 15% for direct industry assistance, while in the Bureau of Seafood and Aquaculture Promotion, the ratio is about 60% toward consumers and 40% directly toward industry. There is one exception (as can be noted in the funding table listed above): 100% of the funds in Special Category 100131 in General Revenue and the Agricultural Emergency Eradication Trust Fund allocated by the Legislature for the FAPC campaign are included in this activity's funding.

While not accurate to the dollar in either of the two independent activities, collectively all funds expended by the Department in an effort to increase profitability for the agriculture sector are captured and the formula provides an accurate reflection of its initiatives.

This measure is a good indicator of the level of service provided on behalf of Florida's agricultural industry. We perform *on behalf of* an entire industry, but the industry does not make sales – businesses do. That information is closely guarded in most cases because businesses don't want competitors to have that information and it becomes public when we obtain it. Short of having sales data, the next best thing is consumer impressions made, because frequency of exposure is the number one way to sell a product. The Division does document actual sales whenever possible and the information is used in its decisions regarding continuation of specific campaigns.

**Reliability:**



Department staff develops and analyzes ROI Reports. An automated, standardized form is utilized Division wide. A team of internal staff verifies the information in periodical random audits. Industry groups are frequently surveyed as well, to monitor “customer satisfaction” regarding our representation of their respective industry.

The probability that someone else calculating the ROI results would end up with the same number we provide is high so long as they use the same formulas that we use. There are multiple ways consumers are reached with messages, each requiring a unique formula because we cannot assume every TV viewer watching a particular channel, or every reader of a magazine actually views our ad on the channel or in the publication. Our data as to which media was used and the “viewership” of each media leave no room for discrepancy whether it is us or someone else making the calculations. But making that “raw” data relevant to our campaigns requires adjustments that have to be applied identically by whoever is making the calculations.

#### **LRPP EXHIBIT IV: PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY**

**Department: Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services**

**Program: Agricultural Economic Development**

**Service: Agricultural Products Marketing**

**Measure: Number of marketing assists provided to producers and businesses  
(Approved measure # 76)**

**Action** (check one):

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

#### **Glossary:**

Marketing Assist – A significant exchange of information provided to a specific producer or business that could enable the business or producer to improve performance, increase sales, or reduce job-related risks (physical or financial); or the production of materials to achieve such an exchange. The representative list of activities for this measure follows. The list is not all inclusive:

Merchandising calls – personal visits or telephone contacts with businesses, primarily retailers who buy and resell commodities and products from Florida. Each company receiving a merchandising call – either in person or via telephone – is counted as a recipient of an agriculturally related assist. This activity is associated with the Bureaus of Development & Information and Seafood & Aquaculture. Data is being captured manually by each marketing representative.

Trade leads – Data regarding potential large-scale purchase of Florida agricultural products and commodities that is provided to sellers of products grown and made in Florida. Each company receiving a trade lead is counted as a recipient of an agriculturally related assist each time such data is provided. This activity is associated with the Bureaus of Development & Information and Seafood & Aquaculture. Our distribution lists are our means for capturing the data.

Trade missions – An event designed to bring Florida exporters together with potential buyers. Each participating company in such events is counted as a recipient of an agriculturally related assist. This activity is associated with the Bureaus of Development & Information and Seafood & Aquaculture. Data is captured manually following each event.

SFM / WIC Nutrition Program – A cooperative program between the Florida Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services, Florida Department of Health and the U.S. Department of Agriculture in which WIC eligible individuals are given coupons which can be redeemed at local farmers markets for fresh fruits and vegetables grown in Florida. Each farmer participating in sales that are a part of this program is assessed for eligibility and provided materials that are used in conducting their activities. Each farmer receiving this service is counted as a recipient of an agriculturally related assist. The Department provides permits to participating farmers and the permit records are the source for collecting the data. This activity is associated with the Bureaus of Food Distribution and State Farmers Markets. Recipients of the food receive printed information about Florida's agricultural industry, and specifically information about the value of adding fresh fruits and vegetables to their diets. Thus, each recipient of food through this program is also counted as a consumer reached with promotional campaign materials under another of the Division's measures ("Buyers reached with Florida Agricultural Promotion Campaign messages").

Fairs Registration – The Bureau of State Farmers Markets has statutory responsibility to regulate agricultural fairs and exhibitions in Florida by issuance of permits that verify compliance to Florida Statutes for such events. Each fair receiving this service is counted as a recipient of an agriculturally related assist. The permit records are used to collect this data.

Market Facilities – The Bureau of State Farmers Markets operates 13 State Farmers Markets within Florida. Tenants of the markets are included in this issue as each having received an agriculturally related assist because the markets provide the service of putting growers and buyers in a centralized location, thereby facilitating sales of Florida agricultural products. The Bureau's lease database is used to collect this data.

The Bureau of State Farmers Markets offers occasional assistance by providing information and services to existing agricultural businesses or from entities contemplating the start-up of an agri-business. Materials containing training components for services such as (but not limited to) composing business plans,

tips for writing grants and tips for securing conventional funding are provided, along with direct staff assistance. Each business or individual who requests such assistance is counted as a recipient of an agriculturally related assist. This data is collected manually by bureau staff members assigned to the program.

Media Items Produced – The Bureau of Education and Communications produces, among other things, graphics, documents, and audio-visual productions and internet elements on behalf of the agriculture industry that convey informational, educational or promotional / marketing data. Each item produced is considered an assist by the Education & Communications Bureau. The Market Bulletin, a monthly publication the bureau produces, contains advertisements for agriculturally-related items. Each issue of the publication is considered a media item and thus an agriculturally-related assist. Each ad in each issue is considered an agriculturally-related assist because it helps a producer or business sell an item. The Division website is a multi-faceted source of information for both industry and consumers. Brochures, news releases, program-specific data and links to other relevant agriculture-related sites are featured on the site. Each media item distributed to a specific agricultural producer by the bureau, each new web page created or updated, and each “hit” on industry-related pages is considered an assist to industry. Items distributed to consumers and “hits” to consumer-related web pages, are counted under another Division measure (buyers reached by promotional messages). The bureau collects the data from its monthly projects work list, and via internet-related software.

Ag Dealer’s Licenses Activities – Assistance is provided to agricultural producers by the Bureau of Ag Dealer’s Licenses (formerly named the Bureau of License and Bond) through activities associated with the issuance of dealer licenses and bond certification to businesses and individuals who purchase and re-sell commodities grown in Florida. Activities include: Issuing licenses, conducting field contacts and bond audits, issuing prospect letters, notices of deficiencies and denials and renewal and delinquent renewal notices, processing complaints, speaking to industry groups (growers and dealers), participation in trade shows (distributing information on how the licensing process aids in assuring that fair trading practices are conducted in the purchase and resale of agricultural products), and conducting enforcement actions. The license records are used to determine the number of licenses distributed, while the other activities listed are manually collected by staff members assigned to the program.

Telephone Assists – Calls made or received by reps – during which a significant exchange of information occurs which qualifies to be counted as an assist – are logged onto the Division’s “Marketing Calls by Telephone” spreadsheet in the Bureau of Seafood & Aquaculture. The Development & Information Bureau collects its data via sampling, by logging calls periodically and then extrapolating the test period data over the full year. Each telephone contact is not an assist, however; only those which result in the passing of helpful information as described in the Marketing Assist definition are posted on the calls spreadsheet

or logged during D&I's sampling periods. The number is computed quarterly. The telephone assists activity is primarily associated with the Bureaus of Development & Information and Seafood & Aquaculture.

Specific Publications – Issues of the following list of specific publications (FAPC Magazine, SEA-Notes, Market News reports and Source Directories), are produced hardcopy, electronically or on CD-ROM in scheduled times by the Bureaus of Development & Information and Seafood & Aquaculture. Each hardcopy or CD-ROM distributed, and electronic copies accessed on the Internet, are counted as marketing assists. Distribution lists are maintained for hardcopy and CD-ROM distribution, while electronic “hits” are collected via special software from the Division's Internet homepage.

On-Site Training – As opportunities arise, the Division conducts on-site training sessions during which specific data is dispensed to provide assistance to recipients. Most such training sessions are done in conjunction with a Florida agricultural industry association. Each attendee of such training sessions is counted as a marketing assist and is manually collected after each event.

#### **Data Sources and Methodology:**

The data for this measure is collected by staff persons in the Bureaus of Development and Information, Seafood and Aquaculture, State Farmers' Markets, Education & Communications, Food Distribution, and Ag Dealer's Licenses.

The methodology for collecting the information varies by bureau. The Bureau of Development & Information uses the ACT database to track merchandising calls, trade leads & missions and other assists in a report named “Bureau of Development & Information Return on Investment Report”.

The Bureau of Seafood & Aquaculture Marketing uses an Access data base to capture the same information in its Seafood Return on Investment (ROI) Tool.

The Bureau of State Farmers Markets maintains spreadsheets on its network server. The fair permits are tracked on the L-Drive in the “Permits” folder with a report name of “Fair xxxx-xx Permit #.xls” (where xxxx-xx denotes the fiscal year). The Promotional Awards are also tracked on the L-Drive in the “Premiums” folder; report name: “FAIRSPREMIUMCHECKSxxxx-xx.xls”(again with the fiscal year designed by xxxx-xx). An Access database on the L-Drive in the “FMNP” folder (report name: “qryxxxxFMNPActive” (xxxx denoting the fiscal year) is used to track farmers participating in the Farmers Market Nutrition / WIC program; and designated staff provides business services (business plan writing, incorporating guidelines, promotional materials design, etc.) and tracks them with email documentation.

The Bureau of Education and Communications uses a monthly projects tracking spreadsheet to generate a report titled “Bureau of Education & Communications Activity Measure Summary” to calculate the number of media items it produces on behalf of the

agricultural industry. It also maintains industry-standard software that tracks “hits” to the Division’s web pages.

The tracking tool for the measure in the Ag Dealer’s Licenses database is maintained on the Department’s mainframe computer. The database contains licensing data which is used to track the agricultural dealers licenses issued, the number of businesses bonded and other pertinent data.

**Validity:**

The Department is mandated by statute to provide multi-faceted assistance to the industries it serves. This measure documents the extent to which the Department fulfills that mandate in terms of providing financial, production or marketing assistance. The validity of this measure is very high because it is based on meaningful assists provided to agri-business, including Florida’s seafood industry. However, the measure doesn’t give any indication of the results of the assist that are provided. Furthermore, the measure makes no distinction between assists that take minutes to complete or others that requires months of work. Nor does it distinguish between an assist that results in a small financial gain by an organization and one that could result in sales valued in the millions.

**Reliability:**

The information is first-hand in that our staff compiles, analyzes and produces reports. We also utilize internal teams to verify non-automated information via periodical random audits. Industry groups are frequently surveyed to monitor “customer satisfaction” regarding our representation of their respective industry.

Because of the complexity of this measure (numerous contributors counting multiple types of assists in six bureaus), it would be difficult – though not improbable – for an outsider to step in and successfully duplicate these calculations without intimate insight into the bureaus. It would be reasonable to believe, however, that anyone spending realistic time in one of the bureaus contributing to the measure would compute the same result as was currently computed.

**LRPP EXHIBIT IV: PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY**

**Department: Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services**  
**Program: Agricultural Economic Development**  
**Service: Agricultural Products Marketing**  
**Measure: Pounds of federal commodities and recovered food distributed**  
**(DOAS approved measure # 77)**

**Action** (check one):

Requesting Revision to Approved Measure

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

### **Glossary:**

**Federal commodities:** These are food products purchased by the U.S. Department of Agriculture for distribution to schools and needy citizens on a state-by-state basis, utilizing a network of distributors including food banks, soup kitchens and similar charitable organizations.

**Recovered food:** These are fresh fruits and vegetables donated to Florida Farm Share, Inc., for distribution to needy citizens. Farmers donate primarily items that are cosmetically blemished or are not sized properly for commercial sales, and items that have been over-produced and cannot be profitably sold.

### **Data Sources and Methodology:**

The source of the data regarding federal commodities is the United States Department of Agriculture. Our Bureau of Food Distribution is linked by computer to the USDA food distribution office. The federal office tracks the purchase, movement, and value of all food distributed by this program throughout the U.S. and we have the ability to access that information at all times.

Data regarding recovered food is supplied by Florida Farm Share, Inc., the state's partner in this program. Farm Share, Inc., actually collects the food, distributes it and maintains auditable records of the process. The poundage of each donation is recorded as it's received from the farmer. The farmer is provided a receipt for each donation, and monthly he receives a statement of his total donation for the month for tax purposes. The program data is then provided to the Department of Agriculture on a monthly basis.

Farm Share provides this information monthly when they submit their invoice for payment. Their information relates only to the pounds of recovered foods distributed. Data regarding pounds of federal commodities distributed is taken directly from the USDA's Electronic Commodity Ordering System (ECOS). The report is called the "Commodity Code Outlays Report". This online system can only be accessed by password.

### **Validity:**

The measure is a valid gauge of the worth of the program because it clearly defines the impact it has on solving the social problem of hunger among the state's needy citizens.

### **Reliability:**

Reliability is high in that both the USDA program and the Florida Farm Share program are rigorously audited for accuracy of this very information. The probability is high that

anyone calculating the data provided by Florida Farm Share and the USDA would arrive at an identical number to which we arrive because the Food Recovery calculation is a simple addition of monthly totals, and the USDA calculation is simply taking a number off a federally-operated (and audited) database.

## **LRPP EXHIBIT IV: PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY**

**Department: Agriculture and Consumer Services**

**Program: Agricultural Economic Development**

**Service: Agricultural Products Marketing**

**Measure: Number of leased square feet at State Farmers' Markets  
(DOACS approved measure #78)**

**Action (check one):**

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

### **Data Sources and Methodology:**

The source of this data is in-house records of the Bureau of State Farmers' Markets. Square-footage data for each leasable area (i.e., office, warehouse, cooler, etc.) is periodically measured at each market by staff and reported to the Bureau's Administrative Office. Market lease agreements are maintained on an automated database (the "State Markets Lease Management" database). In conjunction with database reports and linked spreadsheets, the Bureau is able to calculate the total square footage available and leased at any given time. The figure that is used as the criteria for this measure is the number of square feet of market space that was under lease on June 30<sup>th</sup> each year.

"Square feet available for leasing" and "actual square feet leased" measures are computed by the "State Markets Lease Management" database.

### **Validity:**

As is the case with any entity that leases property, unoccupied space is an indicator of one of three things: lack of demand for that type property, the property isn't competitively priced, or tenant recruitment is ineffective. The use of this measure ensures that the activity is needed, that it fills a void that private industry isn't satisfying and that the Division of Marketing and Development is maximizing its performance. With that in mind, the measure is a viable reflection of the scope of one service provided to the state's agricultural community – cost-effective, specialized business infrastructure.

However, a lesser amount of leased square feet does not necessarily mean that performance has dropped, but could be caused by other factors, such as poor condition of the facilities, for example, which is controlled by funding availability.

**Reliability:**

The Department must maintain tenant records in order to satisfy required state audits. By having an automated system that both tracks the details of each lease and calculates the output measure, it makes for not only a reliable indicator, but also an efficient one. The major shortcoming of the system is that the information is dynamic, changing virtually daily, and has no method of producing a history report. Lease data therefore is available on any given day, but data cannot be precisely calculated for any specific previous day.

The name of the Microsoft Access database which generates this information is: "State Markets Lease Management.mdb".



## LRPP EXHIBIT IV: PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY

**Department: Agriculture and Consumer Services**

**Program: Agricultural Economic Development**

**Service: Aquaculture**

**Measure: Percent of shellfish facilities in significant compliance with permit and food safety regulations  
(DOACS approved measure # 79)**

**Action** (check one):

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

### **Glossary:**

Shellfish Facilities - Shellfish processing plants that hold a valid certification license from the Florida Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services – Division of Aquaculture during the reporting period.

Compliance Matrix – United States Food and Drug Administration molluscan shellfish processing plant compliance matrix for “In-Field Plant Criteria” provided under Data Sources and Methodology Below.

Out of Compliance – Shellfish processing facilities are out of compliance if they exceed the United States Food and Drug Administration compliance matrix during a reporting period for HACCP and Sanitation criteria pursuant to the FDA Compliance Program Guidance Manual.

### **Data Sources and Methodology:**

Florida Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services shellfish processing plant inspection reports are the source of the data. DACS inspectors are required to conduct periodic shellfish processing plant inspections. Administrative staff enters inspection results into a Microsoft Access database. Environmental Administrator queries the data to determine the total number of shellfish facilities and the number of shellfish facilities that were found to be ‘out of compliance’ during the reporting period. To prevent double counting, no facility will be counted as ‘out of compliance’ more than one time during any reporting period.

*–“FDA Compliance Program Guidance Manual in-field Plant Sanitation Element will be deemed in compliance with this requirement when the plant meets the following criteria:*

- a. *Shucker / packers and repackers*

- (i) *HACCP Requirements:*
    - (a) *A HACCP plan accepted by the Authority; and*
    - (b) *No critical deficiencies; and*
    - (c) *Not more than 4 key deficiencies; or*
    - (d) *Not more than 4 other deficiencies.*
  - (ii) *Sanitation and Additional Model Ordinance Requirements*
    - (a) *No critical deficiencies; and*
    - (b) *Not more than 4 key deficiencies; and*
    - (c) *Not more than 6 other deficiencies.*
- b. Shellstock shippers and reshippers*
- (i) *HACCP Requirements:*
    - (a) *A HACCP plan accepted by the Authority; and*
    - (b) *No critical deficiencies; and*
    - (c) *Not more than 3 key deficiencies; or*
    - (d) *Not more than 3 other deficiencies.*
  - (ii) *Sanitation and Additional Model Ordinance Requirements*
    - (a) *No critical deficiencies; and*
    - (b) *Not more than 3 key deficiencies; and*
    - (c) *Not more than 5 other deficiencies.”*

This compliance matrix is used to determine the percent of shellfish facilities out of compliance comply with permit and food safety regulations.

The percent of shellfish facilities in significant compliance is calculated by the following formula:

$$\frac{(\text{Number of Shellfish Facilities}) - (\text{Number of Facilities Out of Compliance})}{(\text{Number of Shellfish Facilities})} \times 100$$

### **Validity:**

The methodology is based on the assessment contained in the OIG PB2 Assessment Blueprint. We interviewed program staff and reviewed documentation for the purpose of analyzing the measure definition, data elements, and any source of external data. We determined the degree to which a logical relation exists between the name of the measure, the definitions, and the formula used to calculate the measure. Due to time constraints in the budget process, data testing could not be conducted prior to budget submission. Data testing would be necessary to fully assess the validity of the measure. Also, we examined the appropriateness of the measure in regard to the program purpose.

Based on our assessment methodology, there is a high probability that this measure is valid subject to data testing results. 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 tabulation.

**Reliability:**

The methodology is based on the assessment program contained in the OIG PB2 Assessment Blueprint. 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. When applicable, we examined calibration records for any instrumentation used in the process of collecting data. Due to time constraints in the budget process, verification of procedure and data testing could not be conducted prior to the budget submission. Data testing would be necessary to fully assess the reliability of the measure.

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 reporting system structure and the data definition have been implemented. The program has a clear and specific description of the procedure for collecting data, reporting, and tabulating the measure.

**LRPP EXHIBIT IV: PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY****Department: Agriculture and Consumer Services****Program: Agricultural Economic Development****Service: Aquaculture****Measure: Number of shellfish processing plant inspections and HACCP records reviews  
(DOACS approved measure # 80)****Action** (check one):

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

**Glossary:**

Inspection Forms - Processing Plant Inspection Forms

Processing Plant Inspection Reports - Inspection Forms

HACCP – Hazard Analysis Critical Control Point – Requires: identifying hazards likely to occur; establishing critical limits for the identified hazards; taking corrective actions when critical limits are exceeded; and keeping detailed record documentation.

## **Data Sources and Methodology:**

The data source is the Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services processing plant inspection reports (DACS inspection forms). DACS inspectors are required to conduct periodic shellfish processing plant inspections and HACCP records reviews. Administrative staff, using a Microsoft Access database program, tabulates the number of inspections and HACCP records reviews.

The number of inspections and HACCP records reviews are tabulated quarterly.

## **Validity:**

The methodology is based on the assessment contained in the OIG PB2 Assessment Blueprint. We interviewed program staff and reviewed documentation for the purpose of analyzing the measure definition, data elements, and any source of external data. We also determined the degree to which a logical relation exists between the name of the measure, the definitions, and the formula used to calculate the measure. Due to time constraints in the budget process, data testing could not be conducted prior to budget submission. Data testing would be necessary to fully assess the validity of the measure. Also, we examined the appropriateness of the measure in regard to the program purpose.

Based on our assessment methodology, there is a high probability that this measure is valid subject to data testing results. 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 tabulation.

## **Reliability:**

The methodology is based on the assessment program contained in the OIG PB2 Assessment Blueprint. 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. When applicable, we examined calibration records for any instrumentation used in the process of collecting data. Due to time constraints in the budget process, verification of procedure and data testing could not be conducted prior to the budget submission. Data testing would be necessary to fully assess the reliability of the measure.

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 reporting system structure and the data definition have been implemented. The program has a clear and specific description of the procedure for collecting data, reporting, and tabulating the measure.

## LRPP EXHIBIT IV: PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY

**Department: Agriculture and Consumer Services**  
**Program: Agricultural Economic Development**  
**Service: Aquaculture**  
**Measure: Number of acres tested**  
**(DOACS approved measure # 81)**

**Action** (check one):

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

### **Glossary:**

Fecal Coliform - All aerobic and anaerobic, gram-negative, nonspore-forming rod-shaped bacteria that ferment lactose with gas formation when incubated for 3 hours at 35 C then transferred to a water bath at 44.5 C for 21 hours.

Reclassified - Shellfish harvesting areas are defined as being reclassified when the status changes between any of the following: Approved, Conditionally Approved, Restricted, Conditionally Restricted, Prohibited, or Unclassified.

### **Data Sources and Methodology:**

The Division of Aquaculture tests and classifies coastal waters for shellfish harvesting based upon public health criteria in Florida Statute and Agency Rules. Once classified, areas must be routinely tested to ensure that the public health is being protected.

Three external data sources are used to determine the number of acres tested. The Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission, the Florida Department of Transportation, and the U.S. Coast Guard provide shoreline, roads and railroads and channel marker data respectively in an electronic format. The division of Aquaculture uses this data to create maps, which are used to calculate the number of acres tested.

Field Environmental Specialist's of the Bureau of Aquaculture Environmental Services supply the Division of Aquaculture's Technical Resource Center with the classification boundary lines drawn on a paper map by FAX, mail, or hard copy. The boundaries of classification polygons are digitized in ArcInfo software. ArcView is the software used to calculate the number of acres in classification polygons. The conversion from square meters to acres is achieved by multiplying square meters by 0.0002471054. The field ESII or Technical Resource Center provide the Environmental Administrator of the Shellfish Environmental Assessment Section with acres by area number. The

Environmental Administrator enters the acres into Microsoft Word tables and compiles and reports results.

Field Environmental Specialists II's monitor the water quality of shellfish areas for fecal coliform bacteria. Testing is accomplished when at least one fecal coliform water sample is analyzed. The field Environmental Specialist II communicates areas tested to the EA of the Shellfish Environmental Assessment Section. The Environmental Administrator of the Shellfish Environmental Assessment Section determines the number of acres tested.

When a shellfish area is reclassified, acres are recalculated, compiled and reported.

**Validity:**

The methodology is based on the assessment contained in the OIG PB2 Assessment Blueprint. We interviewed program staff and reviewed documentation for the purpose of analyzing the measure definition, data elements, and any source of external data. We also determined the degree to which a logical relation exists between the name of the measure, the definitions, and the formula used to calculate the measure. Due to time constraints in the budget process, data testing could not be conducted prior to the budget submission. Data testing would be necessary to fully assess the validity of the measure. Also, we examined the appropriateness of the measure in regard to the program purpose.

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 tabulation.

**Reliability:**

The methodology is based on the assessment program contained in the OIG PB2 Assessment Blueprint. 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. When applicable, we examined calibration records for any instrumentation used in the process of collecting data. Due to time constraints in the budget process, verification of procedures and data testing could not be conducted prior to the budget submission. Data testing would be necessary to fully assess the reliability of the measure.

Based on our assessment of methodology, there is a high probability this measure is reliable subject to verification of procedures and data testing results. The measure definition, the description of the reporting system, and the data definition have been implemented. The program has a clear and specific description of the procedure for collecting data, reporting, and tabulating the measure.

## LRPP EXHIBIT IV: PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY

**Department:** Agriculture and Consumer Services  
**Program:** Agricultural Economic Development  
**Service:** Aquaculture  
**Activity:** Administer the Shellfish Lease Program  
**Measure:** Number of Aquaculture Leases  
(DOACS approved measure # 82)

**Action** (check one):

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

### **Glossary:**

Aquaculture - The culture of aquatic organisms.

Aquaculture Lease - Parcel of sovereignty (state owned) submerged land that is leased from the Board of Trustees under Chapter 253, F.S., for conducting aquacultural activities.

### **Data Sources and Methodology:**

Data is collected and maintained in the Aquaculture Lease Database.

The number of Aquaculture leases with a valid lease agreement with the Board of Trustees listed in the Aquaculture Lease Database during the Fiscal Year are counted and reported.

### **Validity:**

The methodology is based on the assessment program contained in the OIG PB2 Assessment Blueprint. We interviewed program staff and reviewed documentation for the purpose of analyzing the measure definition, data elements, and any source of external data. We also determined the degree to which a logical relation exists between the name of the measure, the definitions, and the formula used to calculate the measure. Due to time constraints in the budget process, data testing could not be conducted prior to the budget submission. Data testing would be necessary to fully assess the validity of the measure.

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 tabulation.

**Reliability:**

The methodology is based on the assessment program contained in the OIG PB2 Assessment Blueprint. 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. When applicable, we examined calibration records for any instrumentation used in the process of collecting data. Due to time constraints in the budget process, verification of procedures and data testing could not be conducted prior to the budget submission. Data testing would be necessary to fully assess the reliability of the measure.

Based on our assessment of methodology, there is a high probability this measure is reliable subject to verification of procedures and data testing results. The measure definition, the description of the reporting system, and the data definition have been implemented. The program has a clear and specific description of the procedure for collecting data, reporting, and tabulating the measure.

**LRPP EXHIBIT IV: PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY**

**Department: Agriculture and Consumer Services**  
**Program: Agricultural Economic Development**  
**Service: Aquaculture**  
**Activity: Conduct oyster planting activities**  
**Measure: Number of bushels of processed shell and live oysters deposited to restore oyster habitat on public oyster reefs (DOACS approved measure # 83)**

**Action** (check one):

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

**Glossary:**

Bushel - Volumetric measurement used to determine the amount of oyster shell or live oysters collected or deposited.

Public Oyster Reef - A functional ecological assemblage of oysters and other fauna which is located in the waters of the state.

Resource Development Projects - Program activities to restore, enhance, enlarge oyster resources in the waters of the state.



Shellfish Processor - Facility that processes (shucks) oysters, clams, or scallops and discards the shell as a byproduct of the process.

Transplanting - Activity that involves harvesting, transporting, and depositing of live oysters from one location to another.

### **Data Sources and Methodology:**

Data sources for this measure are:

- Oyster Shell Collection and Deposition Logs and Reports
- Oyster Resource Development Projects, Contracts, Invoices, and Payments

Data is collected during each program component to account for each bushel collected and planted. The program includes collecting oyster and scallop shell from shellfish processors, transporting the shell to a stockpile, and depositing the shell on public oyster reefs. The number of bushels collected and planted, and the date of the action is recorded. Logs are maintained when shell is collected from processors and when they are deposited on reefs.

Additionally, the program includes cooperative resource development projects where local oyster associations provide participants to transplant live oysters. The number of bushels of oysters planted is counted and payments are made to the associations based on an amount per bushel specified in a contract. Contracts, invoices, receipts, and payments are maintained for program audits.

The methods used have been practiced by oyster resource managers for more than 50 years, and are proven methods for restoring oyster resources. A formula has been established that converts the number of bushels deposited to the number of acres restored; the formula is dependent upon the level of restoration required on specific reefs.

Calculations: The Marine Captain maintains a daily log of processed shell planted. At the end of each month, the Captain is responsible for adding the daily totals and forwarding the monthly total to the Administrative Assistant. The monthly total is entered into the Bureau's internal month-end report and into an excel spread sheet located at I/BAD/reports/shells-oysters collected-planted; Click on *Shell tab*.

The Administrative Assistant calculates the number of live oysters deposited on public reefs by running an Access Report (I/BAD/BAD database/Oyster Relay/Reports; select *Oyster Relay Summary*; enter starting and ending dates). The monthly total is entered into the Bureau's internal month-end report and into an excel spread sheet.

### **Validity:**

The methodology is based on the assessment contained in the OIG PB2 Assessment Blueprint. We interviewed program staff and reviewed documentation for the purpose of analyzing the measure definition, data elements, and any source of external data. We

also determined the degree to which a logical relation exists between the name of the measure, the definitions, and the formula used to calculate the measure. Due to time constraints in the budget process, data testing could not be conducted prior to budget submission. Data testing would be necessary to fully assess the validity of the measure. Also, we examined the appropriateness of the measure in regard to the program purpose.

Based on our assessment methodology, there is a high probability that this measure is valid subject to data testing results. 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 tabulation.

**Reliability:**

The methodology is based on the assessment program contained in the OIG PB2 Assessment Blueprint. 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. When applicable, we examined calibration records for any instrumentation used in the process of collecting data. Due to time constraints in the budget process, verification of procedure and data testing could not be conducted prior to the budget submission. Data testing would be necessary to fully assess the reliability of the measure.

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 reporting system structure and the data definition have been implemented. The program has a clear and specific description of the procedure for collecting data, reporting, and tabulating the measure.

## LRPP EXHIBIT IV: PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY

**Department:** Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services

**Program:** Agricultural Economic Development

**Service:** Agricultural Interdiction Stations

**Measure:** Percent of vehicles carrying agricultural related products that are inspected and found to be free of potentially devastating plant and animal pests and diseases  
(DOACS approved measure # 84)

**Action** (check one):

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

### **Glossary of Key Terms:**

**Agricultural Interdiction Station-** A fixed facility strategically located at all highway crossings of the natural boundaries of the Suwannee and St. Mary's Rivers, where highway shipments of agricultural, horticultural, aquacultural and livestock commodities are inspected around the clock, 365 days per year to assure compliance with Federal-State Marketing Orders and various laws, rules and regulations designed to ensure the consuming public a safe, wholesome, quality food product and/or to prevent, control or eradicate specific plant and animal pests and diseases that could economically devastate segments of Florida's agricultural industry.

**Vehicle –** Those vehicles subject to inspection under S. 570.15 FS and Chapter 5A-16, Florida Administrative Code (FAC). Motor vehicles, except private passenger automobiles with no trailer in tow, travel trailers, camping trailers, van conversions, and motor homes as defined in s. 320.01(1)(b), or pickup trucks not carrying agricultural, horticultural, or livestock products and which have visible access to the entire cargo area, or city, county, state, or federal vehicles; truck and motor vehicle trailers.

**Regulated Commodity –** All food, agricultural, horticultural, aquacultural or livestock products or any article or product with respect to which any authority is conferred by law on the Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services.

**Plant Pest –** Any living stage of any insects, mites, nematodes, slugs, snails, protozoa, or other invertebrate animals, bacteria, fungi, other parasitic plants or their reproductive parts, or viruses, or any organisms similar to or allied with any of the foregoing, including any genetically engineered organisms, or any

infectious substances which can directly or indirectly injure or cause disease or damage in any plants or plant parts or any processed, manufactured, or other plant products.

Plant Disease – Any living stage of any bacteria, fungi or viruses, or any organisms similar to or allied with any of the foregoing, including any genetically engineered organisms, or any infectious substances which can directly or indirectly injure or cause disease or damage in any plants or plant parts or any processed, manufactured, or other plant products.

Animal Pest – Any living stage of any insects, mites, slugs, snails, protozoa, or other invertebrate animals, bacteria, fungi, other parasitic animals or their reproductive parts, or viruses, or any organisms, similar to or allied with any of the foregoing, including any genetically engineered organisms, or any infectious substances which can directly or indirectly injure or cause disease or damage in any animals or animal parts or any processed, manufactured, or other animal products.

Animal Disease – Any living stage of any bacteria, fungi or viruses, or any organisms similar to or allied with any of the foregoing, including any genetically engineered organisms, or any infectious substances which can directly or indirectly injure or cause disease or damage in any animals or animal parts or any processed, manufactured, or other animal products.

### **Data Sources and Methodology:**

The traffic volume counts and number of interdictions are logged and recorded on various activity reporting forms by law enforcement officers of the Bureau of Uniform Services assigned to the agricultural interdiction stations. Each agricultural inspection is recorded on truck passing reports that identify the agricultural products, livestock, or commodities being transported.

Counts are determined in the following manner:

Remote or non-interstate stations conduct manual counts daily and enter those numbers in the automated Truck Summary Report.

Interstate stations prepare an inspection report for each vehicle they inspect that contains regulated commodities. A manual count is conducted daily and those numbers are entered in the automated Truck Summary Report. The number of empty trucks and those carrying non-regulated products are estimated. The estimate is based on an actual count conducted over one 24-hour period each month. It is then multiplied by the number of days in the month and entered in the Truck Summary Report, which is forwarded to headquarters monthly.

Pre-pass trucks are counted by the automated pre-pass system. At the end of the reporting period, PrePass queries the pre-pass system and generates a PrePass Report At A Glance, which indicates the number of pre-pass trucks that passed each interdiction station during the reporting period. This information is forwarded to headquarters monthly.

Staff at headquarters access the Truck Summary Report and print it monthly and annually to include with the performance measure documentation.

The traffic volume counts are continuously reviewed, monitored and audited by supervisory staff. Agriculturally laden vehicles are logged separately and carefully. Traffic volume counts have a long historical record and are often compared with Department of Transportation counts to ensure validity and accuracy.

This measure is determined by dividing the number of vehicles found to be free of any plant and animal diseases by the total number of vehicles transporting agricultural products and then multiplying that number by 100 to obtain the percent.

This methodology was used to compile the FY 2008-09 actual performance of this measure. Prior to FY 2007-08, manual counts were made daily at remote and interstate stations. The counts were automated and put into operation July 1, 2007.

**Validity:**

This measure reflects the workload of the agricultural interdiction stations as it indicates the total number of vehicles transporting regulated commodities that are inspected. Vehicles must be inspected to determine if they are transporting agricultural or regulated commodities (citrus, fruits & vegetables, tomatoes, horses, cattle, swine, poultry, nursery products, ornamental horticultural products, feed and fertilizers, pesticides, aquacultural products, dairy and forestry products). Vehicles transporting such commodities are given a more thorough inspection to determine and assure compliance with applicable statutes and regulations governing movement of such commodities. The total number of vehicles inspected is another performance measure.

This measure, when considered as a whole with other outcome and output measures, should serve as a comprehensive indication of the performance of the Agricultural Economic Development Program. It is also one of several measures that provides a comprehensive indicator of the performance of the law enforcement officers assigned to the agricultural interdiction stations as well as the overall effectiveness of the interdiction/inspection process.

**Reliability:**

The automated method now used to collect this data is more reliable than the old manual methodology used prior to FY 2007-08. The report is easily generated and does not require interpretation; therefore, other equally qualified law enforcement investigators, supervisors, analysts or auditors, would reach the same or similar conclusions. It is highly reliable.

**LRPP EXHIBIT IV: PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY****Department: Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services****Program: Agricultural Economic Development****Service: Agricultural Interdiction Stations****Measure: Amount of revenue generated by bills of lading transmitted to the Department of Revenue from agricultural interdiction stations  
(DOACS approved measure # 85)****Action** (check one):

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

**Glossary of Key Terms:**

**Agricultural Interdiction Station-** A fixed facility strategically located at all highway crossings of the natural boundaries of the Suwannee and St. Mary's Rivers where highway shipments of agricultural, horticultural, aquacultural and livestock commodities are inspected around the clock, 365 days per year to assure compliance with Federal-State Marketing Orders and various laws, rules and regulations designed to ensure the consuming public that a safe, wholesome, quality food product and/or to prevent, control or eradicate specific plant and animal pests and diseases that could economically devastate segments of Florida's agricultural industry.

**Revenue-** Use tax collected as a result of "bills of lading" pertaining to incoming shipments of specified commodities transmitted to the Florida Department of Revenue by the Florida Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services.

**Bill of Lading –** Document(s) that establish whether the carrier is shipping their own goods or is transporting the goods for someone else for hire; that identifies the consignor (usually the seller), consignee (usually the purchaser) and the

transportation company, if different than the consignor, and describes the type of goods being transported.

Direct Collections – Revenue collections resulting from the initial shipment covered by a bill of lading.

Residual Collections – Revenue collections received during the twelve (12) month period immediately following initial contact with person(s) or entity not familiar with Florida's sales and use tax requirements, excluding any direct collection.

Vehicle – Those vehicles subject to inspection under S. 570.15 FS and Chapter 5A-16 FAC. Motor vehicles, except private passenger automobiles with no trailer in tow, travel trailers, camping trailers, van conversions, and motor homes as defined in s. 320.01(1)(b), or pickup trucks not carrying agricultural, horticultural, or livestock products and which have visible access to the entire cargo area, or city, county, state, or federal vehicles; truck and motor vehicle trailers.

Regulated Commodity – All food, agricultural, horticultural, aquacultural or livestock products or any article or product with respect to which any authority is conferred by law on the Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services.

Plant Pest – Any living stage of any insects, mites, nematodes, slugs, snails, protozoa, or other invertebrate animals, bacteria, fungi, other parasitic plants or their reproductive parts, or viruses, or any organisms similar to or allied with any of the foregoing, including any genetically engineered organisms, or any infectious substances which can directly or indirectly injure or cause disease or damage in any plants or plant parts or any processed, manufactured, or other plant products.

Plant Disease – Any living stage of any bacteria, fungi or viruses, or any organisms similar to or allied with any of the foregoing, including any genetically engineered organisms, or any infectious substances which can directly or indirectly injure or cause disease or damage in any plants or plant parts or any processed, manufactured, or other plant products.

Animal Pest – Any living stage of any insects, mites, slugs, snails, protozoa, or other invertebrate animals, bacteria, fungi, other parasitic animals or their reproductive parts, or viruses, or any organisms, similar to or allied with any of the foregoing, including any genetically engineered organisms, or any infectious substances which can directly or indirectly injure or cause disease or damage in any animals or animal parts or any processed, manufactured, or other animal products.

Animal Disease – Any living stage of any bacteria, fungi or viruses, or any organisms similar to or allied with any of the foregoing, including any genetically

engineered organisms, or any infectious substances which can directly or indirectly injure or cause disease or damage in any animals or animal parts or any processed, manufactured, or other animal products.

### **Data Sources and Methodology:**

Bills of lading are either photocopied or electronically captured through an imaging software system at the agricultural interdiction station by law enforcement officers of the Bureau of Uniform Services. These documents are transmitted to a server within the Department of Agriculture, where they are indexed for identification and transmitted to the Florida Department of Revenue. Document and image counts regarding the number of images supplied are maintained by the Agricultural Interdiction Stations and the Department of Revenue, as well as retained through the imaging software system. This data can be retrieved daily by FDACS through a Summary Collections Report from an administration and report module within the Bill of Lading System.

This methodology was used to compile the FY 2008-09 actual performance of this measure.

### **Validity:**

The number of bills of lading, regardless of form, is easily verifiable by either the Department of Agriculture & Consumer Services or the Department of Revenue. The Department of Revenue generates a monthly report, which provides in detail the amount of workable/non-workable bills and the amount of revenue recovered. Document and image counts are also available through the imaging software system. The imaging system now has a management module for purposes of monitoring all bill of lading activity.

This measure, i.e., the amount of revenue generated by the Bill of Lading Program transmitted to the Department of Revenue from Agricultural Interdiction Stations, should serve as a comprehensive indicator of the Agricultural Economic Development Program since these measures are directly related to the amount of commercial traffic moving through the Agricultural Interdiction Stations. It is also one of several measures that provide an immediate and comprehensive indicator of the performance and workload experienced by the law enforcement officers assigned to the agricultural interdiction stations. The measurement of the Bill of Lading Program is based primarily upon two factors: 1) the number of bills captured and transmitted; and 2) the tax dollars collected as a result of the captured documents.

Since the amount of revenue generated by this program is provided by the Department of Revenue, we are dependent upon them concerning the validity of the data. However, the new management module that allows us to monitor all Bill of Lading activity will help ensure the validity of the data.



**Reliability:**

The Bill of Lading Program, a joint cooperative effort between two diverse state agencies, is an example of how a coordinated use of resources can have a very beneficial impact upon the state without increasing the work force costs. Through technology and the use of existing personnel who are already inspecting commercial vehicles, additional revenues are captured that would otherwise remain uncollected. Since the inception of the Bill of Lading Program in 1993, this joint cooperative effort is responsible for the collection of more than \$169,000,000 in tax revenue. The Bill of Lading Program currently averages \$20,000 per day in revenues generated. This data can be retrieved daily by FDACS through a Summary Collections Report from an administration and report module within the Bill of Lading System.

**LRPP EXHIBIT IV: PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY****Department: Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services****Program: Agricultural Economic Development****Service: Agricultural Interdiction Stations****Measure: Number of vehicles inspected at agricultural interdiction stations (DOACS approved measure # 86)  
Number of vehicles inspected at agricultural interdiction stations transporting agricultural or regulated commodities (DOACS approved measure # 87)****Action (check one):**

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

**Glossary:**

Agricultural Interdiction Station- A fixed facility strategically located at all highway crossings of the natural boundaries of the Suwannee and St. Mary's where highway shipments of agricultural, horticultural, aquacultural and livestock commodities are inspected around the clock, 365 days per year to assure compliance with Federal-State Marketing Orders and various laws, rules and regulations designed to ensure the consuming public a safe, wholesome, quality food product and/or to prevent, control or eradicate specific plant and animal pests and diseases that could economically devastate segments of Florida's agricultural industry.

Vehicle – Those vehicles subject to inspection under S. 570.15 FS and Chapter 5A-16 FAC. Motor vehicles, except private passenger automobiles with no trailer in tow, travel trailers, camping trailers, van conversions, and motor homes as defined in s. 320.01(1)(b), or pickup trucks not carrying agricultural, horticultural, or livestock products and which have visible access to the entire cargo area, or city, county, state, or federal vehicles; truck and motor vehicle trailers.

Regulated Commodity – All food, agricultural, horticultural, aquacultural or livestock products or any article or product with respect to which any authority is conferred by law on the Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services.

Plant Pest – Any living stage of any insects, mites, nematodes, slugs, snails, protozoa, or other invertebrate animals, bacteria, fungi, other parasitic plants or their reproductive parts, or viruses, or any organisms similar to or allied with any of the foregoing, including any genetically engineered organisms, or any infectious substances which can directly or indirectly injure or cause disease or damage in any plants or plant parts or any processed, manufactured, or other plant products.

Plant Disease – Any living stage of any bacteria, fungi or viruses, or any organisms similar to or allied with any of the foregoing, including any genetically engineered organisms, or any infectious substances which can directly or indirectly injure or cause disease or damage in any plants or plant parts or any processed, manufactured, or other plant products.

Animal Pest – Any living stage of any insects, mites, slugs, snails, protozoa, or other invertebrate animals, bacteria, fungi, other parasitic animals or their reproductive parts, or viruses, or any organisms, similar to or allied with any of the foregoing, including any genetically engineered organisms, or any infectious substances which can directly or indirectly injure or cause disease or damage in any animals or animal parts or any processed, manufactured, or other animal products.

Animal Disease – Any living stage of any bacteria, fungi or viruses, or any organisms similar to or allied with any of the foregoing, including any genetically engineered organisms, or any infectious substances which can directly or indirectly injure or cause disease or damage in any animals or animal parts or any processed, manufactured, or other animal products.

#### **Data Sources and Methodology:**

The traffic volume counts and number of inspections are logged and recorded on various activity reporting forms by law enforcement officers of the Bureau of Uniform Services, assigned to the agricultural interdiction stations. Each agricultural inspection is recorded on truck passing reports that identify the

agricultural products, livestock, or commodities being transported. This measure is determined from logs completed by law enforcement officers.

Counts are determined in the following manner:

Remote or non-interstate stations conduct manual counts daily and enter those numbers in the automated Truck Summary Reports

Interstate stations prepare an inspection report for each vehicle they inspect that contains regulated commodities. A manual count is conducted daily and those numbers are entered in Truck Summary Reports located in each station. These logs are forwarded to headquarters monthly. The number of empty trucks and those carrying non-regulated products are estimated. The estimate is based on an actual count conducted over one 24-hour period each month. It is then multiplied by the number of days in the month and entered in (name of spreadsheet or log), which is forwarded to headquarters monthly.

Pre-pass trucks are counted by the automated pre-pass system. At the end of the reporting period, PrePass queries the pre-pass system and generates a PrePass Report At A Glance, which indicates the number of pre-pass trucks that passed during the reporting period. This information is forwarded to headquarters monthly.

Staff at headquarters access the Truck Summary Report and print it monthly and annually to include with the performance measure documentation located in the Bureau Chief's Office.

This methodology was used to compile the FY 2008-09 actual performance of this measure.

**Validity:**

The traffic volume counts are continuously reviewed, monitored and audited by supervisory personnel. Traffic volume counts have a long historical record and are often compared with Department of Transportation counts to ensure validity and accuracy.

This measure reflects the workload of the agricultural interdiction stations as it indicates the total number of vehicles that are inspected. Vehicles must be inspected to determine if they are transporting agricultural or regulated commodities (citrus, fruits & vegetables, tomatoes, horses, cattle, swine, poultry, nursery products, ornamental horticultural products, feed and fertilizers, pesticides, aquacultural products, dairy and forestry products). Vehicles transporting such commodities are given a more thorough inspection. The

number of vehicles inspected transporting agricultural or regulated commodities is another performance measure.

This measure, when considered as a whole with other outcome and output measures, should serve as a comprehensive indicator of the performance of the Agricultural Economic Development Program. It is also one of several measures that provide a comprehensive indication of the performance of the law enforcement officers at the agricultural interdiction stations as well as the overall effectiveness of the interdiction process.

**Reliability:**

The automated method now used to count this data is more reliable than the old manual methodology used prior to FY 2007-08. The report is easily generated and does not require interpretation; therefore, other equally qualified law enforcement investigators, supervisors, analysts or auditors, would reach the same or similar conclusions. It is highly reliable.

**LRPP EXHIBIT IV: PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY**

**Agency:** Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services  
**Program:** Agricultural Economic Development  
**Service:** Agricultural Interdiction Stations  
**Measure:** Number of bills of lading transmitted to the Department of Revenue from agricultural interdiction stations (DOACS approved measure # 88)

**Action** (check one):

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

**Glossary:**

Agricultural Interdiction Station- A fixed facility strategically located at all highway crossings of the natural boundaries of the Suwannee and St. Mary's Rivers where highway shipments of agricultural, horticultural, aquacultural and livestock commodities are inspected around the clock, 365 days per year to assure compliance with Federal-State Marketing Orders and various laws, rules and regulations designed to ensure the consuming public that a safe, wholesome, quality food product and/or to prevent, control or eradicate specific plant and

animal pests and diseases that could economically devastate segments of Florida's agricultural industry.

Revenue- Use tax collected as a result of "bills of lading" pertaining to incoming shipments of specified commodities transmitted to the Florida Department of Revenue by the Florida Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services.

Bill of Lading – Document(s) that establish whether the carrier is shipping their own goods or is transporting the goods for someone else for hire; that will identify the consignor (usually the seller), consignee (usually the purchaser) and the transportation company if it is different than the consignor; and that will describe the type of goods being transported.

Direct Collections – Revenue collections resulting from the initial shipment covered by a bill of lading.

Residual Collections – Revenue collections received during the twelve (12) month period immediately following initial contact with person(s) or entity not familiar with Florida's sales and use tax requirements excluding any direct collection.

Vehicle – Those vehicles subject to inspection under S. 570.15 FS and Chapter 5A-16 FAC. Motor vehicles, except private passenger automobiles with no trailer in tow, travel trailers, camping trailers, van conversions, and motor homes as defined in s. 320.01(1)(b), or pickup trucks not carrying agricultural, horticultural, or livestock products and which have visible access to the entire cargo area, or city, county, state, or federal vehicles; truck and motor vehicle trailers.

Regulated Commodity – All food, agricultural, horticultural, aquacultural or livestock products or any article or product with respect to which any authority is conferred by law on the Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services.

### **Data Sources and Methodology:**

Beginning in FY 2005-06, the Florida Department of Revenue began providing and periodically updating a list of companies in compliance with Florida tax laws and therefore, excluded from the Bill of Lading Program. When a truck enters an Agricultural Inspection Station, officers check the company name against the DOR list; if a company is not excluded from the Program, its bills of lading are either photocopied or electronically captured through an imaging software system. This change in methodology increases the efficiency of the program by allowing DACS to photocopy and transmit to DOR only bills of lading that are likely to result in revenue collection. This efficiency has decreased the number of documents imaged and transmitted to DOR without impacting the revenue generated by this program.

These documents are transmitted to a server within the Department of Agriculture, where they are indexed for identification and transmitted to the Florida Department of Revenue. Document and image counts regarding the number of images supplied are maintained by the Agricultural Inspection Stations and the Department of Revenue, as well as retained through the imaging software system. This data can be retrieved daily by FDACS through a Summary Collections Report from an administration and report module within the Bill of Lading System.

This methodology was used to compile the FY 2008-09 actual performance of this measure.

**Validity:**

The number of bills of lading regardless of the form is easily verifiable by either the Department of Agriculture & Consumer Services or the Department of Revenue. The Department of Revenue generates a monthly report, which provides in detail, the amount of workable/non-workable bills and the amount of revenue recovered. Document and image counts are retained through the imaging software system.

This measure, i.e., the amount of revenue generated by the Bill of Lading Program transmitted to the Department of Revenue from agricultural interdiction stations, should serve as a comprehensive indicator of the Agricultural Economic Development Program since these measures are directly related to the amount of commercial traffic experienced by the agricultural interdiction stations. It is also one of several measures that provide an immediate and comprehensive indicator of the performance and workload experienced by personnel assigned to the agricultural interdiction stations. The measurement of the Bill of Lading Program is based primarily upon two factors: 1) the number of bills captured and transmitted; and 2) the tax dollars collected as a result of the captured document.

**Reliability:**

The Bill of Lading Program, a joint cooperative effort between two diverse state agencies, is an example of how a coordinated use of resources can have a very beneficial impact upon the state without increasing the work force costs. Through technology and the use of existing personnel who are already inspecting commercial vehicles, additional revenues are captured that would otherwise remain uncollected. Since the inception of the Bill of Lading Program in 1993, this joint cooperative effort is responsible for the collection of more than \$169,000,000 in tax revenue. The Bill of Lading Program currently averages \$20,000 per day in revenues generated. This data can be retrieved daily by FDACS through a Summary Collections Report from an administration and report module within the Bill of Lading System.

## LRPP EXHIBIT IV: PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY

**Agency:** Agriculture and Consumer Services  
**Program:** Agricultural Economic Development  
**Service:** Animal Pest and Disease Control  
**Measure:** Percent of positive test results from livestock and poultry tested for specific diseases for which monitoring, controlling, and eradication activities are established  
(DOACS Approved Measure #89)

**Action** (check one):

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

### **Glossary:**

Test – Any test performed on an animal to detect any of the diseases listed on the List of Division of Animal Industry Diseases and Tests Report (LDAIDTR)

### **Data Sources and Methodology:**

Division of Animal Industry program managers receive laboratory reports from a variety of sources (Division laboratories, private laboratories, USDA, etc.) that routinely report results on the diseases in the LDAIDTR. The majority of the test results are derived from USDA databases and the data accuracy in those databases is the responsibility of the USDA. The program managers have documented procedures for data access and compilation which allows for accurate reproduction of the data. The formula for calculation of the percentage of positive test results is:  $\text{Number of positive tests} / \text{Total number of tests} \times 100$ .

### **Validity:**

This measure is appropriate because testing is necessary to detect these diseases. The mission of the Division of Animal Industry is the prevention, eradication and control of animal diseases.

### **Reliability:**

The program managers have documented procedures for data access and compilation. Program managers are audited randomly throughout the year by their supervisor and are required to regenerate a report within a specified timeframe that reproduces previously reported numbers. Their data access and compilation procedures are also reviewed during these random audits.

## LRPP EXHIBIT IV: PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY

**Department:** Agriculture and Consumer Services  
**Program:** Agricultural Economic Development  
**Service:** Animal Pest and Disease Control  
**Measure:** Number of Animal Site Inspections Performed  
(DOACS approved measure # 90)

**Action** (check one):

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

### **Glossary:**

Animal site or premises - Any location where animals have been, are, or may be maintained.

Inspections - Examination of animals for detection and prevention of diseases and/or evaluation of premises to ensure compliance with state and federal regulations within the Division of Animal Industry's (DAI) jurisdiction.

### **Data Sources and Methodology:**

The data source is the DAI Daily Activity Report database software application. The monthly DAI Activity Report provides the summary of the animal site inspections performed. Each activity is recorded by the employee or designee directly into the database. Multiple inspections can occur at a single site (multiple programs/activities may be conducted on single premises). The DAI Activity Code Report is utilized to define the codes used to produce the monthly activity report. The annual report will be calculated based on the compilation of monthly activity reports within the state fiscal year. Based on the OIG Audit in 2005, the data from the previous years can not be compared to the current and future years information as the methodology used to capture the data has been modified.

### **Validity:**

The measure is appropriate because site inspections are the keystone to detection and prevention of diseases and evaluation of premises.



**Reliability:**

This data is reliable due to the implementation of an electronic daily activity report (7/2006) with precise activity codes. A random sampling of daily activity reports is reviewed monthly by each district supervisor to ensure accurate data entry. The data can be accurately reproduced on an annual basis and the same report can be generated upon demand. This data is backed up daily by AGMIC.

**LRPP EXHIBIT IV: PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY****Department: Agriculture and Consumer Services****Program: Agricultural Economic Development****Service: Animal Pest and Disease Control****Measure: Number of tests and/or vaccinations performed on animals  
(DOACS approved measure # 91)****Action (check one):**

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

**Glossary:**

Animals - Any animal that is tested for a disease as defined on the List of Division of Animal Industry Diseases and Tests Report (LDAIDTR) and any animal vaccinated with Brucella abortus (RB51) vaccine.

Tests - Any test performed on an animal to detect any of the diseases listed on the LDAIDTR.

Vaccination - Immunization of cattle with Brucella abortus (RB51) vaccine as authorized by cooperative USDA-State program guidelines.

**Data Sources and Methodology:**

Division of Animal Industry program managers receive laboratory reports from a variety of sources (Division laboratories, private laboratories, USDA, etc.) that routinely report results on the diseases in the LDAIDTR. The majority of the test results are derived from USDA databases and the data accuracy in those databases is the responsibility of the USDA. The program managers have documented procedures for data access and compilation which allow for accurate reproduction of the data.

Animal vaccinations relate to the injection of brucella abortus vaccine into cattle by accredited veterinarians. Data is received from field personnel, along with information provided from veterinary practitioners, and reports are forwarded to the USDA office for entry into the USDA GDB database system.

Data is compiled in an Excel spreadsheet on the Bureau of Animal Disease "I" Drive/ Monthly report, listed by year and month.

**Validity:**

This measure is appropriate because testing is necessary to detect and control these diseases. The mission of the Division of Animal Industry is the prevention, eradication and control of animal diseases.

**Reliability:**

The program managers have documented procedures for data access and compilation. Program managers are audited randomly throughout the year by their supervisor and are required to regenerate a report within a specified timeframe that reproduces previously reported numbers. Their data access and compilation procedures are also reviewed during these random audits.

**LRPP EXHIBIT IV: PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY**

**Agency:** Agriculture and Consumer Services  
**Program:** Agricultural Economic Development  
**Service:** Animal Pest and Disease Control  
**Measure:** Number of reports of suspected or positive dangerous, transmissible diseases received by the state veterinarian (DOACS approved measure # 92)

**Action** (check one):

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

**Glossary:**

**Report** – Notification of the State Veterinarian of a suspected or positive dangerous, transmissible disease by any person who has knowledge of, or suspects, the existence of any of the diseases or pests listed in 5C-20 in the state. That person is required to immediately report suspicions or findings to the State Veterinarian (office hours: (850) 410-0900; fax: (850) 410-0915; after hours: 1(800) 342-5869; email: [rad@doacs.state.fl.us](mailto:rad@doacs.state.fl.us)).

Any person who has knowledge of, or suspects, the existence of any other unusual animal disease or pest in the state which may be a foreign or a newly-emerging disease that might result in unusually high animal loss, economic damage, or is suspected of causing human disease, should immediately report suspicions or findings to the State Veterinarian (office hours: (850) 410-0900; fax: (850) 410-0915; after hours: 1(800) 342-5869; email: [rad@doacs.state.fl.us](mailto:rad@doacs.state.fl.us)).

**Dangerous, transmissible disease** - Each of the following pests or diseases is declared to be a dangerous, transmissible pest or disease of animals (Rule 5C-20) and to constitute an animal and/or public health risk.

- (1) African Horse Sickness.
- (2) African Swine Fever.
- (3) Anthrax.
- (4) Avian Influenza.
- (5) Bont Tick infestation (*Amblyomma*).
- (6) Bovine Piroplasmiasis (Cattle Tick Fever).
- (7) Bovine Spongiform Encephalopathy.
- (8) Brucellosis (*B. abortus*, *B. suis*).
- (9) Southern Cattle Tick infestation (*Boophilus*).
- (10) Chlamydiosis (*Psittacosis*, *Ornithosis*).
- (11) Classical Swine Fever.
- (12) Chronic Wasting Disease.
- (13) Contagious Bovine or Caprine Pleuropneumonia.
- (14) Contagious Equine Metritis.
- (15) Dourine.
- (16) Equine Encephalitis (Eastern, Western, Venezuelan, or West Nile Virus).
- (17) Equine Herpes Virus (Neurological Disease).
- (18) Equine Infectious Anemia.
- (19) Equine Piroplasmiasis (Horse Tick Fever).
- (20) Equine Viral Arteritis.
- (21) Exotic Newcastle Disease.
- (22) Foot and Mouth Disease.
- (23) Glanders.
- (24) Heartwater.
- (25) Infectious Bronchitis.
- (26) Infectious Laryngotracheitis.
- (27) Lumpy skin disease.
- (28) Mycoplasmosis (poultry).
- (29) Peste des Petits Ruminants.
- (30) Pseudorabies (Aujeszky's Disease).
- (31) Pullorum Disease.
- (32) Rabies.
- (33) Rift Valley Fever.
- (34) Rinderpest.
- (35) *Salmonella enteritidis*.
- (36) Scabies (sheep or cattle).
- (37) Scrapie (sheep or goats).
- (38) Screwworm infestation.

- (39) Sheep and Goat Pox.
- (40) Strangles (Equine).
- (41) Spring Viremia of Carp.
- (42) Swine Vesicular Disease.
- (43) Tropical Horse Tick Infestation (*Demacentor nitens*).
- (44) Tuberculosis.
- (45) Vesicular Exanthema.
- (46) Vesicular Stomatitis.

### **Data Sources and Methodology:**

The State Veterinarian or authorized representative receives reports of suspected or positive dangerous, transmissible diseases from private veterinarians, animal owners and anyone suspecting the presence of such disease in the State of Florida via telephone, facsimile or e-mail. These diseases are designated Dangerous Transmissible Diseases by Statute (F.S. 585.15, 18, and 19) and Rule (5C-20). These diseases are foreign or emerging diseases that seriously threaten animals and/or public health. All reports received are entered into the division's Reportable Animal Disease Database (RADD) and are monitored and characterized. Often further testing and evaluation may rule out the suspected disease but positive cases will require initiation of control or eradication measures. Follow-up work generally involves investigation, sample collection, incremental laboratory diagnostic testing, and epidemiological evaluation. Careful analysis is required to assess the potential threat to animal and/or public health.

### **Validity:**

This measure is appropriate because the State Veterinarian is established via statute as the contact point for the reporting of these diseases. The mission of the Division of Animal Industry is the prevention, eradication and control of animal diseases.

### **Reliability:**

The State Veterinarian and designated staff have documented procedures for data input, access and compilation. Program managers are audited randomly throughout the year by their supervisor and are required to regenerate a report within a specified timeframe that reproduces previously reported numbers. Their data input, access and compilation procedures are also reviewed during these random audits. The Reportable Animal Disease Database (RADD) was developed utilizing ISDM standards as required by AGMIC. All RADD information is maintained and backed up daily by AGMIC.

## LRPP EXHIBIT IV: PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY

**Agency:** Agriculture and Consumer Services  
**Program:** Agricultural Economic Development  
**Service:** Animal Pest and Disease Control  
**Measure:** Number of employee hours spent on animal and agricultural emergency activities  
(DOACS approved measure # 93)

**Action** (check one):

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

### **Glossary:**

**Animal Emergency** - A declared or non-declared emergency due to an animal disease or pest occurrence which has a significant animal and/or public health impact which could result in a negative economic impact to the affected industries or citizens of the State of Florida.

**Agricultural Emergency** – A declared or non-declared emergency which could result in a negative economic impact to the affected agricultural and/or animal industries or citizens of the State of Florida.

**Emergency Support Function 17 (ESF 17)** - An entity that is identified as an Emergency Support Function (ESF) in the State Comprehensive Emergency Management Plan. The purpose of this ESF is to plan and coordinate support agencies' response actions relating to animal and agricultural concerns that may arise as part of a natural or man made disaster.

### **Data Sources and Methodology:**

Division Emergency Management staff utilize activation logs, training logs and Daily Activity Reports (DAR's) to compile the employee hours spent responding, training, preparing and planning for animal and agricultural emergencies. Designated staff compile and report these hours annually.

### **Validity:**

This measure is appropriate as the Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services/Division of Animal Industry was designated as the lead agency/division for Emergency Support Function 17 in the State Comprehensive Emergency Management Plan (CEMP).

**Reliability:**

The Division of Animal Industry, Emergency Response staff has documented procedures for the compilation of employee hours spent on these activities. Emergency Response staff is audited randomly throughout the year and are required to regenerate a report within a specified timeframe that reproduces previously reported numbers.

## LRPP EXHIBIT IV: PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY

**Department:** Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services

**Program:** Agricultural Economic Development

**Service:** Plant Pest and Disease Control

**Measure:** Percent of newly introduced pests and diseases prevented from infesting Florida plants to a level where eradication is biologically or economically unfeasible (DOACS approved measure # 94)

**Action** (check one):

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

### **Glossary:**

Plant Pests/Diseases - Insect, disease or other organism, which adversely affects a commercially produced or native plant or plant product.

Excluded – preventing the entry of a plant pest or disease

### **Data Sources and Methodology:**

The total number of new, established pests is obtained from the Bureau of Entomology, Nematology and Plant Pathology Databases. This is added to the total number of shipments rejected for lack of certification or the presence of exotic plant pests as provided by the Bureau of Plant and Apiary Inspection Quarterly reports. Both of these figures are input by the respective bureaus into a share drive spread sheet for performance measures. They are added by hand and the number of rejections divided by the total and multiplied by 100 to obtain the percentage.

### **Validity:**

These measures are the most valid indication of the effectiveness of plant inspection activities currently available. However, failure to detect exotic plant pests and diseases is not necessarily an indication of poor inspection performance. It may be that plant importers are doing a better job of shipping pest-free products or that improperly certified shipments are being intercepted at agricultural inspection stations and are being rejected entry into the state. Another complicating factor is that new pests may enter through international

ports over which the department has no control. In addition, Florida receives over 50 million visitors a year. Their vehicles or belongings are minimally inspected if at all, which suggests this pathway is also important in new exotic pests being brought to Florida on contraband plant materials.

**Reliability:**

The data is very reliable, and it can be easily verified since a laboratory specimen slip that identifies the specific pest detected is required before control action can be taken. The Bureau of Entomology, Nematology and Plant Pathology report these records bimonthly in Triology. The percentage figure used will represent a comparison of the total plant pests and diseases established annually versus those that were excluded or eradicated. The information on rejected shipments is collected at the Agricultural Inspection Stations or from individual inspectors as documented on passing reports or quarantine notices.

**LRPP EXHIBIT IV: PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY**

**Department: Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services**  
**Program: Agricultural Economic Development**  
**Service: Plant Pest and Disease Control**  
**Measure: Number of plant, fruit fly trap and honeybee inspections performed (DOACS approved measure # 95)**

**Action** (check one):

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

**Glossary:**

Exotic fruit fly – a tephritid fly that does not occur in Florida that is considered a pest of fruits and vegetables. These include Mediterranean fruit fly, Oriental fruit fly, Mexican fruit fly and several other species.

Inspections - A visual observation made by a Department's authorized representative to determine whether or not the plant, fruit fly trap, or honeybee is free of the target pest.



Trap – a deltoid trap baited with a sex attractant or a glass bell shaped trap baited with a food attractant capable of attracting and catching exotic fruit flies.

Serviced – examined to determine if one of the target flies has been detected and re-baited if scheduled.

### **Data Sources and Methodology:**

Data is manually collected from daily or weekly inspection reports or collected on a daily basis electronically from personal data assistants from individual inspectors indicating the type of inspection. It is compiled into weekly or quarterly summaries by the various bureaus or programs. The citrus canker and citrus greening inspection statistics are obtained from the PICS database and generated by the contractor who designed the database.

*The number of plant inspections performed, the number of exotic fruit fly traps serviced and the number of honeybee inspections performed are sub-categories of the number of plant, fruit fly trap and honeybee inspections performed. The number of plant inspections performed is a total of the following subcategories:*

- number of plant inspections from the Bureau of Plant and Apiary Inspection
- number of citrus budwood inspections
- number of Citrus Health Response Program property inspections
- number of Citrus Health Response Program regulatory inspections.

Both the numbers generated from PICS and manual counts of inspection reports are entered in our spreadsheet for performance measures. Each section inputs the number of inspections conducted into the share drive spread sheet for performance measures.

### **Validity:**

Inspections are an integral component of all division programs. The number of plant and honeybee pests prevented from becoming introduced or spread throughout the state is directly related to the number of inspections conducted; therefore measuring this output is very important. An important point to consider is that a single inspection may include an entire nursery or a single plant. Also the number of inspections can greatly vary depending on plant pest situations.

### **Reliability:**

Each person responsible for entering data into the performance measure spreadsheet only has access to change his or her own data. And, although the data is collected by hand, much of it can be reconciled with receipts for service fees or quality control activities. Therefore, it is considered to be very reliable.

## LRPP EXHIBIT IV: PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY

**Department:** Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services

**Program:** Agricultural Economic Development

**Service:** Plant Pest and Disease Control

**Measure:** Number of commercial citrus acres surveyed for citrus diseases  
(DOACS approved measure # 96)

**Action** (check one):

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

### **Glossary:**

Survey - A visual observation made by a Department's authorized representative to determine whether or not a commercial citrus grove is free of citrus canker

Commercial Citrus - A solid planting of 40 or more citrus trees (including grapefruit, oranges & tangerines).

### **Data Sources and Methodology:**

Data is collected from daily inspection reports from individual inspectors or by personal data assistants and entered daily into the PICS Data Base maintained by the Citrus Health Response Program. The contractor who designed the PICS system is responsible for generating reports from the PICS database that reflect counts of acres surveyed. This data is then input on a share drive spread sheet for performance measures.

### **Validity:**

Surveys are an integral component of the Citrus Health Response Program. They are necessary to verify that commercial groves are free of Citrus Canker and Citrus Greening so that the fruit will be eligible for shipment to other states and countries. The number of acres surveyed is a good indication of workload for this activity.

**Reliability:**

Although some of the data is collected by hand, inspection crews work in teams and supervisors or special quality control staff closely monitor their work and conduct targeted follow-up inspections to insure that the inspections are conducted as reported. Therefore, it is considered to be very reliable.

The same conclusion would be reached by anyone accessing the spreadsheet for performance measures.

**LRPP EXHIBIT IV: PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY**

**Department: Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services**

**Program: Agricultural Economic Development**

**Service: Plant Pest and Disease Control**

**Measure: Number of sterile med flies released  
(DOACS approved measure # 97)**

**Action** (check one):

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

**Glossary:**

Mediterranean fruit fly - A fruit fly in the family Tephritidae commonly known as the Medfly. These flies damage fruit by laying eggs in fruit. The eggs hatch into maggots that feed on the fruit pulp making it unacceptable for the fresh fruit market.

Eclosion or eclosion - The fruit fly development stage where the adult fly emerges from the pupae case similar to a butterfly emerging from a cocoon.

**Data Sources and Methodology:**

Data on the number of flies released is calculated on daily flights by USDA from the number of pounds of flies released in each box on each flight/release date. This number is derived from average weight/size of flies from a particular pupae shipment date. The data is compiled by USDA and entered monthly into a spreadsheet maintained by the Bureau of Methods Development and Biological

Control. This data is then input on a share drive spreadsheet for performance measures.

**Validity:**

Mediterranean fruit fly is one of the most destructive pests known, attacking over 250 different fruits and vegetables such as oranges, grapefruit, tangerines, tomatoes, bell peppers, peaches, avocado, mango, etc. Releasing sterile Medflies as a preventative measure in high-risk areas of the state can prevent fertile Medflies from becoming established.

The more sterile flies we release, the less likely we are to have a Medfly outbreak. This does work since we have not had an outbreak since 1998 in the areas treated. And this is an indication that the program is worthwhile. The measure also provides a good indication of workload for this activity.

**Reliability:**

Detailed records are maintained by the eclosion facility in Sarasota. A separate quality control section in the facility tests the quality of the flies and records the numbers received and released. This can be verified by shipping records and bills from the rearing facility in Guatemala. Therefore, this data is considered to be very reliable.

**LRPP EXHIBIT IV: PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY**

**Department: Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services**

**Program: Agricultural Economic Development**

**Service: Plant Pest and Disease Control**

**Measure: Number of plant, soil, insect and other organism samples processed for identification or diagnosis (DOACS approved measure # 98)**

**Action** (check one):

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

**Glossary:**

Sample Processed - Sample logged in; separated into subunits as appropriate; prepared through slide making, culturing, pinning, and other laboratory manipulations as necessary; identification or diagnosis made by taxonomic expert; and report prepared for recipients. If one sample is separated into sub units it is still counted as one sample.

**Data Sources and Methodology:**

This measurement is obtained from the Entomology, Nematology and Plant Pathology databases. An individual specimen report is completed for each sample and maintained in the section database. This information is subsequently input into the share drive spread sheet for performance measures.

**Validity:**

This measurement is valid since the specimens collected as part of inspection activities must be properly identified in order that appropriate control action can be taken. The measure is a direct reflection of the amount of work being done by our inspectors since they are collecting specimens for identification.

**Reliability:**

This data is very reliable since it can be readily reconciled by comparing samples logged into the system with those processed as maintained in the computer data base and as reported on individual specimen identification slips.

**LRPP EXHIBIT IV: PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY**

**Department: Florida Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services**

**Program: Agricultural Economic Development**

**Service: Plant Pest and Disease Control**

**Measure: Number of cartons of citrus certified fly-free for export  
(DOACS approved measure # 99)**

**Action (check one):**

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

**Glossary:**

Carton - A 4/5-bushel cardboard or plastic container used to package fresh citrus fruit.

Certified Pest-free - Citrus fruit that is free of Caribbean fruit fly and other pests of quarantine significance regulated by the importing state or country as verified on a plant health certificate.

**Data Sources and Methodology:**

These data are collected by inspectors when certifying citrus shipments to other states or countries. Copies of the numbered certificates are collected, categorized and tallied on an annual basis by state, country and commodity. The majority of this data is obtained from the Division of Fruit and Vegetable Inspection. This data is then input on a share drive spread sheet for performance measures.

**Validity:**

The measurement is valid since the actual number of cartons is listed on each certificate that indicates workload and progress towards goals of expanded export markets for Florida citrus. However this figure can fluctuate due to market or production changes that are beyond the division's control.

**Reliability:**

The data is compiled by hand; however, it can be reconciled by comparison with receipts and voided certificates, so it should be very accurate. The same conclusion would be reached by anyone accessing the spreadsheet for performance measures. In addition, only the designated person can change the information that they input.

Associated Activities  
Contributing to Performance  
Measures – LRPP  
Exhibit V

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

### Division: Agricultural Law Enforcement

Measure Number	Approved Performance Measures for FY 2009-10 (Words)		Associated Activities Title
1	Criminal investigations closure rate		ACT2005 - Conduct law enforcement investigations
			ACT2010 - Administration of law enforcement and assistance to local law enforcement in the wake of natural disasters
2	Number of law enforcement investigations initiated		ACT2005 - Conduct law enforcement investigations
			ACT2010 - Administration of law enforcement and assistance to local law enforcement in the wake of natural disasters

Office of Policy and Budget – July, 2008



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

### Division: Water Policy

Measure Number	Approved Performance Measures for FY 2009-10 (Words)	Associated Activities Title
3	Number of acres in priority basins or watersheds outside the Northern Everglades and Estuaries Protection Program (NEEPP) area enrolled annually, through Notices of Intent, in Agricultural Water Policy Best Management Practices (BMP) programs	ACT2055 - Assist implementation of 1999 Watershed Restoration Act
		ACT2070 - Assist soil and water conservation districts
4	Number of water policy assists provided to agricultural interests	ACT2060 - Develop water policy
		ACT2070 - Assist soil and water conservation districts
5	Number of acres in the Northern Everglades and Estuaries Protection Program area enrolled annually, through Notices of Intent, in Agricultural Water Policy Best Management Practices programs	ACT2050 - Develop and implement Best Management Practices (BMP's) for agricultural industry
		ACT2070 - Assist soil and water conservation districts
6	Number of gallons of water potentially conserved annually by agricultural operations pursuant to site-specific recommendations provided by participating Mobile Irrigation Labs during the fiscal year	ACT2060 - Develop water policy
		ACT2065 - Assist mobile irrigation laboratory conservation programs
		ACT2070 - Assist soil and water conservation districts

Office of Policy and Budget – July, 2008

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

**Division: Administration**

Measure Number	Approved Performance Measures for FY 2009-10 (Words)		Associated Activities Title
7	Administrative cost as a percent of total agency costs		ACT0010 - Executive Direction
8	Administrative positions as a percent of total agency positions		ACT0010 - Executive Direction

Office of Policy and Budget – July, 2008

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

### Division: Licensing

Measure Number	Approved Performance Measures for FY 2009-10 (Words)		Associated Activities Title
9	Percent of license revocations or suspensions initiated within 20 days after receipt of disqualifying information (all license types)		ACT1215 - Compliance Section   
10	Percent of security, investigative, and recovery licenses issued within 90 days after receipt of an application		ACT1200 - Licensing   
11	Percent/number of concealed weapon/firearm licenses issued within 90-day statutory timeframe without fingerprint results		ACT1200 - Licensing   
12	Number of default concealed weapon/firearm licensees with prior criminal histories		ACT1200 - Licensing   
13	Percent of security, investigative, and recovery investigations completed within 60 days		ACT1225 - Regional Offices   

14	Percent of security, investigative, and recovery inspections completed within 30 days		ACT1225 - Regional Offices
15	Average cost of concealed weapon/firearm applications processed		ACT1200 - Licensing
			ACT1210 - Public Inquiry
16	Average cost of security, investigative, and recovery applications processed		ACT1200 - Licensing
			ACT1210 - Public Inquiry
17	Average cost of security, investigative, and recovery investigations		ACT1225 - Regional Offices
18	Average cost of security, investigative, and recovery compliance inspections		ACT1225 - Regional Offices

19	Average cost of administrative actions (revocation, fine, probation, and compliance letters)		ACT1215 - Compliance Section
20	Number of investigations performed (security, investigative, recovery complaint and agency generated investigations)		ACT1225 - Regional Offices
21	Number of compliance inspections performed (security, investigative, and recovery licensee/new agency, and random inspections)		ACT1225 - Regional Offices

Office of Policy and Budget – July, 2008

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

### Division: Land Management

Measure Number	Approved Performance Measures for FY 2009-10 (Words)		Associated Activities Title
22	Percent of state forest timber producing acres adequately stocked and growing		ACT1120 - State Forest Resource Management
23	Number of acres of state forests managed by the Department		ACT1120 - State Forest Resource Management
24	Number of hours spent providing forest-related technical assists to non-industrial private landowners		ACT1130 - Provide technical assists to non-industrial forest landowners
25	Number of hours spent providing forest-related technical assists public land management agencies		ACT1160 - Provide land management assistance to other agencies
26	Number of state forest visitors served		ACT1140 - Visitor service / recreation

Office of Policy and Budget – July, 2008

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

### Division: Wildfire Prevention

Measure Number	Approved Performance Measures for FY 2009-10(Words)		Associated Activities Title
27	Percent of acres of protected forest and wild lands not burned by wildfires		ACT1180 - Protect acres of forest land from wildfires
28	Percent of threatened structures not burned by wildfires		ACT1180 - Protect acres of forest land from wildfires
29	Number/Percent of wildfires caused by humans		ACT1180 - Protect acres of forest land from wildfires
30	Number of wildfires suppressed		ACT1180 - Protect acres of forest land from wildfires
31	Number of acres authorized to be burned through prescribed burning		ACT1180 - Protect acres of forest land from wildfires

32	Number of acres of forest land protected from wildfires		ACT1180 - Protect acres of forest land from wildfires
33	Number of person-hours spent responding to emergency incidents other than wildfires		ACT1180 - Protect acres of forest land from wildfires

Office of Policy and Budget – July, 2008



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

### Division: Dairy

Measure Number	Approved Performance Measures for FY 2009-10 (Words)		Associated Activities Title
34	Percent of Florida Milk Regulatory Program samples analyzed that meet standards		ACT5020 - Perform sample analyses
35	Percent of dairy establishments meeting food safety and sanitation requirements		ACT5010 - Inspect dairy establishments and collect samples
36	Number of analyses conducted on Florida Milk Regulatory Program samples.		ACT5020 - Perform sample analyses
37	Number of dairy establishment inspections		ACT5010 - Inspect dairy establishments and collect samples
			ACT5025 - Inspect dairy tankers and evaluate bulk milk sample collectors

Office of Policy and Budget – July, 2008

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

### Division: Food Safety

Measure Number	Approved Performance Measures for FY 2009-10 (Words)		Associated Activities Title
38	Percent of food establishments meeting food safety and sanitation requirements		ACT1420 - Conduct food establishment inspections
39	Percent of food products analyzed that meet standards		ACT1430 - Perform analyses of food samples
40	Percent of produce or other food samples analyzed that meet chemical residue standards		ACT1440 - Perform analyses for chemical residues
41	Number of inspections of food establishments and water vending machines		ACT1420 - Conduct food establishment inspections
42	Number of food analyses conducted		ACT1430 - Perform analyses of food samples
43	Number of chemical residue analyses conducted		ACT1440 - Perform analyses for chemical residues

Office of Policy and Budget – July, 2008

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

### Division: Agricultural Environmental Services

Measure Number	Approved Performance Measures for FY 2009-10 (Words)		Associated Activities Title
44	Percent of feed, seed and fertilizer inspected products in compliance with performance/quality standards		ACT1350 - Regulate fertilizer companies
			ACT1365 - Regulate seed companies
			ACT1380 - Analyze feed products
			ACT1370 - License feed companies
45	Percent of pesticide ingredients evaluated and/or managed that are in compliance and regulations		ACT1320 - Register pesticide products
			ACT1315 - Evaluate and manage pesticide ingredients
46	Percent of commercial pest control businesses and applicators inspected who are in compliance with regulations		ACT1335 - Inspect pest control businesses and applicators
47	Percent of licensed pesticide applicators inspected who are in compliance with regulations		ACT1305 - Inspect pesticide applicators and dealers
			ACT1310 - License pesticide applicators and dealers

48	Number of reported human/equine disease cases caused by mosquitoes		ACT1345 - Regulate mosquito control programs
49	Number of pest control, feed, seed, fertilizer, and pesticide inspections conducted		ACT1305 - Inspect pesticide applicators and dealers ACT1335 - Inspect pest control businesses and applicators ACT1350 - Regulate fertilizer companies ACT1365 - Regulate seed companies
50	Number of people served by mosquito control activities		ACT1345 - Regulate mosquito control programs
51	Number of pesticide products registered		ACT1320 - Register pesticide products
52	Number of pesticide sample determinations made in the pesticide laboratory		ACT1325 - Analyze pesticide ingredients
53	Number of pest control businesses and applicators licensed		ACT1340 - License pest control businesses and applicators

54	Number of fertilizer sample determinations		ACT1355 - Analyze fertilizer products
55	Number of official seed sample determinations performed		ACT1360 - Analyze seed products

Office of Policy and Budget – July, 2008

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

### Division: Consumer Services

Measure Number	Approved Performance Measures for FY 2009-10 (Words)		Associated Activities Title
56	Percent of all regulated entities where an investigation found a violation of consumer protection laws		ACT1065 - Enforce consumer protection laws
			ACT1070 - Provide consumer education to the public
57	Number of Lemon Law assists made to consumers		ACT1030 - Provide Lemon Law assists to consumers
			ACT1070 - Provide consumer education to the public
58	Number of complaints investigated/processed by the Division of Consumer Services		ACT1065 - Enforce consumer protection laws
			ACT1070 - Provide consumer education to the public
			ACT1075 - Mediate (non-regulated) consumer complaints
59	Number of "No Sales Solicitation Calls" processed		ACT1020 - Process "No Sales Solicitation Calls" subscriptions
			ACT1070 - Provide consumer education to the public

60	Number of regulated entities licensed by Division of Consumer Services		<p>ACT1010 - Register and respond to complaints applicable to motor vehicle repairs</p> <p>ACT1015 - Register and respond to complaints applicable to solicitation of contribution law</p> <p>ACT1025 - Register and respond to complaints applicable to sellers of travel law</p> <p>ACT1035 - Register and respond to complaints applicable to health studio law</p> <p>ACT1040 - Register and respond to complaints applicable to pawn shop law</p> <p>ACT1045 - Register and respond to complaints applicable to telemarketing law</p> <p>ACT1050 - Register and respond to complaints applicable to business opportunity law</p> <p>ACT1055 - Register and respond to complaints applicable to dance studio law</p> <p>ACT1070 - Provide consumer education to the public</p> <p>ACT1083 - Register and respond to complaints applicable to game promotions</p> <p>ACT1090 - Register and respond to complaints applicable to intrastate moving companies</p>
61	Number of assists provided to consumers by the call center		<p>ACT1060 - Provide assists to consumers (Call Center)</p> <p>ACT1070 - Provide consumer education to the public</p> <p></p> <p></p>

Office of Policy and Budget – July, 2008

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

### Division: Standards

Measure Number	Approved Performance Measures for FY 2009-10 (Words)		Associated Activities Title
62	Percent of regulated weighing and measuring devices, packages, and businesses with scanners in compliance with accuracy standards during initial inspection/testing		ACT3040 - Conduct weights and measures inspections   
63	Percent of LP Gas facilities found in compliance with safety requirements on first inspection		ACT3070 - Conduct LP gas inspections   
64	Percent of amusement attractions found in full compliance with safety requirements on first inspections		ACT3110 - Conduct amusement ride safety inspections   
65	Percent of petroleum products meeting quality standards		ACT3030 - Analyze petroleum products   
66	Number of LP Gas facility inspections and reinspections conducted		ACT3070 - Conduct LP gas inspections   



67	Number of petroleum field inspections conducted		ACT3020 - Conduct petroleum field inspections
68	Number of petroleum tests performed		ACT3030 - Analyze petroleum products
69	Number of amusement ride safety inspections conducted		ACT3110 - Conduct amusement ride safety inspections

Office of Policy and Budget – July, 2008

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

### Division: Fruit and Vegetables

Measure Number	Approved Performance Measures for FY 2009-10 (Words)		Associated Activities Title
70	Dollar value of fruit and vegetables that are shipped to other states or countries that are subject to mandatory inspection		ACT7020 - Conduct shipping and receiving point vegetable inspections and regulate imports in applicable areas upon request
71	Number of tons of fruit and vegetables inspected		ACT7010 - Conduct citrus packing house and processing plant inspections
			ACT7020 - Conduct shipping and receiving point vegetable inspections and regulate imports in applicable areas upon request
			ACT7030 - Conduct terminal market inspections upon request of shippers/receivers

Office of Policy and Budget – July, 2008

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

### Division: Marketing

Measure Number	Approved Performance Measures for FY 2009-10 (Words)		Associated Activities Title
72	Florida agricultural products as a percent of the national market		ACT6020 - Conduct Florida Agriculture Promotion Campaign (FAPC) and related promotional activities
73	Total sales of agricultural and seafood products generated by tenants of State Farmers' Markets		ACT6040 - Conduct State Farmers' Market Program
74	Percent of available square feet of State Farmer's Markets leased		ACT6040 - Conduct State Farmers' Market Program
75	Number of buyers reached with agricultural promotion campaign messages		ACT6020 - Conduct Florida Agriculture Promotion Campaign (FAPC) and related promotional activities
			ACT6030 - Provide education and communications
			ACT6040 - Conduct State Farmers' Market Program
			ACT6060 - Pass-through funds to food distribution agencies to distribute federal commodities to the needy



76	Number of marketing assists provided to producers and businesses		ACT6050 - Conduct agricultural/seafood/ aquaculture assists
			ACT6030 - Provide education and communications
			ACT6070 - Issue, inspect and review licenses and bond programs
			ACT6130 - Conduct market news programs
			ACT6040 - Conduct State Farmers' Market Program
			ACT6060 - Pass-through funds to food distribution agencies to distribute federal commodities to the needy
77	Pounds of federal commodities and recovered food distributed		ACT6060 - Pass-through funds to food distribution agencies to distribute federal commodities to the needy
78	Number of leased square feet at State Farmers' Markets		ACT6040 - Conduct State Farmers' Market Program

Office of Policy and Budget – July, 2008

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

### Division: Aquaculture

Measure Number	Approved Performance Measures for FY 2009-10 (Words)		Associated Activities Title
79	Percent of shellfish facilities in significant compliance with permit and food safety regulations		ACT1710 - Inspect shellfish processing plants
80	Number of shellfish processing plant inspections and HACCP (Hazard Analysis Critical Control Point) records reviews		ACT1710 - Inspect shellfish processing plants
82	Number of acres tested		ACT1720 - Test water quality
83	Number of Aquaculture Leases		ACT1740 - Administer shellfish lease program
84	Number of bushels of processed shell and live oysters deposited to restore habitat on public oyster reefs		ACT1750 - Conduct oyster planting activities

Office of Policy and Budget – July, 2008

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

### Division: Agricultural Interdiction

Measure Number	Approved Performance Measures for FY 2009-10 (Words)		Associated Activities Title
85	Percent of vehicles carrying agricultural related products that are inspected and found to be free of potentially devastating plant and animal pests and diseases		ACT2020 - Agricultural state law enforcement - commodity interdiction
86	Amount of revenue generated by Bills of Lading transmitted to the Department of Revenue from Agricultural Interdiction Stations		ACT2025 - Capture Bills of Lading
87	Number of vehicles inspected at Agricultural Interdiction Stations		ACT2020 - Agricultural state law enforcement - commodity interdiction
88	Number of vehicles inspected at Agricultural Interdiction Stations transporting agricultural or regulated commodities		ACT2020 - Agricultural state law enforcement - commodity interdiction
89	Number of Bills of Lading transmitted to the Department of Revenue from Agricultural Interdiction Stations		ACT2025 - Capture Bills of Lading

Office of Policy and Budget – July, 2008

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

### Division: Animal Industry

Measure Number	Approved Performance Measures for FY 2009-10 (Words)		Associated Activities Title
90	Percentage of positive test results from livestock and poultry tested for specific diseases for which monitoring, controlling and eradication activities are established		ACT9010 - Prevent, control, and eradicate animal diseases  
91	Number of animal site inspections performed		ACT9030 - Inspect livestock on farms/ranches for sanitary/humane conditions  
92	Number of tests and/or vaccinations performed on animals		ACT9010 - Prevent, control, and eradicate animal diseases  
93	Number of reports of suspected or positive dangerous, transmissible diseases received by the state veterinarian		ACT9010 - Prevent, control, and eradicate animal diseases  
94	Number of employee hours spent on animal and agricultural emergency activities		ACT9010 - Prevent, control, and eradicate animal diseases  

Office of Policy and Budget – July, 2008



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

### Division: Plant Industry

Measure Number	Approved Performance Measures for FY 2009-10 (Words)	Associated Activities Title
95	Percent of newly introduced pests and diseases prevented from infesting Florida plants to a level where eradication is biologically or economically unfeasible	ACT8011 - Inspect plants for plant pests, diseases or grade and service exotic fruit fly traps
		ACT8130 - Inspect apiaries
96	Number of plant, fruit fly trap, and honeybee inspections performed	ACT8011 - Inspect plants for plant pests, diseases or grade and service exotic fruit fly traps
		ACT8130 - Inspect apiaries
97	Number of commercial citrus acres surveyed for citrus diseases	ACT8120 - Inspect citrus trees for crop forecast and pest detection
98	Number of sterile med flies released	ACT8100 - Release sterile fruit flies
99	Number of plant, soil, insect and other organism samples processed for identification or diagnosis	ACT8060 - Identify plant pests
100	Number of cartons of citrus certified as fly-free for export	ACT8080 - Certify citrus fly-free



AGRICULTURE AND CONSUMER SERVICES, DEPARTMENT OF, AND		FISCAL YEAR 2008-09			
SECTION I: BUDGET		OPERATING	FIXED CAPITAL OUTLAY		
TOTAL ALL FUNDS GENERAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT		335,521,980	11,515,350		
ADJUSTMENTS TO GENERAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT (Supplementals, Vetoes, Budget Amendments, etc.)		20,370,854	10,500,000		
FINAL BUDGET FOR AGENCY		355,892,834	22,015,350		
SECTION II: ACTIVITIES - MEASURES		Number of Units	(1) Unit Cost	(2) Expenditures (Allocated)	(3) FCO
Executive Direction, Administrative Support and Information Technology (2)					22,015,350
Register And Respond To Complaints Applicable To Motor Vehicle Repair Law * Number of motor vehicle repair shops licensed by the Division of Consumer Services		22,413	42.06	942,677	
Register And Respond To Complaints Applicable To Solicitation Of Contribution Law * Number of solicitors of contributions licensed by the division		14,607	64.88	947,649	
Process No Sales Solicitation Calls* Subscriptions * Number of "No Sales Solicitation Calls" subscriptions processed		95,157	8.50	808,727	
Register And Respond To Complaints Applicable To Sellers Of Travel Law * Number of sellers of travel licensed by the division		6,173	82.32	508,770	
Provide Lemon Law Assists To Consumers * Number of Lemon Laws assists made to consumers		13,423	33.24	446,715	
Register And Respond To Complaints Applicable To Health Studio Law * Number of health studios licensed by the division		1,079	116.54	219,010	
Register And Respond To Complaints Applicable To Pawn Shop Law * Number of pawn shops licensed by the division		1,169	187.35	219,010	
Register And Respond To Complaints Applicable To Telemarketing Law * Number of telemarketers licensed by the division		10,648	13.71	145,938	
Register And Respond To Complaints Applicable To Business Opportunity Law * Number of sellers of business opportunity licensed by the division		2,304	94.16	217,129	
Register And Respond To Complaints Applicable To Dance Studio Law * Number of dance studios licensed by the division		204	66.73	13,612	
Provide Assists To Consumers (call center) * Number of assists provided to consumers by the call center		518,412	2.87	1,488,934	
Enforce Consumer Protection Laws * Number of complaints investigated/processed by the division		47,774	21.01	1,003,794	
Provide Consumer Education To Public * Number of assists provided to consumers for consumer education		2,526,055	0.14	343,836	
Mediate (non-regulated) Consumer Complaints * Number of assists provided to consumers for non-regulated consumer complaints		23,993	18.03	432,586	
Register And Respond To Complaints Applicable To Game Promotions * Number of game promoters licensed by the division		2,978	97.45	290,201	
Register And Respond To Complaints Applicable To Intrastate Moving Companies * Number of intrastate moving companies licensed by the division		893	324.97	290,201	
State Forest Resource Management * The number of acres of State Forests managed by the Department		1,043,860	20.75	21,664,541	
Provide Technical Assists To Non-Industrial Forest Landowners * Number of hours spent providing forest-related technical assists to non-industrial private landowners		36,437	53.98	1,966,981	
Visitor Service / Recreation * The number of State Forest visitors served		984,892	3.38	3,324,448	
Capital Improvements * Number of hours spent on capital improvement projects		337,371	43.89	14,806,570	
Provide Land Management Assistance To Other Agencies * Number of hours spent providing forest-related technical assists to public land management agencies		16,949	21.99	372,773	
Supervise Workcamp Inmates * Number of inmate hours worked on Division of Forestry Programs		247,828	4.15	1,028,952	
Protect Acres Of Forest Land From Wildfires * Number of acres of forest land protected from wildfires		21,632,261	3.09	66,760,956	
Licensing * Number of license applications processed		19	625,640.39	11,261,887	
Public Inquiry * Number of inquiries responded to		222,808	4.51	1,004,299	
Compliance Section * Number of Administrative Actions		329	5,630.62	1,852,473	
Regional Offices * Number of investigations performed		1,962	2,363.40	4,636,982	
Inspect Pesticide Applicators And Dealers * Number of pesticide inspections conducted		4,835	543.46	2,627,633	
License Pesticide Applicators And Dealers * Number of pesticide applicators and dealers licensed		11,837	65.95	780,651	
Evaluate And Manage Pesticide Products * Number of pesticide ingredients evaluated		180	4,715.38	848,769	
Register Pesticide Products * Number of pesticide products registered		15,287	46.55	711,596	
Analyze Pesticide Products * Number of pesticide ingredient sample determinations made in the pesticide laboratory		104,069	10.41	1,083,351	
Inspect Pest Control Businesses And Applicators * Number of pest control businesses and applicators inspected		2,847	1,029.00	2,929,577	
License Pest Control Businesses And Applicators * Number of pest control businesses and applicators licensed		59,080	8.61	508,676	
Regulate Mosquito Control Programs * Number of people served by mosquito control activities		17,467,431	0.15	2,677,924	
Regulate Fertilizer Companies * Number of fertilizer inspections conducted		4,156	335.44	1,394,109	
Analyze Fertilizer Products * Number of fertilizer sample determinations		146,821	7.78	1,142,126	
Analyze Seed Companies * Number of official seed sample determinations performed		62,087	6.40	397,380	
Regulate Seed Companies * Number of seed inspections conducted		2,969	145.06	430,693	
License Feed Companies * Number of feed companies licensed		866	541.83	469,224	
Analyze Feed Products * Number of official feed samples collected by feed manufacturers and analyzed by certified labs for regulatory purposes		1,767	127.14	224,668	
Conduct Food Establishment Inspections * Number of inspections of food establishments and water vending machines		83,231	151.85	12,622,029	
Perform Analyses Of Food Samples * Number of food analyses conducted		47,478	69.15	3,282,908	
Perform Analyses For Chemical Residues And Pesticide Data * Number of chemical residue analyses conducted		429,322	7.73	3,318,676	
Perform Grade Evaluations On Poultry And Eggs * Tons of poultry and shell eggs graded		430,000	3.89	1,672,821	
Inspect Shellfish Processing Plants * Number of shellfish processing plants inspected		105	4,138.73	434,567	
Test Water Quality * Number of acres tested		1,451,990	1.10	1,592,533	
Administer Aquaculture Certification Program * Number of certifications issued to first-time applicants or renewed		764	85.49	653,598	
Administer Shellfish Lease Program * Number of leases verified for compliance		540	125.72	67,891	
Conduct Oyster Planting Activities * Number of bushels of processed shell and live oysters deposited to restore habitat on public oyster reefs		433,678	4.05	1,754,336	
Conduct Law Enforcement Investigations * Number of law enforcement investigations initiated		3,344	972.72	3,252,767	
Agriculture State Law Enforcement - Commonly Interdicted * Number of vehicles inspected at agricultural interdiction stations		9,466,834	1.68	15,876,200	
Capture Bills Of Lading * Number of Bills of Lading transmitted to the Department of Revenue from Agricultural Interdiction Stations		48,336	54.40	2,629,521	
Develop And Implement Best Management Practices (bmp's) For Agricultural Industry * Number of acres in the Northern Everglades and Estuaries Protection Program area enrolled annually, through Notices of Intent, in Agricultural Water Policy Best Management Practices programs		40,898	132.49	5,418,448	
Assist Implementation Of 1999 Watershed Restoration Act * Number of acres in the Northern Everglades and Estuaries Protection Program area enrolled annually, through Notices of Intent, in Agricultural Water Policy Best Management Practices programs		45,658	159.12	7,265,180	
Develop Water Policy * Number of water policy assists provided to agricultural interests		559	466.87	260,983	
Assist Mobile Irrigation Laboratory Conservation Programs * Number of gallons of water potentially conserved annually by agricultural operations pursuant to site-specific recommendations provided by participating Mobile Irrigation Labs		3,140,000,000	0.00	173,158	
Assist Soil And Water Conservation Districts * Number of soil and water conservation districts assisted		63	3,435.68	216,448	
Conduct Petroleum Field Inspections * Number of petroleum field inspections conducted		223,885	17.88	4,004,064	
Analyze Petroleum Products * Number of Petroleum samples analyzed		143,670	12.01	1,724,990	
Conduct Weights And Measures Inspections * Number of weights and measures inspections conducted		72,000	38.11	2,743,884	
Conduct Metrological Laboratory Tests * Number of physical measurement standards tests or calibrations performed		8,934	24.32	217,240	
Issue Liquefied Petroleum Gas Licenses * Number of LP gas licenses issued		12,970	57.82	749,992	
Conduct Liquefied Petroleum Gas Inspections * Number of LP gas facility inspections/inspections conducted		10,733	81.03	869,666	
Administer Liquefied Petroleum Gas Examinations * Number of LP gas examinations administered		925	145.95	136,463	
Conduct Liquefied Petroleum Gas Accident Investigations * Number of LP gas related accidents investigated		51	1,724.06	87,927	
Conduct Amusement Ride Safety Inspections * Number of amusement ride safety inspections conducted		9,820	158.03	1,551,846	
Inspect Dairy Establishments And Collect Samples * Number of dairy establishment inspections		1,643	698.28	1,147,272	
Perform Sample Analyses * Number of analyses conducted on Florida Milk Regulatory Program samples		47,114	9.90	466,421	
Inspect Dairy Tankers And Evaluate Bulk Milk Sample Collectors * Number of dairy tankers inspected and bulk milk sample collectors evaluated		1,517	39.80	60,381	
Conduct Florida Agriculture Promotion Campaign (apc) And Related Promotional Activities * Number of buyers reached with agricultural promotion campaign messages		13,785,003,805	0.00	6,275,073	
Provide Education & Communications * Number of media items produced for promotional and educational purposes		12,642	89.71	1,134,071	
Conduct State Farmers Market Program * Number of leased square feet at state farmers' markets		1,575,080	2.22	3,494,942	
Conduct Agricultural/Seafood/ Aquaculture Assists * Number of marketing assists provided to producers and businesses		614,508	7.34	4,512,444	
Issue, Inspect And Renew Licenses And Bond Program * Number of agricultural dealer licenses issued		5,665	229.83	1,301,994	
Conduct Citrus Crop/Maturity Estimates For The Citrus Industry * Number of agricultural production observations conducted		1,351,706	1.78	2,400,849	
Conduct Market News Program * Number of market pricing information assists provided to agriculture producers and businesses		5,698	41.96	239,100	
Conduct Citrus Packing House And Processing Inspections * Number of tons of citrus inspected		5,428,668	0.86	4,675,709	
Conduct Shipping And Receiving Point Vegetable Inspections And Regulate Imports In Applicable Areas Upon Request * Number of tons of vegetables inspected		898,791	3.29	2,953,480	
Conduct Terminal Market Inspections Upon Request Of Shippers/Receivers * Number of tons of fruits and vegetables inspected		9,325,458	0.07	662,679	
Inspect Plants For Plant Pests, Disease Or Grubs * Number of plant inspections performed		787,482	25.89	20,387,885	
Identify Plant Pests * Number of plant, soil, insect and other organism samples processed for identification or diagnosis		306,774	15.06	4,618,504	
Certify Citrus Fire-free * Number of acres treated for canyfly		6,195,442	0.19	1,180,890	
Develop Control Methods And Rear Biocontrol Agents * Number of bio-control agents reared		73,500,051	0.04	2,589,499	
Release Sterile Fruit Flies * Billions of sterile medflies released		4,279,851,125	0.00	973,007	
Inspect Citrus Trees For Crop Forecast And Pest Detection * Number of commercial acres surveyed for citrus pests or diseases		139,611	2.96	412,982	
Inspect Apiaries * Number of honeybee inspections performed		71,532	19.87	1,421,457	
Register Citrus Budwood * Number of citrus budwood trees registered		33,118	26.84	888,795	
Certify Nurseries As Imported Fire Ant Free * Number of inspections conducted for imported fire ants		3,434	64.87	222,778	
Prevent, Control And Eradicate Animal Diseases * Number of animals tested or vaccinated		504,047	7.85	3,958,226	
Conduct Animal-related Diagnostic Laboratory Procedures * Number of animal-related diagnostic laboratory procedures performed		324,062	12.94	4,194,481	
Inspect Livestock On Farms/Ranches For Sanitary/Humane Conditions * Number of animal site inspections performed		17,677	125.68	2,221,728	
Identify The Origin And Health Status Of Imported Animals * Number of animals covered by health certificates		23,139,992	0.03	734,204	
TOTAL				298,932,567	22,015,350
SECTION III: RECONCILIATION TO BUDGET					
PASS THROUGHS					
TRANSFER - STATE AGENCIES					
AID TO LOCAL GOVERNMENTS					
PAYMENT OF PENSIONS, BENEFITS AND CLAIMS					
OTHER					
REVERSIONS					
TOTAL BUDGET FOR AGENCY (Total Activities + Pass Throughs + Reversions) - Should equal Section I above. (4)					
				355,892,927	22,015,350

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

- Some activity unit costs may be overstated due to the allocation of double budgeted items.
- 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.
- Information for FCO depicts amounts for current year appropriations only. Additional information and systems are needed to develop meaningful FCO unit costs.
- Final Budget for Agency and Total Budget for Agency may not equal due to rounding.

## ***Glossary of Terms and Acronyms***

Activity: A set of transactions within a budget entity that translates inputs into outputs using resources in response to a business requirement. Sequences of activities in logical combinations form services. Unit cost information is determined using the outputs of activities.

Actual Expenditures: Includes prior year actual disbursements, payables and encumbrances. The payables and encumbrances are certified forward at the end of the fiscal year. They may be disbursed between July 1 and December 31 of the subsequent fiscal year. Certified forward amounts are included in the year in which the funds are committed and not shown in the year the funds are disbursed.

Adequately Stocked and Growing: A pine timber stands containing an average of at least 40 square feet per acre of merchantable basal area, or at least 300 pre-merchantable pine seedlings/saplings per acre, where volume growth of merchantable timber exceeds mortality.

Agricultural Commodities: All items such as fruits, vegetables, plants, potting soil, etc.

Agricultural Dealer: Any person, whether itinerant or domiciled within this state, engaged within this state in the business of purchasing, receiving, or soliciting agricultural products from the producer or her or his agent or representative for resale or processing for sale; acting as an agent for such producer in the sale of agricultural products for the account of the producer on a net return basis; or acting as a negotiating broker between the producer or her or his agent or representative and the buyer.

Agricultural Interdiction Station: A fixed facility strategically located at all highway crossings of the natural boundaries of the Suwannee and St. Mary's Rivers, where highway shipments of agricultural, horticultural, aquacultural and livestock commodities are inspected around the clock, 365 days per year to assure compliance with Federal-State Marketing Orders and various laws, rules and regulations designed to ensure the consuming public a safe, wholesome, quality food product and/or to prevent, control or eradicate specific plant and animal pests and diseases that could economically devastate segments of Florida's agricultural industry.

Agricultural production observations: A wide range of physical counts of trees, amount of commodity on trees, size, level of maturity and other data requested by the citrus industry.

Animal Disease: Any living stage of any bacteria, fungi or viruses, or any organisms similar to or allied with any of the foregoing, including any genetically engineered organisms, or any infectious substances which can directly or indirectly injure or cause disease or damage in any animals or animal parts or any processed, manufactured, or other animal products.

Animal Pest: Any living stage of any insects, mites, slugs, snails, protozoa, or other invertebrate animals, bacteria, fungi, other parasitic animals or their reproductive parts, or viruses, or any organisms, similar to or allied with any of the foregoing, including any genetically engineered organisms, or any infectious substances which can directly or indirectly injure or cause disease or damage in any animals or animal parts or any processed, manufactured, or other animal products

Animal site or premise: Any location where animals may be maintained or assembled for production, sale, or exhibition.

Aquaculture: The culture of aquatic organisms.

Aquaculture Certificate: - A certificate of registration issued by the Department to any person or facility engaging in aquaculture implementing the appropriate best management practices.

Aquaculture Lease: Parcel of sovereign submerged lands that is authorized by the Board of Trustees for conducting aquacultural activities.

Aquaculture Products: Aquatic organisms and any product derived from aquatic organisms that are owned and propagated, grown, or produced under controlled conditions.

BMP's: Best Management Practices

Baseline Data: Indicators of a state agency's current performance level, pursuant to guidelines established by the Executive Office of the Governor in consultation with legislative appropriations and appropriate substantive committees.

Bovine spongiform encephalopathy (BSE), widely referred to as "mad cow disease," is a chronic degenerative disease affecting the central nervous system of cattle. The disease was first diagnosed in 1986 in Great Britain. Cattle affected by BSE experience progressive degeneration of the nervous system. Affected animals may display changes in temperament, such as nervousness or aggression, abnormal posture, in coordination and difficulty in rising, decreased milk production, or loss of body weight despite continued appetite. Affected cattle die. Currently, there is no test to detect the disease in a live animal; veterinary

pathologists confirm BSE by postmortem microscopic examination of brain tissue or by the detection of the abnormal form of the prion protein. BSE is so named because of the spongy appearance of the brain tissue of infected cattle when sections are examined under a microscope.

Budget Entity: A unit or function at the lowest level to which funds are specifically appropriated in the appropriations act. "Budget entity" and "service" have the same meaning.

Bushel: Volumetric measurement used to determine the amount of oyster shell or live oysters collected or deposited.

Businesses With Scanners: Wholesale or retail businesses that utilize electronic means to charge prices to consumers such as Universal Product Code (UPC) scanners, Price Look-Up (PLU) codes, and Stock-Keeping Unit (SKU) codes.

CIO - Chief Information Officer

CIP - Capital Improvements Program Plan

Capital Improvements Projects: New facility design and construction activities (including roads, parking and all other infrastructure) as well as land acquisition and repairs or renovations to existing facilities, roads or other infrastructure that is funded with Fixed Capital Outlay dollars.

Caribfly: A fruit fly that attacks tropical fruit and on occasion citrus fruit. It was introduced into Florida in 1965, was not eradicated and is now widespread in the state.

Category I Liquefied Petroleum (LP) Gas Dealer: A dealer in LP gas whose business license allows a wide variety of LP gas activities, including sales of product, service, installation and repair of appliances and equipment, installation of propane tanks and systems.

Certified Pest-free: Citrus fruit that is free of Caribbean fruit fly and other pests of quarantine significance regulated by the importing state or country as verified on a plant health certificate.

Chemical Residue Analysis (plural analyses): An official determination of the presence, amount or absence of a specific pesticide or other chemical component in produce or other food products, by use of valid analytical methodology

Citrus Budwood Trees: Citrus trees that have been selected because the tree and fruit have superior horticultural qualities. Small sections of the stems of these trees are cut and the buds on these stems are removed and grafted onto

seedling rootstock that is selected because it has insect or disease resistance. The trees from which citrus budwood is removed must be tested and found free of certain diseases and certified as being horticulturally true to type.

Citrus crop / maturity estimates: Statistical data used to calculate an approximation of the upcoming citrus crop.

Citrus greening, or *huanglongbing*, is a bacterial disease that attacks the vascular system of plants. Once infected, there is no cure for a tree with citrus greening disease. In areas of the world where citrus greening is endemic (Asia, Africa and the Saudi Arabian Peninsula), citrus trees decline and die within a few years. There are three forms: Asian, African and Brazilian. The strain found in South Florida appears to be the Asian form.

Closed Case: Investigation or matter that warrants no further action.

Commercial Citrus: A solid planting of 40 or more citrus trees (including grapefruit, oranges & tangerines).

Consumer Education: The various forms of information, including Public Service Announcements (PSA's), public outreach, distribution of written materials relative to specific regulated activities, and brochures, provided by the Department to consumers to enhance their awareness and knowledge of their rights as consumers.

Consumer Protection laws: Any law relating to consumer protection.

Cooperative County Fire Protection Agreements: Agreements between the Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services, Division of Forestry, and a Board of County Commissioners for the establishment and maintenance of countywide fire protection of all forest and wildlands within said county assessed at .03 per acre.

Crop forecast: An estimate of the upcoming citrus crop compiled by the Department and the USDA

Cultured Shellfish: Oysters and clams harvested and processed by the aquaculture industry of the state.

DNC: Do Not Call

D3-A: A legislative budget request (LBR) exhibit which presents a narrative explanation and justification for each issue for the requested years.

Dairy Establishments: Grade A Plants, Farms, Single Service Plants and Frozen Dessert Plants regulated under authority of Chapters 502 or 503, F.S. For the purpose of this measure, a count of only those establishments receiving an inspection during the period is utilized.

Dairy Establishments which meet food safety and sanitation requirements: Any dairy establishment without a failure to meet food safety and sanitation standards during one or more inspections within a specified period.

Demand: The number of output units which are eligible to benefit from a service or activity.

Department: Means the Florida Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services.

Diagnostic Laboratory Procedure - A series of actions, defined by established diagnostic laboratory scientific protocols, which include the preparation, examination and assay of specimens to determine the absence/presence or quantification of expected assumptions and/or results.

Division of Forestry Programs: The Division of Forestry has four core programs that include Forest Protection and Disaster Response, State Land Management, Forestry Technical Assistance and the Forestry Youth Academy.

Eclose or Eclosion: The fruit fly development stage where the adult fly emerges from the pupae case similar to a butterfly emerging from a cocoon.

Emergency Incidents Other Than Wildfires - Are such emergencies as hurricane, flood, tornado, insect or plant disease outbreak, storms, drought, etc.

Endangered Plant: A plant classified as endangered in Rule Chapter 5B-40, Florida Administrative Code.

Estimated Expenditures: Includes the amount estimated to be expended during the current fiscal year. These amounts will be computer generated based on the current year appropriations adjusted for vetoes and special appropriations bills.

Exotic fruit fly – a tephritid fly that does not occur in Florida that is considered a pest of fruits and vegetables. These include Mediterranean fruit fly, Oriental fruit fly, Mexican fruit fly and several other species.

FCC: Federal Communications System

FTC: Federal Trade Commission



Fairs Registration: Statutory responsibility to regulate agricultural fairs and exhibitions in Florida by issuance of permits that verify compliance to Florida Statutes for such events. Each fair receiving this service is counted as a recipient of an agriculturally related assist.

Fecal Coliform : All aerobic and anaerobic, gram-negative, nonspore-forming rod-shaped bacteria that ferment lactose with gas formation when incubated for 3 hours at 35 C then transferred to a water bath at 44.5 C for 21 hours.

Federal Commodities: These are food products purchased by the U.S. Department of Agriculture for distribution to schools and needy citizens on a state-by-state basis, utilizing a network of distributors including food banks, soup kitchens and similar charitable organizations.

FLAIR - Florida Accounting Information Resource Subsystem

F.S. - Florida Statutes

Fire Report: A report that the Division of Forestry firefighters complete to record the details of a wildfire. The report includes fire cause and origin, weather, fire location, fire resources used and time information.

Food establishment: Those food establishments (including water vending machines, WVM) regulated under authority of Chapter 500, F.S. For the purpose of this measure, only those establishments receiving a rated sanitation inspection during the period are considered.

Food Establishments That Meet Food Safety and Sanitation Standards: Those food establishments that meet food safety and sanitation standards during all inspections within the specified period.

Food product analyzed: Food product sample submitted to Food Laboratory, whereupon the analysis for one or several components, contaminants or other pertinent characteristics of the product is completed.

Food Product Analyzed Which Meets Standards: Food product analyzed for which none of the analyses conducted result in finding of a violation of food safety or quality standards (i.e. a finding that would cause the product to be declared “adulterated”, “misbranded”, etc.)

Forestland Protected: All wildlands in Florida that are either under Cooperative County Fire Protection Agreements with the Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services/Division of Forestry as authorized by Florida Statutes 125.27, or State Parks under 590.02(1)(f) or other Federal, State and local governments lands for which fire protection is provided for by the Division of Forestry.

Forest-Related Technical Assist: Includes telephone calls, personal visits, conversations or work performed related to the implementation of management recommendations by a resource professional and supported by documentation either in electronic or “hard copy” format. . Such documentation may include, but is not limited to, the following types: Forest Management Plan, Needs Determination Form (AD-862), Tree Planting Prescription, Prescribed Burn Plan, correspondence, etc.

Free of Citrus Canker - Based on a visual inspection of the commercial citrus planting which verifies that no symptoms of citrus canker disease were detected.

Fresh Shipment Reports: Reports of all Fruit and Vegetable Shipments for domestic and international market.

GAA - General Appropriations Act

GR - General Revenue Fund

Hazard Analysis Critical Control Point (HACCP) Records Inspection: Comprehensive review of certain food establishments to determine compliance with HACCP requirements, as documented by completing specific fields of an inspection report form.

Health Certificate: An official form from the state of origin or from the USDA issued by a licensed and accredited veterinarian at the point of origin of an interstate movement of domestic animals (including equine, bovine, goats, sheep, swine, poultry, ostrich, rhea, emu, cervidae, dogs and cats, etc.)

IOE - Itemization of Expenditure

IT - Information Technology

Independent Dispute Settlement Procedure (IDSP): An informal Lemon Law dispute resolution procedure established by motor vehicle manufacturers and certified by the Department.

Information Technology Resources: Includes data processing-related hardware, software, services, telecommunications, supplies, personnel, facility resources, maintenance, and training.

Imported fire ant: An exotic ant from Brazil imported into the Southeastern United States in the 1950's in soil used for ballast in South American ships. The ant is very aggressive and frequently bites its victims causing painful blisters. It destroys useful native ants and other native insects and small animals. The USDA has a federal quarantine designed to prevent the spread of this pest to

other areas of the U.S. The quarantine requires that all nursery stock be inspected and certified free of this pest.

Inspection of a Dairy Establishment: Visits by authorized agents of the Department to dairy establishments, which result in an inspection report.

Inspection of Food Establishment - Visit by authorized agent of the Department to a food establishment during which a review of conditions is made that results in an inspection rating

Inspection of petroleum dispensers: Include tests for measurement accuracy and general maintenance. The measurement accuracy test consists of pumping a specified volume of petroleum product through a dispenser into a calibrated test measure. The volume of the pumped fuel is then measured to ensure the dispenser is accurate within specified tolerances. General maintenance inspections ensure that hoses are safe, price and volume indicators are operating properly, valves are not leaking, etc. In addition, the design of the device is inspected to ensure that petroleum products cannot be fraudulently diverted.

Inspection of Water Vending Machine: Comprehensive review of sanitation of a water vending machine, which results in a written report stating an inspection rating.

Irradiated: Exposed to low levels of electrons to preserve shelf life, reduce pathogens, or eliminate insects or other quarantine plant pests

Judicial Branch: All officers, employees, and offices of the Supreme Court, district courts of appeal, circuit courts, county courts, and the Judicial Qualifications Commission.

LAN - Local Area Network

LAS/PBS - Legislative Appropriations System/Planning and Budgeting Subsystem. The statewide appropriations and budgeting system owned and maintained by the Executive Office of the Governor.

LBC - Legislative Budget Commission

LBR - Legislative Budget Request

LP - Liquefied Petroleum

L.O.F. - Laws of Florida

LRPP - Long-Range Program Plan

Legislative Budget Commission: A standing joint committee of the Legislature. The Commission was created to: review and approve/disapprove agency requests to amend original approved budgets; review agency spending plans; and take other actions related to the fiscal matters of the state, as authorized in statute. It is composed of 14 members appointed by the President of the Senate and by the Speaker of the House of Representatives to two-year terms, running from the organization of one Legislature to the organization of the next Legislature.

Legislative Budget Request: A request to the Legislature, filed pursuant to section 216.023, Florida Statutes, or supplemental detailed requests filed with the Legislature, for the amounts of money an agency or branch of government believes will be needed to perform the functions that it is authorized, or which it is requesting authorization by law, to perform.

License & Bond Activities: Assistance provided to agricultural producers associated with the issuance of dealer licenses and bond certification to businesses and individuals who purchase and resale commodities grown in Florida. Activities include: issuing licenses, conducting field contacts and bond audits, issuing prospect letters, notices of deficiencies and denials and renewal and delinquent renewal notices, and processing complaints and conducting enforcement actions.

LP Gas Accidents: As defined by statute, include uncontrolled ignition of LP Gas products, accidents or incidents requiring medical attention, or damaged property exceeding \$1,000.

LP Gas Storage and Handling Facility: Any location where liquefied petroleum gas is stored in containers for future sale or use, distributed through pipelines or by vehicle, dispensed to the public, or offered for sale in containers.

LP Gas Facility Inspection: Defined as an inspection conducted to ensure compliance with safety codes and laws pertaining to equipment condition, use and maintenance, qualification of staff, facility licensing, compliance with insurance requirements, facility installation, procedures, etc.

LP Gas Facility Re-Inspection: Defined as a follow-up to a routine inspection to determine whether or not deficiencies identified in the first inspection have been corrected.

LP Gas Storage and Handling Facility: Any location where liquefied petroleum gas is stored in containers for future sale or use, distributed through pipelines or by vehicle, dispensed to the public, or offered for sale in containers.

Long-Range Program Plan: A plan developed on an annual basis by each state agency that is policy-based, priority-driven, accountable, and developed through careful examination and justification of all programs and their associated costs. Each plan is developed by examining the needs of agency customers and clients and proposing programs and associated costs to address those needs based on state priorities as established by law, the agency mission, and legislative authorization. The plan provides the framework and context for preparing the legislative budget request and includes performance indicators for evaluating the impact of programs and agency performance.

Marketing Assist: A significant exchange of information provided to a specific producer or business that could enable the business or producer to improve performance, increase sales, or reduce job-related risks (physical or financial); or the production of materials to achieve such an exchange.

Mediate: Non-binding negotiation between two parties with the help of a facilitator, otherwise known as the mediator, to arrive at a mutually agreeable resolution to a dispute.

Mediterranean Fruit Fly: A fruit fly in the family Tephritidae commonly known as the Medfly. These flies damage fruit by laying eggs in fruit. The eggs hatch into maggots that feed on the fruit pulp making it unacceptable for the fresh fruit market.

Metrology: The science of measurement.

Metrologists: Nationally trained and certified measurement scientists.

Milk and Milk Products Analyzed: Those items regulated by Chapters 502 and 503, Florida Statutes, of which samples are submitted to the State Dairy Laboratories for testing to insure requirements are being met.

Milk and Milk Products which Meet Standards: Those milk and milk product samples analyzed and found to meet all standards set forth in Chapters 502 and 503, Florida Statutes, and Chapter 5D-1, Florida Administrative Code.

NASBO - National Association of State Budget Officers

Non-Industrial Private Landowner: The owner of private forestland excluding forest industry land or forest industry-leased land.

Nonrecurring: Expenditure or revenue which is not expected to be needed or available after the current fiscal year.

Non-regulated entities: Those business entities not specifically regulated by the Department; however, such entities are subject to the provisions of unfair and deceptive trade practice laws.

No Sales Solicitation Calls List: The list that is published quarterly, with all residential telephone numbers of Florida consumers who have submitted their request with the appropriate fee to the Department, to have their phone number placed on the list.

OPB - Office of Policy and Budget, Executive Office of the Governor

Open Burning Authorization Program: A centralized computer database residing within the Department's Information Technology Section on the Fire Management Information System (FMIS) that stores and processes information related to the issuance of burning authorizations.

PBPB/PB2 - Performance-Based Program Budgeting

PLU – Price Look-up Code

PSA – Public Service Announcement

Pass Through: Funds the state distributes directly to other entities, e.g., local governments, without being managed by the agency distributing the funds. These funds flow through the agency's budget; however, the agency has no discretion regarding how the funds are spent, and the activities (outputs) associated with the expenditure of funds are not measured at the state level.

***NOTE: This definition of "pass through" applies ONLY for the purposes of long-range program planning.***

People's First – Personnel System

Performance Measure: A quantitative or qualitative indicator used to assess state agency performance.

- Input means the quantities of resources used to produce goods or services and the demand for those goods and services.
- Outcome means an indicator of the actual impact or public benefit of a service.
- Output means the actual service or product delivered by a state agency.

Pesticide: Any substance or mixture or substances intended for preventing, destroying, repelling or mitigating any insect, rodents, nematodes, fungi, weeds or other forms of plant or animal life or viruses, except viruses, bacteria or fungi

on or in living man or other animals which the Department by rule declares to be a pest and any substance or mixture of substances intended for use as a plant regulator, defoliant or desiccant.

Person-hours: The number of employees times the number of work hours performed on non-fire emergencies.

Petroleum Dispensers: The pumps at retail gasoline stations open to the general public that consumers use to meter a volume of petroleum to their vehicles. Although inspections are conducted by request at private facilities such as military bases, municipality fueling stations, and fleet fueling stations, the vast majority of inspections are conducted at those stations open to the general public.

Petroleum Field Measuring Devices: Petroleum dispensers (gas pumps) that are used to fuel consumer vehicles.

Petroleum Products: Gasoline, diesel fuel, kerosene, fuel oil or similar products. Consumer Vehicles refer to vehicles owned by citizens or businesses that operate on petroleum products.

Physical Measurement Standards Tests or Calibrations: The actual physical comparison of measurement standards to the state primary standards using precision lab equipment and internationally accepted methods and procedures to determine accuracy or actual values. Each test to determine accuracy including adjustment to bring the standard's value to within acceptable parameters or test to determine actual value of a measurement standard is considered one test or calibration.

Plant Disease: Any living stage of any bacteria, fungi or viruses, or any organisms similar to or allied with any of the foregoing, including any genetically engineered organisms, or any infectious substances which can directly or indirectly injure or cause disease or damage in any plants or plant parts or any processed, manufactured, or other plant products.

Plant Pest: Any living stage of any insects, mites, nematodes, slugs, snails, protozoa, or other invertebrate animals, bacteria, fungi, other parasitic plants or their reproductive parts, or viruses, or any organisms similar to or allied with any of the foregoing, including any genetically engineered organisms, or any infectious substances which can directly or indirectly injure or cause disease or damage in any plants or plant parts or any processed, manufactured, or other plant products.

Policy Area: A grouping of related activities to meet the needs of customers or clients which reflects major statewide priorities. Policy areas summarize data at a statewide level by using the first two digits of the ten-digit LAS/PBS program

component code. Data collection will sum across state agencies when using this statewide code.

Price Verification Tests: Tests conducted to determine accuracy rate of a business' pricing systems, such as Universal Product Code (UPC) scanners, stock keeping units (SKU's), price look-up codes (PLU's) and manually operated cash registers. The procedures used and compliance rates established are nationally developed and adopted in state regulations.

Privatization: Occurs when the state relinquishes its responsibility or maintains some partnership type of role in the delivery of an activity or service.

Priority Watersheds/Basins - Rivers, river segments, ground water basins, or surface water basins that are impaired based on scientifically acceptable water quality data and have been prioritized by the state for additional protection.

Program: A set of activities undertaken in accordance with a plan of action organized to realize identifiable goals based on legislative authorization (a program can consist of single or multiple services). For purposes of budget development, programs are identified in the General Appropriations Act by a title that begins with the word "Program." In some instances a program consists of several services, and in other cases the program has no services delineated within it; the service is the program in these cases. The LAS/PBS code is used for purposes of both program identification and service identification. "Service" is a "budget entity" for purposes of the LRPP.

Program Purpose Statement: A brief description of approved program responsibility and policy goals. The purpose statement relates directly to the agency mission and reflects essential services of the program needed to accomplish the agency's mission.

Program Component: An aggregation of generally related objectives which, because of their special character, related workload and interrelated output, can logically be considered an entity for purposes of organization, management, accounting, reporting, and budgeting.

Public Land Management Agencies: Includes Florida Department of Environmental Protection, Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission, Water Management Districts and Counties.

Public Oyster Reef: A functional ecological assemblage of oysters and other fauna which is located in the waters of the state.

Recovered Food: These are fresh fruits and vegetables donated to Florida Farm Share, Inc., for distribution to needy citizens. Farmers donate primarily items that



are cosmetically blemished or are not sized properly for commercial sales, and items that have been over-produced and cannot be profitably sold.

Regulated Commodity: All food, agricultural, horticultural, and aquacultural or livestock products or any article or product with respect to which any authority is conferred by law on the Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services.

Regulated Entities: Those businesses required to file with the Department, or be registered or licensed by the Department, pursuant to Florida Statutes (Motor Vehicle Repair shops, Charitable Organizations, Professional Solicitors, Fundraising Consultants, Sellers of Travel, Telemarketers, Sellers of Business Opportunities, Health Studios, Dance Studios, Pawn Shops, operators of Game Promotions and-Intrastate Moving companies).

Regulated Weighing: Measuring devices are devices used in measuring commodities for commercial sale such as scales, motor fuel dispensers (gas pumps at retail stations), taximeters, timing devices, grain moisture meters, etc.

Regulatory: To control or direct according to rule, principle, or law as it relates to the mission of the Department and regulated community.

Reliability: The extent to which the measuring procedure yields the same results on repeated trials and data are complete and sufficiently error free for the intended use.

STO - State Technology Office

SWOT - Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats

SFM / WIC Nutrition Program: A cooperative program between the Florida Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services, Florida Department of Health and the U.S. Department of Agriculture in which WIC eligible individuals are given coupons which can be redeemed at local farmers markets for fresh fruits and vegetables grown in Florida. Each farmer participating in sales that are a part of this program is assessed for eligibility and provided materials that are used in conducting their activities. Each farmer receiving this service is counted as a recipient of an agriculturally related assist.

Section 3 product registration: Those unique pesticide labels assigned by the U.S Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) under the authority of the federal pesticide law: Federal Insecticide, Fungicide and Rodenticide Act (FIFRA).

Shellfish Processor: Facility that processes (shucks) oysters, clams, or scallops and discards the shell as a byproduct of the process.

Shipping Point: Point of origin

Standard: The level of performance of an outcome or output.

State Forest Timber Producing Acres: Acres of State Forest that are capable of producing commercial quality/quantity timber. An acre = 43,560 square feet (4,840 square yards)

State Metrology Laboratory: A calibration and testing laboratory that houses the state primary standards of mass, length and volume and serves as a scientific measurement center for regulatory programs, industry, testing laboratories, and other users of precision measurement standards. The laboratory is certified by, and partners with, the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) as part of the National Measurement System and provides measurement traceability to the national primary standards of mass, length and volume.

State Veterinarian: Chief animal health regulatory official.

TCS - Trends and Conditions Statement

TF - Trust Fund

TMDL – Total Maximum Daily Load

TRW - Technology Review Workgroup

TSE: Transmissible Spongiform Encephalitis

Temporary Amusement Rides - Those rides that are regularly relocated with or without disassembly.

Terminal Market: Building/group of buildings where goods are received.

Timber Stand: A contiguous management unit containing trees of similar enough size, age, species, etc., to make it distinct from adjacent areas.

Total Maximum Daily Load: The acceptable level of a particular pollutant flows into an impacted water body that allows it to maintain its designated uses.

Trade Missions: An event designed to bring Florida exporters together with potential buyers. Each participating company in such events is counted as a recipient of an agriculturally related assist.

UPC – Universal Product Code

Unit Cost: The average total cost of producing a single unit of output – goods and services for a specific agency activity.

Validity: The appropriateness of the measuring instrument in relation to the purpose for which it is being used.

WNV: West Nile Virus

Water Conservation Programs: Programs are designed to improve irrigation system efficiency, facilitate better management of irrigation methods to match crop needs and plan long-term capital improvements to implement new technologies.

Weighing and Measuring Devices: Include commercial scales of all sizes from prescription balances up to motor vehicle scales, taximeters, grain moisture meters at grain elevators, tanks on dairies used to measure milk sold to processors, parking meters and other commercial devices used in determining measure in commerce.

Wildfire: Any wildland fire of either natural or man-caused origin that is or has become uncontrolled (e.g., an escaped control burn becomes a wildfire when it is no longer controlled).

Wildfire Reporting System: A computer database residing on the Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services' mainframe computer that stores and processes information related to wildfires responded to by the Division of Forestry.

Wildland: Any public or private managed or unmanaged forest, urban/interface pasture or range land, recreation lands, or any other land at risk of wildfire.

Wild Shellfish: Oysters and clams harvested and processed from the natural resources of the state.