LONG RANGE PROGRAM PLAN

DRAFT

FY 2008-09 through FY 2012-13

DEPARTMENT OF MILITARY AFFAIRS

SEPTEMBER 30, 2007

Douglas Burnett
Major General
Florida Air National Guard
The Adjutant General

82 Marine Street
St. Augustine, Florida 32084

TELEPHONE: (904) 823-0675   FAX: (904) 827-8530   EMAIL: PATRICK.FLYNN@US.ARMY.MIL

TABLE OF CONTENTS

The mission of the Florida Department of Military Affairs is to provide Florida National Guard units and personnel ready to support national security objectives; to protect the public safety of citizens; and to contribute to national, state and community programs that add value to the United States of America and to the State of Florida.

Goals, Objectives, Outcomes and Performance Projection Tables

Overview

The Department's goals and objectives are based upon comprehensive internal and external assessments and reflect the agency's fundamental policy intentions. Goals represent Customer-focused, long-term ends. Related objectives identify time-certain performance benchmarks. Although not contained within this plan, objectives are supported by strategies which provide the basis for the Department's action plans.

Goals, Objectives, Outcomes and Projection Tables in Agency Priority Order

GOAL 1: Military Readiness - *Provide military organizations that are trained and ready to meet the needs of national, state and local authorities.*

Objective 1A: Recruit, retain and administratively support personnel to meet mission requirements. *(Staff Lead: ODCSPER)*

Outcome: Percent of Florida National Guard funded personnel positions filled.

Baseline FY 1997-98	FY 2008-09	FY 2009-10	FY 2010-11	FY 2011-12	FY 2012-13
99%	99.5%	99.5%	99.5%	99.5%	100%

Objective 1B: Provide effective training that maintains a high level of proficiency to meet mission requirements. *(Staff Lead: ODCSOPS)*

Outcome: Percent of Florida National Guard service members who are fully qualified in their assigned Military Occupational Skill.

Baseline FY 1997-98	FY 2008-09	FY 2009-10	FY 2010-11	FY 2011-12	FY 2012-13
70%	70%	70%	70%	80%	80%

Objective 1C: Provide quality equipment to meet mission requirements. *(Staff Lead: ODCSLOG)*

Outcome: Percent of Florida National Guard units that achieve federally assigned equipment goals.

Baseline FY 1997-98	FY 2008-09	FY 2009-10	FY 2010-11	FY 2011-12	FY 2012-13
70%	60%	70%	80%	85%	85%

Goals, Objectives, Outcomes and Performance Projection Tables

Objective 1D: Increase the number of readiness centers which meet unit and quality of life requirements. *(Staff Lead: CFMO)*

Outcome: Number/percent of Florida National Guard readiness centers rated adequate.

Baseline FY 1997-98	FY 2008-09	FY 2009-10	FY 2010-11	FY 2011-12	FY 2012-13
36/62%	48/87%	50/91%	52/95%	54/98%	55/100%

Objective 1E: Provide quality-training areas to meet mission requirements.

Outcome: Percent of satisfaction with Florida National Guard training facilities.
(Staff Lead: CBJTC)

Baseline FY 1997-98	FY 2008-09	FY 2009-10	FY 2010-11	FY 2011-12	FY 2012-13
82%	88%	88%	88%	88%	90%

GOAL 2: Military Response - *Provide military organizations that are trained and equipped to protect life and property and preserve peace, order and public safety.*

Objective 2A: Fully integrate the Florida National Guard into the state emergency response system, providing timely response to supported agencies. *(Staff Lead: JDOMS)*

Outcome: Percent of supported agencies rating coordination as satisfactory or better.

Baseline FY 1999-00	FY 2008-09	FY 2009-10	FY 2010-11	FY 2011-12	FY 2012-13
90%	90%	90%	90%	90%	90%

GOAL 3: Drug Interdiction and Prevention - *Provide Guard-unique assistance to law enforcement agencies and community based organizations to counter illegal drug use.*

Objective 3A: Provide Florida National Guard interagency counterdrug assistance. (Staff Lead: JDOMS)

Outcome: Number of staff-days devoted to counterdrug tasks.

Baseline FY 2000-01	FY 2008-09	FY 2009-10	FY 2010-11	FY 2011-12	FY 2012-13
48,792 est	41,245	41,245	41,245	41,245	41,245

Goals, Objectives, Outcomes and Performance Projection Tables

Objective 3B: Improve drug awareness among Florida school-aged students.
(Staff Lead: JDOMS)

Outcome: Number of students who receive Florida National Guard drug awareness instruction.

Baseline FY 2000-01	FY 2008-09	FY 2009-10	FY 2010-11	FY 2011-12	FY 2012-13
38,000 est	90,000	90,000	90,000	90,000	90,000

Objective 3C: Provide Florida National Guard support to anti-drug coalitions and prevention agencies. *(Staff Lead: JDOMS)*

Outcome: Monetary savings derived from Drug Demand Reduction event support.

Baseline FY 2002-03	FY 2008-09	FY 2009-10	FY 2010-11	FY 2011-12	FY 2012-13
$300,000	$300,000	$300,000	$300,000	$300,000	$300,000

Objective 3D: Increase Florida National Guard counterdrug training to law enforcement agencies. *(Staff Lead: JDOMS)*

Outcome: Number of law enforcement officers trained.

Baseline FY 1999-00	FY 2008-09	FY 2009-10	FY 2010-11	FY 2011-12	FY 2012-13
400	650	650	650	650	650

GOAL 4: Assistance to Floridians at Risk - *Provide training assistance to those at risk via ABOUT FACE, FORWARD MARCH and Youth Challenge Programs.*

Objective 4A: Provide assistance to Floridians at risk via the Youth Challenge Programs.
(Staff Lead: JDOMS)

Outcome: Number of enrolled participants who graduate.

Baseline FY 2000-01	FY 2008-09	FY 2009-10	FY 2010-11	FY 2011-12	FY 2012-13
200 est	250	250	250	250	250

GOAL 5: Federal/State Cooperative Agreements - *Process federal funds in strict compliance with applicable regulations and guidelines.*

Objective 5A: Effectively execute Department of Defense contracts in Florida.
(Staff Lead: SQM)

Outcome: Percent of allocated federal funds executed.

Baseline FY 2000-01	FY 2008-09	FY 2009-10	FY 2010-11	FY 2011-12	FY 2012-13
100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

GOAL 6: Executive Direction and Support Services - *Provide effective executive direction and support services.*

Objective 6A: Provide high quality executive direction and support services.
(Staff Lead: SQM)

Outcome: Percent of Administration and Support Costs compared to Total Costs.

Baseline FY 2000-01	FY 2008-09	FY 2009-10	FY 2010-11	FY 2011-12	FY 2012-13
8.7% est	8.7%	8.7%	8.7%	8.7%	8.7%

Introduction

The Florida National Guard traces its heritage back to 1565, the year the Spanish founders of St. Augustine organized their first company of citizen-Soldiers. Florida's militia has defended local communities for over 430 years. Consistent with Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution, Florida's Citizen-Soldiers and Airmen continue to serve in units from the Panhandle to the Keys.

The Florida Department of Military Affairs, a state agency created by Chapter 250, *Florida Statutes*, provides management oversight and administrative support to the Florida National Guard. Directly responsive to the Governor of Florida, the Department operates within the policy guidance and fiscal framework of both federal and state authorities. With over $ 379 million in Federal funds and about $ 43.5 million in state General Revenue funding annually, the Department manages a force of about 12,000 National Guard members, over 1,900 full time Military Personnel, and 318 state employees. Together, the Department of Military Affairs and the Florida National Guard are committed to serving the vital interests of the nation, the state, local communities, and Florida's citizens.

In accordance with Chapters 250, 251 and 252, *Florida Statutes*, The Adjutant General is specifically tasked with (1) the combat readiness and emergency preparedness of the Florida National Guard of the Florida National Guard, (2) responding to disasters and civil disturbances, (3) reducing the importation of controlled substances, and (4) assisting Floridians at risk.

Challenges

The Florida National Guard continues to operate in a challenging and stressful environment. We remain engaged in the Global War on Terrorism, vigilant in our preparations to respond to domestic emergencies, and committed to serving our communities and Florida's citizens while we undergo significant transformation of our organization. Over 9,900 Florida Guardsmen have mobilized in support of the Global War on Terrorism and the Florida National Guard now stands as part of the most experienced force in our nation's history. Our Guardsmen are better trained and more confident in their abilities to defend our nation and support our state and communities than ever before. However, this increased capability has come at a cost in terms of increased stress on the part of our families and employers. We remain dedicated to ensuring our forces are trained, equipped, and ready to support our citizens while we are committed to meeting the reasonable expectations of our Guardsmen and families during these challenging times.

We believe our key strengths include our grass roots connection to Florida's communities and the U.S. Army's and Air Forces increasing reliance on the National Guard. Our primary weaknesses revolve around intense competition for resources and the increasingly heavy burden Guard service now places on Guard members, their families, and employers. The continued threats of international and domestic terrorism, coupled with Florida's geographic exposure to natural disasters, will likely keep the Florida National Guard in a state of high operational tempo. Our greatest opportunities are in providing better, more responsive service to Floridians in crisis. These strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats argue forcefully for goals and objectives that emphasize readiness, response, and community service as high operational tempos continue to challenge the Department's achievement of its readiness potential.

Agency Priorities

The Department's Long Range Program Plan takes into account the character and complexity of the Florida National Guard with its ties to an historic past, its focus on responsiveness to federal, state and local authorities, and its goal of being recognized as the best National Guard in the nation.

The Department of Military Affairs and the Florida National Guard focuses on military readiness to support the constitutional mission to provide ready forces for national service during peacetime and wartime. In doing so, the Department remains well-positioned to provide responsive assistance to state and local authorities in times of public need or crisis. In addition, the Department aggressively supports drug interdiction and demand reduction, and other programs that add value to the state and local communities. The Department's emphasis on readiness, response, and programs that contribute to Florida's communities provides the basis for the Department's six goals which either directly or indirectly support the Governor's priorities.

DMA Goal 1: Military Readiness

Federal guidelines, both statutory and regulatory, govern the organization and operation of the Florida National Guard. These regulations and directives establish policy, procedures, and standards related to Guard units, personnel, equipment, and facilities.

The Florida National Guard has transformed from a Strategic Reserve of the Army and Air Force to an Operational force, fully engaged in the Global War on Terrorism while continuing to serve as the first military responder to homeland security and homeland defense events. The increased reliance on the Florida National Guard as an Operational Force has resulted in the deployment of over 8,000 Florida National Guard Soldiers and Airmen to Iraq, Kuwait, Afghanistan, Jordan, Qatar, Bahrain, Bosnia, Cuba, Kosovo, Djibouti and other locations over the last 6 years.

The increase in Operations Tempo as a result of the mission shift to an operational force has had a significant impact on readiness levels, particularly equipment readiness. Historically, Florida National Guard units have been resourced and equipped at less than 100% of authorized levels, making it necessary to transfer equipment from units across the state to the deploying units in order to bring them to deployment standards. These actions ensure the mobilized units are manned and equipped to meet the mission; however, transferring this equipment degrades the readiness levels of our remaining units. Additionally, it is common practice for the Department of the Army to require deployed units to leave select equipment and weapons systems in the combat theater to support follow-on forces and future operations. This "Stay Behind Equipment" policy compounds the challenge of equipping and training our units for federal and state missions.

The Department of the Army and the National Guard Bureau has taken actions to address equipment shortages and ensure all components are ready to meet the Global War on Terror and Homeland Security/Homeland Defense challenges. The Army is undergoing a transformation into a more modular force to improve responsiveness and has increased deliveries of equipment

to the National Guard. The National Guard Bureau has taken actions to ensure each state will have no less than 50% of its total force available to support Homeland Security/Homeland Defense missions within the state and has adjusted equipment allocations to ensure hurricane-prone states receive the equipment they need.

The Department of the Army's transformation into a more modular and agile force has affected over 37% of the Florida National Guard. Numerous Florida Army National Guard units are being reorganized and over 2,500 Florida National Guard Soldiers must be retrained to acquire a new Military Occupation Specialty. Although transformation challenges the Army and the National Guard, it will significantly improve our capability to support missions in the state. For example, we have transformed our Attack Helicopter Battalion, which was armed with Apache Attack helicopters, into a General Support Aviation Battalion equipped with Blackhawk and Chinook lift helicopters. These new helicopters significantly increase our personnel and cargo transport capability and will supplement our rescue, medical evacuation, airlift, and fire-fighting capabilities. In addition, we are gaining ground transportation, military police, and engineering units, considerably enhancing our Homeland Security/Homeland Defense capabilities.

Equipment needed to fully employ these transformed units will lag behind personnel and training actions. Although some equipment will be recapitalized from the Active Component and other National Guard states, receipt of new equipment is scheduled over several years. The Department of the Army and National Guard Bureau estimate that, with the projected funding for new and recapitalized equipment and the capacity of the industrial base, the "get well" target date for equipment is 2013. Until then, we will focus on maintaining the current equipment we have on hand, accept the new and used equipment transferred to the state, and ensure our units have adequate equipment available to support the federal and state missions they are called on to perform.

The Department's military readiness priorities are based upon the traditional determinants of readiness: personnel, training, equipment, facilities and training areas.

Personnel. The Florida National Guard, like its Active Component counterparts, requires a steady influx of quality enlistees. In recent years, the Florida National Guard has found it difficult to meet its strength goals. The increased dependency of the Department of Defense on the reserve components and the increased frequency of deployments present challenges in manning the force. In response, we have increased our emphasis on recruiting and retention. With unprecedented support from the Legislature, we have been able to continue to attract and retain quality personnel and ensure we are able to respond in times of emergency to accomplish our state and federal missions.

Several programs instituted by the Florida Legislature have significantly improved our ability to recruit and retain quality Guardsmen. With the passage of the Florida National Guard Tuition Assistance Act in 1997, new Florida Guard members have been able to attend a state college or university tuition-free if they accept an additional service obligation. This program has proven a powerful recruiting incentive and has enabled the Florida National Guard to achieve its enlistment goals for the past several years. Continuation of this important program is critical to maintaining our strength.

Soldiers and Airmen are the centerpiece of our formations. Retention of qualified Soldiers and Airmen following unit deployments in support of the Global War on Terrorism remains a challenge. We believe that the Legislature's decisions to improve support to our servicemen and women will significantly improve retention. Programs established by House Bill (HB) 1069 (An act relating to Family Readiness Program / Military), HB 0691 (An act relating to the Citizen Soldier Matching Grant Program), HB 1189 (scholarships for children of military heroes who lost their lives during battle and veterans who were left disabled), Senate Bill (SB) 0450 (An act relating to Unfair Insurance Practices), SB 0550 (An act relating to Property Tax Exemptions), HB 0395 (An act relating to Recreational Licenses and Permits), SB 2602 (An act relating to free motor vehicle license plates), and SB 1592 (An act relating to "Service members' Group Life Insurance"), SB 116 (Robert A. Wise Military Protection Act), SB 1026 (Ad Valorem Tax/Disabled Veterans), HB 699 (Preference in Public Employment for Veterans), SB 1448 (Service Members Dependant Assistance), demonstrate the state's continuing commitment to our Servicemembers and their families and significantly improve our ability to retain our outstanding Florida National Guardsmen and women.

The Florida Family Readiness Program Assistance Fund, appropriated by the Florida legislature in July 2005, has been effective in providing need-based assistance to families during deployment of their Service Member. The primary purpose and legislative intent of the Family Readiness Program Assistance Fund is to provide assistance due to unexpected financial hardships experienced during mobilization and to ensure our families have the resources needed to sustain themselves while their loved ones are away. Families of Reserve Component Servicemembers throughout the State are eligible for the program. Family Assistance Centers located throughout the State assist with the application process and link families to other available resources.

Several federal programs also benefit our Florida National Guard personnel. Enlistment and reenlistment incentives, bonuses, federal tuition assistance, student loan repayment and other benefits from the federal government are far better than we have seen in the past. The College First Enlistment Option stabilizes our Soldiers for two (2) years while attending a Florida College/University in a full-time status. Additionally, several new health care programs have been instituted which benefit our Servicemembers. Early TriCare provides medical and dental benefits to Soldiers and Airmen and their families at no cost for up to 90 days prior to deployment and TriCare Reserve Select, a low-cost premium-based health plan, provides 1 year of medical care for every 90 days a soldier or airmen served in support of a contingency operation.

We are very thankful for the Legislature's continued support of our Servicemen and women and believe that the Legislature's decisions to improve support to our Servicemembers will continue to significantly improve retention and attrition.

Training. The Florida National Guard is evaluated and tested using U.S. Army and U.S. Air Force standards. Unlike their Active Component counterparts, some Guard units are intentionally kept at lower readiness rates because of reduced availability of federal funds. Regardless of assigned readiness levels, one of the best measures of a Guard member's ability to perform his responsibilities is his or her Military Occupational Specialty Qualification (MOSQ).

Although we can never reach a 100% qualification rate, the Department believes that under normal conditions a steady management of MOSQ levels at 70% is feasible with intense management. As mentioned earlier, the Army transformation to a modular force impacted the MOSQ of up to 2,500 Soldiers. Retraining this many Soldiers presents a tremendous challenge, yet we remain committed to achieving a statewide MOSQ rate of 70% within one year of initiating a focused re-training effort. (No state funds are committed to this priority.)

Equipment. The Florida National Guard's ability to perform its state and federal missions depends on both the percentage of authorized equipment on-hand (EOH) and the percentage of that equipment which meets equipment readiness (ER) standards. The National Guard Bureau goal is to equip states with at least 65% of their authorized equipment (EOH) and for the states to maintain that equipment in a ready status (ER) at least 90% of the time. With priority rightly placed on supporting the Global War on Terrorism, our EOH and ER for non-deployed equipment significantly decreased. Additionally, some Florida units who were deployed in support of Operation Iraq Freedom (OIF) and Operation Enduring Freedom (OEF) were ordered to leave a portion of their equipment and weapons systems in theater, which is known as Stay Behind Equipment (SBE) and, like other states, Florida has been ordered to transfer equipment to other states who have units deploying in support of the Global War on Terrorism. Finally, the Army's transformation from a Cold War force to a more agile and modular force directly affects Florida National Guard EOH status in two ways. First, several Florida National Guard units which have been reorganized have been ordered to transfer equipment that is no longer authorized to units outside the state. Second, some of the equipment required for the newly transformed organizational structures are not currently available in the Army system, leaving those units short some equipment.

During 2007, only 34% of Florida National Guard units met the equipment on hand (EOH) goal of 65%. However, the equipment in the hands of our Soldiers and Airmen was maintained at an equipment readiness (ER) level of 93%, exceeding the National Guard goal. The Florida National Guard continues to be able to accomplish its federal and state missions by cross-leveling equipment between units in the State and by increased use of Emergency Management Assistance Compact (EMAC) from other states. Unless the Florida Army National Guard receives an increase in new equipment procurement we don't expect our on-hand equipment goals to meet 85% until sometime after 2012.

Facilities. The State's readiness centers (armories) support numerous activities that contribute to unit readiness and serve as a critical focal point for units in the Florida National Guard. Our armories support state and federal unit training requirements for both individual and collective battle tasks, provide security for authorized unit equipment and supplies, provide facilities for required maintenance checks and service, provide office space for the full-time support staff, and generate pride and esprit de corps with unit personnel supporting important strength management considerations. In addition, armories have traditionally served as community assets, hosting various governmental, social, charitable and civic events in the local area.

The Department currently manages 54 readiness centers statewide. Nearly one-half of our armories were constructed more than 40 years ago and five were constructed more than 50 years

ago. Using the standardized rating criteria from the Department of the Army's Installation Status Report (ISR), 30% of all Florida National Guard readiness centers are currently rated inadequate.

Six years ago, with armories deteriorating from age and lack of maintenance resources, the Department initiated an ambitious capital improvement program to renovate and upgrade readiness centers statewide. With support from the Governor and the legislature, the agency is now contracting for significant renovations to Florida National Guard armories under the Florida Armory Revitalization Program (FARP). Specifically, appropriated state funds under this program are being used to renovate selected facilities on a prioritized list approved by The Adjutant General.

As of July 2007, ten armories have been modernized and renovated, another eight are under construction, and seven are under design. State funds are being leveraged to secure additional federal dollars to assist in necessary maintenance and repair projects. Continuation of the multi-year revitalization effort is key to improving the number of adequate armories for our Servicemembers and communities.

Armory operations accounts fund the routine expenses associated with operating the readiness centers (utilities, grounds maintenance, custodial services and janitorial supplies) and emergency repairs (HVAC, code violations, health and safety issues). State funding is supplemented by rental of the facilities; however, as a result of the 9/11 terrorist attacks, rental income significantly decreased due to security and force protection requirements. Even with the increased security restrictions, efforts are being made to increase rental income. Our rental income continues to increase, slightly reversing the downward post-9/11 trend.

The Department of Military Affairs Construction & Facility Management Office has established an Energy Management Program to set energy goals and objectives to meet the mandates for energy conservation and the is partnering with Florida utility companies to conduct facility energy audits to identify opportunities for energy usage reduction. Furthermore, high energy-efficient systems are being incorporated and installed during renovation of the armories and for projects that upgrade major systems, such as heating, ventilation, and air conditioning systems. Although the agency is reducing energy usage, the overall cost of energy is increasing due to rising cost of electricity.

Training Areas. Quality ranges, maneuver areas, and logistical support facilities at Florida National Guard training sites are critical to the overall readiness posture of the Guard. These sites provide the facilities and terrain conditions to support required training. Since Guard members have limited time to train and frequently must travel several hundred miles to use these facilities, every effort must be made to provide an administratively free "roll-on, roll-off" experience. The FLNG is committed to building and maintaining world-class training facilities while preserving the natural resources and minimizing the environmental impact of military operations and training.

Camp Blanding Joint Training Center, located near Starke, Florida, is our center of gravity for training. This training center provides training areas, ranges, education facilities, maintenance and other services to Florida's National Guard and to numerous federal, state, and local partners.

Camp Blanding has proven to be a valuable resource to other state agencies, including serving as a Continuation of Government (COG) Site for the Governor and his Executive Branch, Continuity of Operations (COOP) Site for the Division of Emergency Management (DEM) and Joint Forces Headquarters-Florida, a Reception Staging and Onward Integration (RSOI) site, and a Logistical Support Base during emergency operations as part of the Florida National Guard's operations in support of Civil Authorities. Additionally, Camp Blanding's value as a critical strategic asset for training and mobilizing units in support of the Global War on Terrorism and the Department of Emergency Management's response for hurricane disasters has been repeatedly validated at the State and National levels since the 9/11 terrorist attacks and the increase in hurricane activity over the past several years. Camp Blanding is continuing to enhance its relationship with the Keystone Heights Airport which serves as a valuable asset to support federal and state missions, to include actual State Emergency Operations. This partnership with the Keystone Heights Airport affords the Installation fixed-wing aviation support capabilities without costs for maintenance and operations. The availability of this asset has improved Camp Blanding Training Center's support capabilities to satisfy or exceed its customers' expectations.

Historically, Camp Blanding operated on a self-sustaining basis, deriving its operating funds from mining, timber sales, and the lease of the Titan Rocket Storage Facility. As a result, the Department of Military Affairs did not need to request General Revenue funds to sustain Camp Blanding operations. Beginning in State Fiscal Year 2007-2008, DuPont Mining Company will no longer conduct mining operations on Camp Blanding property, resulting in a projected annual loss of approximately $700,000. Additionally, in State Fiscal Year 2007-2008, timber revenues at Camp Blanding are projected to drop by $250,000 due to damages created by 2006-2007 wildfires impacting the Installation. The Florida Legislature's approval of $900,000 in general revenue funds will substantially offset the projected $950,000 loss in revenue and will enable the Installation to accomplish most of its essential operational support requirements. These recurring general revenue funds are critical to the Installation's abilities to satisfy its state and federal mission support requirements for military training, law enforcement training and support operations, including operations in support of State response to emergency situations. They will also enable Camp Blanding to continue supporting other State-focused programs such as the Florida Youth Challenge Academy, the Florida Counter-Drug Training Academy for law enforcement and community anti-drug coalitions, and the Drug Demand Reduction seminars and Youth Camps for Florida's communities. Non-receipt of these General Revenue funds would have created a severe impact on the Installation and mandated a reduction in employees, operations, and infrastructure maintenance.

While customer throughput has been hampered over the recent past due to increased deployments in support of the Global War on Terrorism, it is anticipated that, with the completion of the new sixty-six million dollar ($66M) Regional Training Institute, student throughput will increase from 500 to over 2000 students per year. The projected increase in the number of personnel to be trained increases the need to expand the size of the supporting facilities such as the dining facility. We will work with our Federal partners to assist us in funding these improvements.

Trends and Conditions Statement

We are also working with our Federal partners to support Camp Blanding's range development plan. We are planning on improving our live fire ranges and our Military Operations in Urban Terrain (MOUT) site. We also plan to add a live fire shoot house, a live-fire convoy range, and significantly improved simulations capability. With these additional training assets, Camp Blanding will be able to provide it's customers with the latest Tactics, Techniques, and Procedures (TTP's) that have been identified through feedback from combat operations in Iraq and Afghanistan. These enhancements will attract additional military and civilian customers seeking an outstanding training venue to support the Global War on Terror and Homeland Defense/Homeland Security Missions.

Goal 2: Emergency Response

The Department supports the Governor's "Safety First" priority, and carries out its legislative mandate to provide emergency response and preserve public safety through Guard assistance to federal, state, and local agencies; as well as by providing services directly to Florida's citizens. In recent years, our Department made important improvements in our ability to provide effective emergency response. We acquired significantly improved satellite-based, interoperable communications capability and substantially improved our ability to provide for effective command and control. We are also improving our ability to respond to weapons of mass destruction events through the addition of an additional Civil Support Team. The new equipment and force structure available to the Department of Military Affairs will increase our ability to meet the challenges of the future.

The Department provides humanitarian assistance, logistical support, transportation, and other services during and immediately following natural disasters. We establish regional emergency operations centers, dispatch liaison teams to each affected county, and mobilize reaction forces when ordered by the Governor. The Department also provides military assistance support to law enforcement. With the Governor's approval, the Department is prepared to work closely with state law enforcement agencies in dealing with civil disturbance, riot control, and security situations. Guard service members work closely with law enforcement officials to identify training requirements and special equipment needs. The Florida National Guard also supports Homeland Security/Homeland Defense outside the state of Florida, recently exemplified by our support provided to other states through the Emergency Management Assistance Compacts (EMAC) during Hurricane Katrina in 2005 and our deployment of forces to support security of the U.S. Southwest Border in 2006-07. Florida National Guard formations are playing increasingly significant roles nationwide.

The difficulty in accurately anticipating future requirements complicates the Department's ability to refine long-range public safety initiatives. Predicting global hurricane patterns, potential civil unrest, dynamic threats of terrorism, and the impact of the importation and use of illegal drugs is difficult at best. Nevertheless, one factor, Florida's changing population, has predictive public safety implications.

The growth rate of our population has been so rapid that Florida has become the nation's third most populous state within the current decade. Population growth in low-lying areas is of particular concern. More than seventy-six percent, about 13 million of the State's total

population, reside in those low-lying counties leaving Florida's citizens are extremely vulnerable to winds, rain, and high seas. Flooding from storm surge remains a major problem and requires an increasing expenditure of emergency response and recovery efforts.

An equally important consideration is Florida's changing population age distribution. The ability of the older segment of our society to prepare for, endure, and recover from disasters must be taken into account when dealing with projected support requirements. According to the Florida Legislature's Office of Economic and Demographic Research (EDR), by 2010 Florida's elder population will grow to an estimated 4.5 million, representing an increase of more than 25% over 1998 levels. Added to the growing number of elderly is an increase in the number of "frail elderly" by approximately 42.5% over the same timeframe. Currently, estimates place the number of "frail elderly" at over 333,000 citizens. Florida's population growth portends increased vulnerability to natural and man-made disasters and suggests an increasing demand upon the Department's emergency response capabilities.

To ensure the most efficient use of Guard personnel and assets, the Department has focused on fully integrating the Florida National Guard into the state's emergency response system. The assignment of Guard personnel to the state's emergency operations center; the development of federal, state, and regional supporting plans; exercising emergency response missions; and the assignment of liaison teams to county emergency response centers are highlights of this effort. The best measure of these integrating efforts is agency satisfaction with Guard coordination and support. To maintain high levels of satisfaction, the state funding of this critical area remains a priority.

Goal 3: Drug Interdiction and Prevention

Florida's Drug Control Strategy, originally published by the Office of Drug Control in 1999 and subsequently updated in 2002, presents a comprehensive long-term plan aimed at reducing the demand and supply of illegal drugs in Florida. The strategy establishes a set of major goals and provides a common vision for state agencies. The Department contributes directly to this vision through a unique, award-winning approach aimed at Demand Reduction, Supply Reduction, and Training. The program encompasses Drug Demand Reduction anti-drug and leadership skill set instruction to school-aged children in grades 3-12, post secondary students and community anti-drug coalition participants. Reducing the demand for drugs is an imperative that will help strengthen families, contribute to the success of students, and promote good health and welfare of Floridians. The program also provides direct military-specific skill training and assistance to law enforcement agencies and specialized training to law enforcement officers and community anti-drug coalition leadership. The Department's aim is to provide effective Guard-unique assistance to counter illegal drug use.

Interagency Counterdrug Assistance. The Department provides both full-time and on-call assistance to federal, state, and local law enforcement agencies. This assistance includes interpretive, linguistic, analytical, communications, aerial reconnaissance, ground reconnaissance, and subsurface diver reconnaissance support. The program provides direct support with highly-skilled intelligence analysts, linguists, communications personnel, and on-call support with aerial and surface reconnaissance assets to the Florida Department of Law Enforcement (FDLE), U.S. Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA), U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE), U.S. Postal Service (USPS), U.S. Customs and Border protection (CBP), U.S. Coast Guard (USCG), U.S. Marshals Service, the three High Intensity Drug Trafficking Area (HIDTA) Offices, the National HIDTA Assistance Center within the state, and Florida's Office of Drug Control. The program also provides quantifiable indirect support to the Department of Homeland Defense, Central Intelligence Agency (CIA), Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI), Office of Foreign Asset Control (OFAC), Department of Agriculture (USDA), and the Department of Transportation (DOT) – Bureau of Export Enforcement (BXA). In fiscal year 06-07, the Florida Counterdrug Program provided support to over 32 Federal, 11 State, and 32 Local Law Enforcement Agency locations throughout the State of Florida. All totaled, the Department supported 75 federal, state, and multi-county inter-agency initiatives which have a federal agency as the requesting and lead law enforcement proponent.

Drug Awareness Instruction. The Drug Demand Reduction Program serves as the Department's prevention arm by providing anti-drug education "Stay on Track" and "Night Vision"; leadership skill-set education "LEADER"; and Youth Camps and anti-drug coalition event support. "Stay on Track" targets students in the 6th, 7th, and 8th grades; supports Florida Sunshine State Standards for Life Skills; is based on Risk Factor and Protective Factor theory; and addresses human development issues at each stage of life. "Night Vision" provides information about the dangers of substance abuse, raises awareness of potential problems, and focuses on gateway drugs. "LEADER" uses low ropes exercises to teach leadership and positive peer pressure to today's youth. During fiscal year 06-07 these programs were presented to approximately 103,000 students statewide, exceeding our goals.

Anti-drug Coalitions. Community counterdrug efforts are key to Florida's Drug Control Strategy. With that focus, the Department provides in-kind assistance to organized anti-drug coalition efforts throughout the state. Additionally, the Department assists a variety of governmental and public agencies such as the Office of National Drug Control Policy, Community Anti-drug Coalitions of America, the Florida Alcohol and Drug Abuse Association, and the Northeast Florida Education Consortium. With continued federal funding to support staff salaries, the Department will continue to show increases in this type of support annually. In fiscal year 06-07 the Program provided approximately $316,000 of in-kind support statewide.

Counterdrug Training. During the past several years, the state appropriated $200,000 annually to the Program to facilitate training of law enforcement and community anti-drug coalitions. Presented by the Department's Florida Counterdrug Training Academy at Camp Blanding Joint Training Center, law enforcement curriculum includes: land navigation, movement techniques, mission planning, tactical tracking/counter tracking, booby trap recognition, and field medical expedients. Coalition training empowers communities and community leaders by leveraging

certified prevention professionals to provide instruction and to assist in the development of comprehensive prevention strategies critical to successful anti-drug coalition efforts.

Goal 4: Assistance to Floridians at Risk

Consistent with Chapter 250, *Florida Statutes*, the Department administers a number of federally funded year-round training programs aimed at the economically disadvantaged and at-risk youth. ABOUT FACE, an after-school and summer program, focuses on youth from 13 to 17 years of age and provides school work assistance, computer skills, home finance and budgeting, basic decision-making, and other skills required to successfully complete a secondary education curriculum. FORWARD MARCH assists Work and Gain Economic Self-sufficiency (WAGES) participants with training to improve work skills and facilitate job placement. Youth Challenge, a resident program that opened at Camp Blanding Joint Training Center in fiscal year 2001-02, assists selected Florida youth in developing life skills, personal discipline, and academic success. Consistent with programmed funding, the Department intends to maintain full enrollment in all three programs through FY 2012-13. STARBASE partners the Florida Air National Guard with the Duval County School system to provide outstanding educational experiences for fifth grade students in the Jacksonville area, especially for those from low socioeconomic backgrounds. The STARBASE curriculum targets national benchmark standards for math and science, correlating with Florida's Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT), and utilizes the Florida Air National Guard's unique resources to enhance the curriculum with a fresh perspective on the real-world applications of math, science, and technology. Throughout their five-day program, students interact with caring senior mentors and positive role models, become involved with inspiring hands-on math and science activities, and develop their teamwork and goal-setting skills. STARBASE Florida gives children an enthusiasm to learn and increases their confidence, motivating them to lead successful lives.

Goal 5: Federal/State Cooperative Agreements

The Department exercises a unique blend of federal and state authority. The Florida National Guard's federal responsibilities include facilitating the transfer of federal funding to in-state agencies and organizations via Federal/State Cooperative Agreements. The federal make-up of the Florida National Guard facilitates this transfer of federal funding to the state.

The Department currently manages 20 U.S. Army agreements, four U.S. Air Force agreements, and three federal grant programs at a total value of about $61 million dollars annually. Such programs include military construction, maintenance and repair, telecommunications, environmental, range support, equipment storage projects, as well as several *WAGES* grants. Federal support for such agreements varies from year to year; however, the Department will continue to focus on the efficient and timely execution of these funds.

Goal 6: Executive Direction and Support Services

The Department of Military Affairs and the Florida National Guard is managed by a single, integrated headquarters located in St. Augustine. The Adjutant General, a federally recognized general officer, serves as both department head of the Department of Military Affairs and senior officer of the Florida National Guard. His staff represents a complex blend of full-time and part-time military personnel, federal technicians, state employees, Citizen-Soldiers and Airmen. The Headquarters is responsible for more than one billion dollars in federal property, armories in 54 communities across the state, and over 73,000 acres in training lands. A significant measure of staff effectiveness is the control of administration and support costs. Even though we have seen a dramatic increase in operations tempo since 9-11, the Department has remained committed to minimizing administration and support costs as a percentage of total agency costs. In one area; however, we have a pressing need which we need to address. During the past two years, the Department has had a marked increase in legal requirements. The steady increase of National Guard state activations has resulted in numerous line-of-duty injuries, requiring significant additional legal work; the remodeling of existing older armories and the closing of outdated facilities has generated a myriad of legal issues; and the duties associated with Ethics and Open Government training have increased. Since the Department does not currently have a full-time state position for an attorney, all state legal work must be contracted or forwarded to the Attorney General's office for action. These actions incur significant legal expenses which are expected to grow in the future. Additionally, contracted attorneys and those from the Attorney General's Office are not normally familiar with the internal workings of the military or the Department of Military Affairs and a great deal of time is spent clarifying issues. The Department has a valid requirement for a fulltime Department of Military Affairs General Counsel and an Administrative Assistant II.

LRPP Exhibit II - Performance Measures and Standards

Department: Military Affairs	Department No.: 62

Program:Readiness and Response	Code:62050000
Service/Budget Entity:Drug Interdiction/Prevention	Code:62050100

NOTE: Approved primary service outcomes must be listed first.

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2008-09 (Words)	Approved **Prior** Year Standard **FY 2006-07** (Numbers)	**Prior** Year Actual **FY 2006-07** (Numbers)	**Approved** Standards for **FY 2007-08** (Numbers)	**Requested** **FY 2008-09** Standard (Numbers)
Percent of law Enforcement officers trained that rate the training as relevant and valuable	90%	92%	90%	90%
Number of staff days devoted to counterdrug tasks	41,245	43,380	41,245	41,245
Number of students who receive Florida National Guard drug awareness instruction	90,000	103,410	90,000	90,000
Number of law enforcement personnel trained (Counterdrug Training Academy Camp Blanding)	650	721	650	650
Number of law enforcement personnel trained (Multi-jurisdictional Counterdrug Training in St. Petersburg)	111,516	210,199	111,516	111,516

FY 2008-09 THROUGH FY 2012-13 LRPP

_____

LRPP Exhibit II - Performance Measures and Standards

Department: Military Affairs	Department No.: 62

Program:Readiness and Response	Code:62050000
Service/Budget Entity:Military Readiness and Response	Code:62050200

NOTE: Approved primary service outcomes must be listed first.

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2007-08 (Words)	Approved **Prior** Year Standard **FY 2006-07** (Numbers)	**Prior** Year Actual **FY 2006-07** (Numbers)	**Approved** Standards for **FY 2007-08** (Numbers)	**Requested** **FY 2008-09** Standard (Numbers)
Percent of funded positions available for state deployment	99 . 50%	99 .50%	99 .50%	99 .50%
Number/percent of amories rated adequate	45/79%	38/70%	42/78%	48/87%
Percent of satisfaction with training facilities at Camp Blanding	88%	86%	88%	88%
Number of annual training days at Camp Blanding	200,000	174,335	200,000	200,000
Percent of supported agencies reporting satisfaction with the Department's support for specific missions	95%	95.00%	90%	90%
Number of New Recruits using State Education Assistance Program	1,450	1,450	1,600	1,000
Number of crisis response exercises conducted annually	4	4	4	4
Number of Soldiers for whom the Florida National Guard provides Recruitment, retention and administrative services	11,498	11,904	11,498	11,498
Number of readiness centers under maintenance and repair	57	54	54	55
Number of Guard personnel using Camp Blanding training area	110,000	70,400	110,000	110,000
Number of liaison teams trained	105	126	105	100
Number of agencies supported	100	100	100	100

FY 2008-09 THROUGH FY 2012-13 LRPP

_____

DEPARTMENT OF MILITARY AFFAIRS

E -II

LRPP Exhibit II - Performance Measures and Standards

Department: Military Affairs	Department No.: 62

Program:Readiness and Response	Code:62050000
Service/Budget Entity:Executive Direction/Support Services	Code:62050400

NOTE: Approved primary service outcomes must be listed first.

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2007-08 (Words)	Approved **Prior** Year Standard **FY 2006-07** (Numbers)	**Prior** Year Actual **FY 2006-07** (Numbers)	**Approved** Standards for **FY 2007-08** (Numbers)	**Requested** **FY 2008-09** Standard (Numbers)
Percent of agency administration and support costs and positions compared to total agency costs and positions	8.7%	8.3%	8.7%	8.7%

FY 2008-09 THROUGH FY 2012-13 LRPP

_____

DEPARTMENT OF MILITARY AFFAIRS

E -II

LRPP Exhibit II - Performance Measures and Standards

Department: Military Affairs	Department No.: 62

Program:Readiness and Response	Code:62050000
Service/Budget Entity:Federal/State Cooperative Agreements	Code:62050500

NOTE: Approved primary service outcomes must be listed first.

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2007-08 (Words)	Approved **Prior** Year Standard **FY 2006-07** (Numbers)	**Prior** Year Actual **FY 2006-07** (Numbers)	**Approved** Standards for **FY 2007-08** (Numbers)	**Requested** **FY 2008-09** Standard (Numbers)
Percent of federal funds executed per year to assist in the administration and operations of community outreach programs (Youth Challenge)	100%	100%	100%	100%

FY 2008-09 THROUGH FY 2012-13 LRPP

_____

DEPARTMENT OF MILITARY AFFAIRS

E -II

LRPP Exhibit III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT

Department: Department of Military Affairs
Program: Readiness and Response
Service/Budget Entity: Drug Interdiction and Prevention
Measure: Percent of law enforcement officers trained that rate the training as relevant and valuable

Action:

☒ Performance Assessment of <u>Outcome</u> Measure ☐ Revision of Measure
☐ Performance Assessment of <u>Output</u> Measure ☐ Deletion of Measure
☐ Adjustment of GAA Performance Standards

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
90%	92%	2%	2.22%

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:

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:

Management Efforts to Address Differences/Problems (check all that apply):
☐ Training ☐ Technology
☐ Personnel ☐ Other (Identify)
Recommendations:

Office of Policy and Budget – July 2007

LRPP Exhibit III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT

Department: Department of Military Affairs
Program: Readiness and Response
Service/Budget Entity: Drug Interdiction and Prevention
Measure: Number of staff days devoted to counterdrug tasks

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
41,245	43,380	2,135	5.18%

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:

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:

Management Efforts to Address Differences/Problems (check all that apply):
☐ Training   ☐ Technology
☐ Personnel   ☐ Other (Identify)
Recommendations:

Office of Policy and Budget – July 2007

LRPP Exhibit III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT

Department: Department of Military Affairs
Program: Readiness and Response
Service/Budget Entity: Drug Interdiction and Prevention
Measure: Number of students who receive Florida National Guard drug awareness instruction

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
90,000	103,410	13,410	14.90%

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:

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:

Management Efforts to Address Differences/Problems (check all that apply):
☐ Training   ☐ Technology
☐ Personnel   ☐ Other (Identify)
Recommendations:

Office of Policy and Budget – July 2007

LRPP Exhibit III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT

Department: Department of Military Affairs_____

Program: Readiness and Response_____

Service/Budget Entity: Drug Interdiction and Prevention_____

Measure: Number of law enforcement personnel trained (Counterdrug Training Academy Camp Blanding)_____

Action:

☐ Performance Assessment of <u>Outcome</u> Measure ☐ Revision of Measure

☒ Performance Assessment of <u>Output</u> Measure ☐ Deletion of Measure

☐ Adjustment of GAA Performance Standards

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
650	721	71	10.92%

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:

Department increased approved standard.

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:

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

☐ Training ☐ Technology

☐ Personnel ☐ Other (Identify)

Recommendations:

Office of Policy and Budget – July 2007

LRPP Exhibit **III**: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT

Department: Department of Military Affairs
Program: Readiness and Response
Service/Budget Entity: Drug Interdiction and Prevention
Measure: Number of law enforcement personnel trained (Multi-jurisdictional Counterdrug Training in St. Petersburg)

Action:

☐ Performance Assessment of <u>Outcome</u> Measure ☐ Revision of Measure
☒ Performance Assessment of <u>Output</u> Measure ☐ Deletion of Measure
☐ Adjustment of GAA Performance Standards

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
111,516	210,199	98,683	88.49%

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:

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: Increase in federal funding, which was dedicated to training efforts, caused marked increase in this year's performance results. It is important to note that Federal funding is specifically provided to St. Petersburg College for this purpose and program, therefore training is nationally focused to include all 50 states and four U.S. territories. Training is normally provided based on a formal request from a law enforcement agency, but can be accessed individually via a variety of training methods including web-based training, CD/ROM, tape/DVD request, etc. Federal funding and out-of-state agency interest primarily affect this measure.

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

	Training		Technology
	Personnel		Other (Identify)

Recommendations:

LRPP Exhibit III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT

Department: Department of Military Affairs
Program: Military Readiness
Service/Budget Entity: Military Readiness and Response, 62050200
Measure: Percent of funded positions available for state deployment

Action:

☐	Performance Assessment of <u>Outcome</u> Measure	☒	Revision of Measure
☐	Performance Assessment of <u>Output</u> Measure	☐	Deletion of Measure
☐	Adjustment of GAA Performance Standards		

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
99.5%	**99.5%**	**0%**	**0%**

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:

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:

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

☐ Training	☐ Technology
☐ Personnel	☐ Other (Identify)

Recommendations: N/A

LRPP Exhibit III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT

Department: ___Department of Military Affairs_____
Program: _____Readiness and Response_____
Service/Budget Entity: _____Military Readiness, 62050200_____
Measure: __Number/Percent of armories rated adequate____

Action:
☒ Performance Assessment of <u>Outcome</u> Measure   ☒ Revision of Measure
☐ Performance Assessment of <u>Output</u> Measure   ☐ Deletion of Measure
☐ Adjustment of GAA Performance Standards

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
45/79%	38/70%	7%	15.55%

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 approved standard for FY06-07 is incorrect, since there were only 54 armories during that fiscal year due to the closure of various readiness centers. This issue was addressed last year, but no action was taken to correct the error. The actual number of armories rated adequate for FY06-07 was 38, thus making the overall percentage rated adequate 70% of the total 54 armories. This performance result is actually an improvement from last year's results.

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:

Management Efforts to Address Differences/Problems (check all that apply):
☐ Training   ☐ Technology
☐ Personnel   ☐ Other (Identify)
With the upcoming completion of several more readiness centers currently being revitalized, the Department will meet or exceed the approved performance standard for FY07-08, which accurately reflects the current number of armories.
Recommendations:
The Measure "Number/Percent of armories rated adequate", should not change. Since number of armories was revised to 54, Request standard for 2007-08 be changed to 42/78% and Standard for 2008-9 be set at 48/87%

Office of Policy and Budget – July 2007

LRPP Exhibit III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT

Department: Department of Military Affairs
Program: Readiness and Response
Service/Budget Entity: Military Readiness, 62050200
Measure: Percent of satisfaction with training facilities at Camp Blanding

Action:
☒ Performance Assessment of <u>Outcome</u> Measure   ☐ Revision of Measure
☐ Performance Assessment of <u>Output</u> Measure   ☐ Deletion of Measure
☐ Adjustment of GAA Performance Standards

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
88	86%	-2%	2.27%

Factors Accounting for the Difference:
Internal Factors (check all that apply):
☐ Personnel Factors   ☐ Staff Capacity
☐ Competing Priorities   ☐ Level of Training
☐ Previous Estimate Incorrect   ☒ Other (Identify)
Explanation: We have received numerous complaints concerning the quality of service and quality of food provided by the contractors running our dining facility.

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: We have received numerous complaints that all of our barracks are not air-conditioned.

Management Efforts to Address Differences/Problems (check all that apply):
☒ Training   ☐ Technology
☐ Personnel   ☒ Other (Identify)
Recommendations:
We have taken staff actions to address shortfalls in the dining facility with the contractor running the facility and some improvements have been realized. We will reassess the contractor's performance prior to contract renewal.

We are working with our federal partners to secure funding to air-condition all of our barracks.

Office of Policy and Budget – July 2007

LRPP Exhibit III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT

Department: __Department of Military Affairs_____
Program: _____Readiness and Response_____
Service/Budget Entity: ____Military Readiness, 62050200_____
Measure: Number of annual training days at Camp Blanding

Action:
☒ Performance Assessment of <u>Outcome</u> Measure   ☐ Revision of Measure
☐ Performance Assessment of <u>Output</u> Measure   ☐ Deletion of Measure
☐ Adjustment of GAA Performance Standards

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
200,000	174,335	25,665	12.8%

Factors Accounting for the Difference:
Internal Factors (check all that apply):
☐ Personnel Factors   ☐ Staff Capacity
☐ Competing Priorities   ☐ Level of Training
☐ Previous Estimate Incorrect   ☐ Other (Identify)
Explanation:

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:
Mobilizations and deployments of National Guard units from the various States and Territories, as well as the deployments of habitual Active Component customers, continue to impact Camp Blanding utilization. Last year's deployments of Florida National Guard's units alone (3-20th SF GRP, 221st EOD, 927th CSB, 930th ARFOR, 3-265th AD BN, 3-116th MLRS BN 202nd CES and 218th IN BDE) resulted in a loss of approximately 25,000 annual training days.

Management Efforts to Address Differences/Problems (check all that apply):
☐ Training   ☐ Technology
☐ Personnel   ☒ Other (Identify)
We will continue to advertise and actively recruit other military units, State agencies, and other civilian organizations to utilize Camp Blanding for training, retreats, leadership seminars, and conferences.

Recommendations:
Change measure to read "Number of civilian personnel using Camp Blanding training area". This coupled with another measure reading "Number of Military personnel using Camp Blanding training area" will provide much more useful measure of usage.

Office of Policy and Budget – July 2007

LRPP Exhibit III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT

Department: Department of Military Affairs

Program: Readiness and Response

Service/Budget Entity: Military response

Measure: Percent of supported agencies reporting satisfaction with the Department's support for specific missions

Action:

☒ Performance Assessment of <u>Outcome</u> Measure ☐ Revision of Measure
☐ Performance Assessment of <u>Output</u> Measure ☐ Deletion of Measure
☐ Adjustment of GAA Performance Standards

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
95%	95%	0%	0%

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:

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:

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

☐ Training ☐ Technology
☐ Personnel ☐ Other (Identify)

Recommendations:

LRPP Exhibit III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT

Department: __Department of Military Affairs__
Program: __Military Readiness__
Service/Budget Entity: __Military Readiness and Response, 62050200__
Measure: __Number of New Recruits using State Education Assistance Program__

Action:
☐ Performance Assessment of <u>Outcome</u> Measure ☒ Revision of Measure
☐ Performance Assessment of <u>Output</u> Measure ☐ Deletion of Measure
☐ Adjustment of GAA Performance Standards

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
1,450	1,450	0	0%

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:

External Factors (check all that apply):
☐ Resources Unavailable ☐ Technological Problems
☐ Legal/Legislative Change ☐ Natural Disaster
☐ Target Population Change ☐ Other (Identify)
☐ This Program/Service Cannot Fix The Problem
☐ Current Laws Are Working Against The Agency Mission
Explanation: N/A

Management Efforts to Address Differences/Problems (check all that apply):
☐ Training ☐ Technology
☐ Personnel ☐ Other (Identify)

Recommendations: Reference Exhibit IV (Requesting a revision to approved performance measure). Request measure be changed from "Number of New Recruits using State Education Assistance Program" to read, "Number of Guard Members using the State Education Assistance program". This revised measure will provide a more accurate assessment, since many Guard members who participate in the program are officers and Noncommissioned officers who have recently left service. In addition, many Guard personnel take advantage of the program after their initial year of service.

Office of Policy and Budget – July 2007

LRPP Exhibit III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT

Department: Department of Military Affairs
Program: Readiness and Response
Service/Budget Entity: Military Readiness
Measure: Number of crisis response exercises conducted annually

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
4	4	0	0%

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:

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:

Management Efforts to Address Differences/Problems (check all that apply):
☐ Training   ☐ Technology
☐ Personnel   ☐ Other (Identify)

Recommendations:

Office of Policy and Budget – July 2007

LRPP Exhibit III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT

Department: __Department of Military Affairs__
Program: _Military Readiness_____
Service/Budget Entity: Military Readiness and Response, 62050200
Measure: Number of Soldiers for whom the Florida National Guard provides recruitment, retention, and administrative services

Action:
☒ Performance Assessment of <u>Outcome</u> Measure   ☐ Revision of Measure
☐ Performance Assessment of <u>Output</u> Measure   ☐ Deletion of Measure
☐ Adjustment of GAA Performance Standards

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
11498	**11904**	**406**	**3.53%**

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:

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:

Management Efforts to Address Differences/Problems (check all that apply):
☐ Training   ☐ Technology
☐ Personnel   ☐ Other (Identify)

Recommendations:

Office of Policy and Budget – July 2007

LRPP Exhibit III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT

Department: ___Department of Military Affairs_____
Program: _____Readiness and Response_____
Service/Budget Entity: _____Military Readiness, 62050200_____
Measure: _Number of readiness centers under maintenance and repair_

Action:
☐ Performance Assessment of <u>Outcome</u> Measure   ☒ Revision of Measure
☒ Performance Assessment of <u>Output</u> Measure   ☐ Deletion of Measure
☐ Adjustment of GAA Performance Standards

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
57	54	3	5.26%

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 current approved standard is incorrect. This issue was addressed last year, but no action was taken to correct the error. The actual performance result is the actual total number of readiness centers currently in Florida for the Florida National Guard for FY06-07. The readiness center in Clearwater was recently reverted back to city authority, and the armory in North Miami was closed during that fiscal year. We now have a total of 54 armories.

External Factors (check all that apply):
- ☐ Resources Unavailable
- ☐ Legal/Legislative Change
- ☐ Target Population Change
- ☐ This Program/Service Cannot Fix The Problem
- ☐ Current Laws Are Working Against The Agency Mission
- ☐ Technological Problems
- ☐ Natural Disaster
- ☐ Other (Identify)

Explanation:

Management Efforts to Address Differences/Problems (check all that apply):
- ☐ Training
- ☐ Personnel
- ☐ Technology
- ☐ Other (Identify)

Recommendations:
The approved FY07-08 performance measure has been corrected to accurately reflect the current number of readiness centers.

Office of Policy and Budget – July 2007

LRPP Exhibit III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT

Department: ___Department of Military Affairs_____

Program: _____Readiness and Response_____

Service/Budget Entity: ____Military Readiness, 62050200_____

Measure: Number of Guard personnel using Camp Blanding training areas

Action:
- ☐ Performance Assessment of <u>Outcome</u> Measure
- ☒ Performance Assessment of <u>Output</u> Measure
- ☐ Adjustment of GAA Performance Standards
- ☐ Revision of Measure
- ☐ Deletion of Measure

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
110,000	70,400	39,600	36%

Factors Accounting for the Difference:

Internal Factors (check all that apply):
- ☐ Personnel Factors
- ☐ Competing Priorities
- ☐ Previous Estimate Incorrect
- ☐ Staff Capacity
- ☐ Level of Training
- ☐ Other (Identify)

Explanation:

External Factors (check all that apply):
- ☐ Resources Unavailable
- ☐ Legal/Legislative Change
- ☐ Technological Problems
- ☐ Natural Disaster

☐ Target Population Change   ☒ Other (Identify)
☐. This Program/Service Cannot Fix The Problem
☐ Current Laws Are Working Against The Agency Mission

Explanation: Mobilizations and deployments from National Guard units of the various States and Territories impact Camp Blanding utilization. Last year's deployments of some of Florida National Guard's units (3-20th SF GRP, 221st EOD, 927th CSB, 930th ARFOR, 3-265th AD BN, 3-116th MLRS BN 202nd CES and 218th IN BDE) resulted in a loss of approximately 17,000 annual training days. Other habitual National Guard customers, such as the 218th Infantry Brigade, South Carolina National Guard, cancelled their training at Camp Blanding which resulted in additional loss of approximately 22,000 annual training days.

Management Efforts to Address Differences/Problems (check all that apply):
☐ Training   ☐ Technology
☐ Personnel   ☒ Other (Identify)

Recommendations: Change measure from "Number of Guard personnel using Camp Blanding training areas" to read, "Number of Military personnel using Camp Blanding training area". This coupled with another measure reading "Number of civilian personnel using Camp Blanding training area" will provide much more useful measure of usage.

Office of Policy and Budget – July 2007

LRPP Exhibit III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT

Department: Department of Military Affairs_____
Program: Readiness and Response_____
Service/Budget Entity: Military Response_____
Measure: Number of liaison teams trained_____

Action:
☐ Performance Assessment of <u>Outcome</u> Measure   ☐ Revision of Measure
☒ Performance Assessment of <u>Output</u> Measure   ☐ Deletion of Measure
☐ Adjustment of GAA Performance Standards

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
105	126	21	20%

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:

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:

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

☐ Training   ☐ Technology
☐ Personnel   ☐ Other (Identify)

Recommendations: This measure is imprecise and does not provide an accurate measure of Florida National Guard response to emergencies. Liaison team size and composition vary widely and the provision of these teams is only one unique mission provided during emergency responses. The Department recommends this output measure be changed from "Number of liaison teams trained annually" to read, "Number of liaison personnel trained annually" as this is a far more accurate measure of performance of this particular mission. Additionally, we would like to measure what we train annually instead of the current standard which is bi-annually. In the past we would train 105 teams every other year which equated to about 210 personnel. We would like to change the standard to read 100 personnel trained annually. This change, although initially appearing to be significant, actually represents a change of 5 less personnel trained per year.

Office of Policy and Budget – July 2007

LRPP Exhibit III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT

Department: <u>Department of Military Affairs</u>
Program: <u>Readiness and Response</u>
Service/Budget Entity: <u>Military Response</u>
Measure: <u>Number of agencies supported</u>

Action:
☐ Performance Assessment of <u>Outcome</u> Measure   ☐ Revision of Measure
☐ Performance Assessment of <u>Output</u> Measure   ☒ Deletion of Measure
☐ Adjustment of GAA Performance Standards

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
100	100	0	0%

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:

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:

Management Efforts to Address Differences/Problems (check all that apply):
☐ Training   ☐ Technology
☐ Personnel   ☐ Other (Identify)

Recommendations: The Department recommends this output measure be deleted. This measure is imprecise and does not provide an accurate measure of Florida National Guard response to natural disasters and civil disturbances. Support provided to agencies can range from providing information by phone to full activation of available military personnel for crisis response to emergencies. Additionally, the number of agencies supported during emergency events varies widely based on the types, magnitude, and number of events occurring in any given year. Number of agencies supported does not accurately measure Readiness and Response. An already existing measure, "Percent of Supported Agencies reporting satisfaction with the Department's support for specific missions" is already included in the LRPP and better measures Military Readiness and Response.

Office of Policy and Budget – July 2007

LRPP Exhibit III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT

Department: <u>Military Response</u>
Program: <u>Readiness and Response</u>
Service/Budget Entity: <u>Executive Direction and Support Services 62050400</u>
Measure: <u>Percent of agency administrative and support costs and positions compared to total agency cost and positions</u>

Action:
☒ Performance Assessment of <u>Outcome</u> Measure   ☐ Revision of Measure
☐ Performance Assessment of <u>Output</u> Measure   ☐ Deletion of Measure
☐ Adjustment of GAA Performance Standards

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
8.7%	8.3%	0.4%	5%

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: None

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:

Management Efforts to Address Differences/Problems (check all that apply):
☐ Training ☐ Technology
☐ Personnel ☐ Other (Identify)
Recommendations:

LRPP Exhibit III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT

Department: Department of Military Affairs
Program: Readiness and Response
Service/Budget Entity: Federal/State Cooperative Agreements
Measure: Percent of federal funds executed per year to assist in the administration and operations of community outreach programs (Youth Challenge)

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
100%	100%	0	0

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:

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:

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

| ☐ Training | ☐ Technology |
| ☐ Personnel | ☐ Other (Identify) |

Recommendations:

Office of Policy and Budget – July 2007

LRPP Exhibit III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT

Department: Department of Military Affairs

Program: Readiness and Response

Service/Budget Entity: Assistance to Floridians at Risk

Measure: Number of enrolled participants (Youth Challenge)

Action:

☐ Performance Assessment of <u>Outcome</u> Measure	☒ Revision of Measure
☒ Performance Assessment of <u>Output</u> Measure	☐ Deletion of Measure
☐ Adjustment of GAA Performance Standards	

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
250	261	11	4.40%

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:

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:

Management Efforts to Address Differences/Problems (check all that apply):
☐ Training   ☐ Technology
☐ Personnel   ☐ Other (Identify)

Recommendations:

Office of Policy and Budget – July 2007

LRPP Exhibit III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT

Department: Department of Military Affairs
Program: Readiness and Response
Service/Budget Entity: Drug Interdiction and Prevention
Measure: Monetary savings derived from Drug Demand Reduction event support

Action:

☒ Performance Assessment of <u>Outcome</u> Measure   ☐ Revision of Measure
☐ Performance Assessment of <u>Output</u> Measure   ☐ Deletion of Measure
☐ Adjustment of GAA Performance Standards

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
$300,000	$316,000	$16,000	5.33%

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:

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:

Management Efforts to Address Differences/Problems (check all that apply):
☐ Training   ☐ Technology
☐ Personnel   ☐ Other (Identify)
Recommendations:

Office of Policy and Budget – July 2007

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: <u>Department of Military Affairs</u>
Program: <u>Readiness and Response</u>
Service/Budget Entity: <u>Drug Interdiction and Prevention</u>
Measure: <u>Percent of law enforcement officers trained that rate the training as relevant and valuable</u>

Action (check one):

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

Data Sources and Methodology: This Agency provides training to local and state law enforcement agencies. This training can be conducted in residence at Camp Blanding Joint Training Center as well as in an export manner at local Law enforcement locations throughout the state.   At the conclusion of each training session, After Action Reviews (AARs) and are distributed to each student receiving law enforcement training in order to receive feedback on provided training. The Florida Counterdrug Training Academy located at Camp Blanding collects and retains this information.

Validity: The Department retains the AARs and tabulates the results. These results assist in the development of future training sessions based upon the training delivered by the Department and the supported law enforcement agencies' satisfaction.

This measure reflects outside agency satisfaction with the Department's training delivered to law enforcement agencies.

Reliability: Continued satisfaction of agencies supported and repeat customers proves its extreme reliability.

Office of Policy and Budget – July 2007

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Department of Military Affairs
Program: Readiness and Response
Service/Budget Entity: Drug Interdiction and Prevention
Measure: Number of staff days devoted to counterdrug tasks

Action (check one):

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

Data Sources and Methodology: The Department provides counterdrug support to a variety of law enforcement offices throughout the state. Support is provided based on a formal request from a law enforcement agency. Each request is reviewed to ensure that it is within the scope of the Counterdrug Program guidelines. Each request is then analyzed to determine the extent of resources required to support the request. If a request is approved for support, it is assigned a mission tracking number. Actual staff day support is collected through the use of the Counterdrug Management Information system (CMIS), which is a national level reporting system. This reporting system provides the total number of staff days utilized in support of law enforcement agencies.

Validity: In addition to the CMIS as a method of collecting data, the Department also utilized an order system. This system requires that every individual deployed in support of law enforcement agencies is placed on orders for the period of duty. These orders are then utilized to validate the CMIS entries and to ensure accuracy in pay actions. Throughout the past three years this dual system has proved to be very effective in ensuring that the total number of staff days utilized is accurately recorded.

Reliability: The use of these systems, the CMIS, orders, and mission tracking ensures that records are complete and accurate. A different person operates each system and then the supervisor of the program reviews all data. An accountability review is conducted on an annual basis by the National Guard Bureau to further ensure the reliability of the data.

Office of Policy and Budget – July 2007

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: ___Department of Military Affairs_____
Program: _____Readiness and Response_____
Service/Budget Entity: __Drug Interdiction and Prevention,__
Measure: ___Number of students who receive Florida National Guard drug awareness instruction_____

Action (check one):

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

Data Sources and Methodology: The Drug Demand Reduction (DDR) Program serves as the Department's prevention arm by providing anti-drug education, leadership skill-set education, and Youth Camps (which contain drug awareness instruction) to students throughout the state.

Validity: The number of students who receive a drug awareness instruction, attend leadership skill-set education, or attend Youth Camps conducted by the Florida National Guard is tracked in a national level database called the Counterdrug Management Information System (CMIS). These student numbers are also tracked at the State level and cross-checked against CMIS on a monthly basis.

Reliability: The number of students reached is computed by instructor count provided, and is validated by student sign-in rosters at the sessions of instruction. The numbers are compiled at the State level and input into CMIS, where they are compared to the rest of the Nation. Three different people manage the three count systems and gross miss-counts can also be checked against the amount of supplies provided for a particular session of instruction. National Guard Bureau conducts a quarterly review of CMIS data to ensure that data is reliable.

Office of Policy and Budget – July 2007

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: ___Department of Military Affairs_____
Program: _____Readiness and Response_____
Service/Budget Entity: _Drug Interdiction and Prevention_____
Measure: _Number of law enforcement personnel trained (Counterdrug Training Academy Camp Blanding)

Action (check one):

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

Data Sources and Methodology: The Department trains a variety of law enforcement agencies in Counterdrug-related Military skills as well as typical law enforcement skills. Training is provided based on a formal request from a law enforcement agency. Each request is reviewed to ensure that it is within the scope of the Counterdrug Program guidelines. If a training event is approved, students must report to the training site for in processing. Students are checked into billeting, issued a meal card and they sign an attendance sheet for each sub-block of instruction. Actual attendance numbers are collected through attendance sign-in sheets and reported using the Counterdrug Management Information System (CMIS) which is a national level, web-based reporting system.

Validity: In addition to attendance sign-in rosters and CMIS, records are maintained by the administration on student attendance in both billeting and the dining facility. Three different people record data for each function. The checks and balances afforded by this multi-tiered system help to validate the accuracy of the data.

Reliability: The use of the four systems, CMIS, attendance, billeting and dining facility ensures that records are complete and accurate. A different person operates each system and then the supervisor of the program reviews all data. CMIS data is quarterly reviewed by National Guard Bureau.

Office of Policy and Budget – July 2007

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: ___Department of Military Affairs_____
Program: _____Readiness and Response_____
Service/Budget Entity: ___Drug Interdiction and Prevention_____
Measure: _Number of law enforcement personnel trained (Multi-jurisdictional Counterdrug Training in St. Petersburg) _____

Action (check one):

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

Data Sources and Methodology: Multi-jurisdictional Counterdrug Task Force Training trains personnel from a variety of law enforcement agencies nation-wide in Counterdrug-related Military skills as well as typical law enforcement skills. Federal funding is specifically provided to St. Petersburg College for this purpose, therefore the program maintains a national training focus to include all 50 states and four U.S. territories. Training is normally provided based on a formal request from a law enforcement agency, but can also be accessed individually via a variety of training methods including web-based training, CD/ROM, tape/DVD request, etc. Each request is reviewed to ensure that it is within the scope of the Counterdrug Program guidelines. Each class has a training coordinator who records and reports the number of attendees to school administrators and to National Guard Bureau. School administrators record attendance in a local database as well as entering the information into the Counterdrug Management Information System (CMIS).

Validity: The local database system functions as a primary source of information for attendance tracking, while CMIS input acts as a backup. Numbers can be cross-checked at the National level if a discrepancy is identified. National Guard Bureau reviews CMIS data quarterly.

Reliability: The use of the two systems, CMIS and a localized database, ensures that records are complete and accurate. A different person operates each system and then the supervisor of the program reviews all data. CMIS data is quarterly reviewed by National Guard Bureau.

Office of Policy and Budget – July 2007

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Military Affairs

Program: Readiness and Response

Service/Budget Entity: Military Readiness, 62050200

Measure: Percent of funded positions available for state deployment

Action (check one):

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

Data Sources and Methodology:
The data source for assigned strength is the Standard Installation Division Personnel Reporting System (SIDPERS), a national data base system. SIDPERS is currently the Florida Department of Military Affairs (DMA) official tracking system for Soldier's data (to include but not limited to) accessions, assignments, skill classification, retirement credit, discharge and miscellaneous personnel actions. Additionally, the Deputy Chief of Staff for Operations (DCSOPS) utilized current and future Florida National Guard authorization documents and the NGB Command Plan to determine current and future authorized strengths. Transformation under Command Plan 07 involves reclassifications of over 2500 Soldiers.

Validity: This percentage is determined by dividing the current assigned strength according to SIDPERS by the authorized strength of all current TDAs and MTOE for units in the FLARNG force structure as outlined in the Command Plan provided by NGB.

Reliability: This data is updated and reviewed on a monthly basis by units and commands. This data only accounts for the assigned strength and does not give a true picture of the percent available. Many soldiers are not available for state deployment due to medical reasons and current deployments.

Office of Policy and Budget – July, 2007

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: ___Department of Military Affairs_____
Program: _____Readiness and Response_____
Service/Budget Entity: _____Military Readiness, 62050200_____
Measure: ___Number/Percent of armories rated adequate_____

Action (check one):

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

Data Sources and Methodology: Number of Armories was reduced to 54 due to closure of facilities. Trained inspectors perform an annual on-site evaluation of each armory using the Department of the Army's Installation Status Report System. Inspectors use standard workbook criteria to assess a variety of functional areas related to the resident unit's ability to administer, train and store equipment. Each functional area is assigned a value score. Green and Amber are considered adequate ratings. Each armory's aggregate score is compared to a range (Green, Amber, and Black) and assigned an overall rating. The overall assessment for each armory is categorized by Quality, Quantity, and Mission. While an armory may be considered qualitatively adequate, this same armory can be assigned an overall inadequate rating, due to, for example, restrictions and limitations in both real estate structure/acquisition and/or the availability of federal military construction funding.

Validity: The Florida National Guard uses the U.S. Army's Installation Status Report System to evaluate Florida National Guard facilities. This Army systems is the approved standard which is used worldwide.

Reliability: The Department's system is considered very reliable. Departmental inspectors are thoroughly trained in the evaluation process and utilize detailed criteria and visual aids to make their evaluations. Supervisory personnel conduct frequent assessments of armory evaluations to ensure the evaluation procedure yields the same assessment on repeated trials.

Office of Policy and Budget – July 2007

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: _Department of Military Affairs_
Program: __Readiness and Response_____
Service/Budget Entity: ___Military Readiness, 62050200_____
Measure: _Percent of satisfaction with training facilities at Camp Blanding_

Action (check one):

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

Data Sources and Methodology: The data will be generated annually by the internal staff, compiling results from a standardized survey (Camp Blanding Evaluation Survey). Methodology involves entering data on an internal database for statistical compilation, analysis, and reporting. Each question is given a quantitative value from 0 to 5 (0 meaning not applicable, 1 being the lowest, et al.). Responses from each organization will be weighed depending upon the size of the organization and the duration of their stay. The database program will store the data and provide analysis through an automated matrix. The matrix will display each user and their response to each question. Besides the matrix, two additional reports will be generated from the data. The first will list individual units with their total score and average. The second will list total number of units reporting along with their gross score and average. The gross average is computed from the total earned value and the total possible earned value, thus providing us the customer satisfaction rate.

Validity: This survey will target increased customer satisfaction with our range and maneuver facilities, as well as with logistical support provided. The survey is mailed to the individual Commander or scheduling official after completion of duty at Camp Blanding. Responses come directly from customers.

Reliability: This measure is considered a reliable indicator as long as we continue to receive a statistically significant number of responses directly from our customers.

Office of Policy and Budget – July, 2007

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: _Department of Military Affairs_____
Program: ____Readiness and Response_____
Service/Budget Entity: __Military Readiness, 62050200_____
Measure: __Number of annual training days at Camp Blanding_____

Action (check one):

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

Data Sources and Methodology: Organizations that train at Camp Blanding complete a daily strength report. The strength report counts the number of people present each day. One person training at Camp Blanding constitutes one annual training day. The Plans and Training Division of Camp Blanding collates this data and reports it to the Training Site Manager (TSM).

To remove confusion and provide more accuracy between measurements and approved output standards, DMA recommends revising this standard to read "Number of civilian personnel using Camp Blanding training areas." The designation of "civilian" includes all non-military organizations.   Combined with the recommended revision of the output measure that currently reads, "Number of Guard personnel using Camp Blanding training area" to "Number of military personnel using Camp Blanding training area," these revisions would provide a more refined mechanism to differentiate between civilian and military use of Camp Blanding.

Validity: Accumulation of this data provides actual numbers of customers at Camp Blanding. Comparison with prior years' totals determines trends and forecasts for future planning and allocation of resources. Anomalies occur when habitual customers conduct training at other training installations.

Reliability: Accurate customer reporting and sound accumulation procedures verify the reliability of this measure. A standardized internal format for data collection ensures accuracy, consistency and reliability.

Office of Policy and Budget – July, 2007

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Military Affairs_____

Program: Readiness and Response_____

Service/Budget Entity: Military Readiness, 62050200_____

Measure: Number of new recruits using State Education Assistance Program

Action (check one):

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

Data Sources and Methodology: Applicants enlisting for the State Education Assistance Program (SEAP) are assigned an SEAP control number. This information is entered into an ACCESS database, which is the base of control for the program. This database can be linked with the U.S. Army's Standard Installations/Division Personnel Reporting System (SIDPERS) database for statistical and demographic analysis.

Request measure be changed from "Number of New Recruits using State Education Assistance Program" to read, "Number of Guard Members using the State Education Assistance program". This revised measure will provide a more accurate assessment, since many Guard members who participate in the program are officers and Noncommissioned officers who have recently left service. In addition, many Guard personnel take advantage of the program after their initial year of service.

Validity: All information is recorded as part of the enlistment contract. Documents are certified and tracked.

Reliability: The tracking process is managed by the program manager and the recruiting force. This information is considered extremely reliable because it is taken from standard Army databases and is used to support a variety of related personnel/recruiting systems.

Office of Policy and Budget – July, 2007

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Department of Military Affairs
Program: Readiness and Response
Service/Budget Entity: Military Readiness
Measure: Number of crisis response exercises conducted annually

Action (check one):

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

Data Sources and Methodology: The Florida National Guard (FNG) executes its crisis response through direct support to federal, state and local authorities. The FNG participates in numerous disaster exercises during the year. The Division of Emergency Management sponsors exercises that provide an opportunity to evaluate personnel manning, staff procedures, logistics and transportation issues. During these exercises, FNG personnel provide feedback to participants on the capabilities and limitations of the FNG. By designing crisis responses based upon each scenario during various exercises, FNG is able to educate participants on operational plans from a "Guard" perspective.

The participants provide the FNG After Action Reviews (AARs) on the exercise. These reviews provide agency points of contact, information on the concerns or considerations of FNG deployment in crisis response to similar types of emergencies, as well as overall success of the exercise. This AAR is used to develop plans of operation for further participation and understanding of the level of FNG participation during a specific state emergency. Plans derive from the collected data and provide a template for crisis response, review and development of new methods of support for emergencies.

Validity: The Department retains these AARs and develops operational plans based upon the FNG's participation. These operational plans have been successfully used during actual emergencies and have been practiced during ongoing exercises.

Reliability: Continued successful execution of these operational plans proves its extreme reliability.

Office of Policy and Budget – July, 2007

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Military Affairs_____

Program: Readiness and Response_____

Service/Budget Entity: Military Readiness, 62050200_____

Measure: Number of Soldiers for whom the Florida National Guard provides recruitment, retention and administrative services

Action (check one):

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

Data Sources and Methodology: The data source for number of Soldiers (assigned strength) is the Standard Installation Division Personnel Reporting System (SIDPERS). SIDPERS is currently the Florida Department of Military Affairs (DMA) official tracking system for Soldier's data (to include, but not limited to) accessions, retirement credit, assignments, miscellaneous personnel actions and discharges. The Florida National Guard Recruiting and Retention Force routinely strives to achieve greater than 100% authorized strength.

Validity: This measurement is based upon a comparison of the number of Soldiers serving in the Florida National Guard compared to the number of annual positions authorized by the National Guard Bureau (NGB).

Reliability: The measure is extremely reliable as it is based on specific/actual number of Soldiers in the SIDPERS database.

Office of Policy and Budget – July, 2007

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: ___Department of Military Affairs_____
Program: _____Readiness and Response_____
Service/Budget Entity: _____Military Readiness, 62050200_____
Measure: _Number of readiness centers under maintenance and repair _

Action (check one):

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

Data Sources and Methodology: The Agency maintains a Readiness Center Project Listing by fiscal year. This listing identifies maintenance and repair projects by Major Commands of the Organization. Maintenance and repair projects are generated at the user level and forwarded to the Department Headquarters for review. Approval is based upon established criteria, i.e., code compliance, facility design, etc. If the project is approved, a project number is assigned. The project number indicates that the project is approved for funding. Since all readiness centers require annual maintenance, all are included in this Measure.

Validity: The Project Listings are reviewed monthly and are prioritized by the Major Commands. Projects are funded based on the priority of the commands as well as safety issues, code compliance, security requirements and health issues. The process provides an immediate indicator as to the number of readiness centers under maintenance and repair. In addition, the listing indicates if the project has been funded.

Reliability: The quarterly review by the Major Commands ensures that readiness center projects are specifically identified. The quarterly review also allows for the reprioritization of projects based on need.

Office of Policy and Budget – July 2007

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Department of Military Affairs

Program: Readiness and Response

Service/Budget Entity: Military Readiness, 62050200

Measure: Number of Guard Personnel using Camp Blanding training areas

Action (check one):

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

Data Sources and Methodology: Organizations that train at Camp Blanding complete a daily strength report. The strength report not only counts the number of people present each day, but it also identifies the component (i.e., Active Duty, Army Reserve, National Guard et al.) and service (Army, Navy, Air Force, Marines, Coast Guard). One National Guardsman training at Camp Blanding one day constitutes one National Guard annual training day. The Plans and Training Division (PTD) of Camp Blanding collates this data and reports it to the Training Site Manager (TSM). Utilization information can be reported down to the component level.

Validity: Accumulation of this data provides actual numbers of National Guardsman who train at Camp Blanding. Comparison with prior years' totals determines trends and forecasts for future planning and allocation of resources. Anomalies occur when Florida National Guard units are required to conduct training at other Training Centers or Active Duty installations.

Revision of wording from "Guard personnel" to "military personnel" provides for a more useful and accurate measure of training usage via permitting the tracking of U.S. Army, U.S. Air Force, and foreign military personnel in addition to the Florida National Guard.

Reliability: Accurate customer reporting and sound accumulation procedures verify the reliability of this measure. A standardized internal format for data collection ensures accuracy, consistency, and reliability. However, wording for this measure requires revision to accurately include all participants within this measure.

Office of Policy and Budget – July, 2007

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Department of Military Affairs
Program: Readiness and Response
Service/Budget Entity: Military Response
Measure: Percent of supported agencies reporting satisfaction with the Department's support for specific missions.

Action (check one):

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

Data Sources and Methodology: This Agency provides support to local and state agencies during state emergencies. This support can range from a single liaison officer for small events, to multiple units consisting of thousands of personnel responding to a catastrophic disaster. Our duties vary according to the support requirement. At the conclusion of the event, a questionnaire is mailed to each supporting agency, specifically requesting their value of satisfaction with the Department's support. The Department maintains copies of these questionnaires.

Validity: The responses received by the supported agency allow us to evaluate our programs and plans.

This measure reflects outside agency satisfaction with the Department's support for specific missions. If a minimum number of agencies are supported, due to minimum emergency events within the state, it is possible that one unsatisfied agency will negatively and greatly impact reaching the approved standard.

Reliability: Continued satisfaction of agencies supported proves its extreme reliability.

Office of Policy and Budget – July, 2007

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Department of Military Affairs
Program: Readiness and Response
Service/Budget Entity: Military response
Measure: Number of liaison teams trained

Action (check one):

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

Data Sources and Methodology: This Agency provides liaison personnel to support a number of agencies during emergency operations. These liaisons are responsible for the collection, processing and distribution of information. They must be familiar with the capabilities and limitations of the Florida National Guard as well as a working knowledge of the state's Comprehensive Emergency Management Plan. The National Guard is charged with ensuring soldiers/airmen are trained to accomplish assigned missions. In keeping with the requirement, the Director of Military Support Office has developed a Florida Division of Emergency Management approved course management plan for the training of liaison personnel. To retain a base foundation of proficient personnel, this training is conducted annually. The instructor of each class provides a written After Action Review delineating the proficiency level of the class. Additionally, each student provides feedback on the training for future improvements or spot corrections. Personnel attending this training are recorded on a standard sign-in roster and are provided orders showing attendance at the course. The Director of Military Support Office collects and retains this information. In the past, training was required bi-annually and we would like to change the standard to annually. In the past we would train 105 teams which equated to 210 personnel every two years. We would like for the standard to change to read 100 personnel trained annually. This change, although initially appearing to be significant, actually represents a change of 5 less personnel trained per year.

Validity: The Director of Military Support Office retains a database of personnel receiving the training, and a Director of Military Support representative validates each class attended. This database along with validation of students has provided an accurate account of personnel receiving this training.

Reliability: The feedback from the instructor on student proficiency, the student After Action Reviews and the database of students, and the feedback on satisfaction with our disaster response make this measure extremely reliable.

Office of Policy and Budget – July, 2007

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: <u>Department of Military Affairs</u>
Program: <u>Readiness and Response</u>
Service/Budget Entity: <u>Military Response</u>
Measure: <u>Number of agencies supported</u>

Action (check one):
☒ Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
☐ Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
☐ Requesting new measure.
☐ Backup for performance measure not previously approved or for which validity, reliability and/or methodology information has not been provided.

Data Sources and Methodology: This Agency provides support to local and state agencies during training, exercises, coordination meetings and state emergencies. This support can range from a single liaison officer participating in a table-top exercise to multiple units consisting of thousands of personnel responding to a catastrophic disaster. Our duties vary according to the support requirement. During these events supported, sign-in rosters are collected to validate the number of agencies in participation. The Department maintains copies of these surveys.

Validity: The State Quartermaster Office and the Deputy Chief of Staff Personnel retain validated Florida National Guard (FNG) Form 427s to identify duty performed. This information is combined with feedback we receive from activated personnel and supported agencies during response to emergencies. While these records provide for valid accounting of support to various agencies, this output measure should be deleted, because the number of outside agencies supported is in direct relation to the number of emergency responses and/or agency requests. The FNG has no control over either of these factors; therefore we cannot effectively influence this measure. The level of support could include a simple response of a phone call from another agency to full activation of available personnel for crisis response to emergencies. This varied level of support makes for imprecise measuring of Guard response in support of other agencies.

Reliability: These validated reports, plus feedback, makes this measure extremely reliable in terms of number of agencies supported, but lacks in accurately measuring Guard response.

Recommendations: The Department recommends this output measure be deleted. This measure is imprecise and does not provide an accurate measure of Florida National Guard response to natural disasters and civil disturbances. Support provided to agencies can range from providing information by phone to full activation of available military personnel for crisis response to emergencies. Additionally, the number of agencies supported during emergency events varies widely based on the types, magnitude, and number of events occurring in any given year. Number of agencies supported does not accurately measure Readiness and Response. An already existing measure, "Percent of Supported Agencies reporting satisfaction with the Department's support for specific missions" is already included in the LRPP and better measures Military Readiness and Response.

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: Military Affairs
Program: Readiness and Response
Service/Budget Entity: Executive Direction and Support Services
Measure: Percent of agency administrative and support costs and positions compared to total agency costs and positions.

Action (check one):

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

Data Sources and Methodology: This measure was developed by the Governor's Office and is applied to all agencies.

Validity: The validity of this measure is established by the Governor's Office.

Reliability: The reliability of this measure is established by the Governor's Office.

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Department: ___Department of Military Affairs_____

Program: _____Readiness and Response_____

Service/Budget Entity: __Drug Interdiction and Prevention____

Measure: _Monetary savings derived from Drug Demand Reduction event support__

Action (check one):

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

Data Sources and Methodology: The Department provides in-kind assistance to organized anti-drug coalition efforts and events throughout the state. Additionally, the Department assists a variety of governmental and public agencies. Event support is provided based upon an official request from each agency. Each request is reviewed to ensure that it is within the scope of the Counterdrug Program guidelines. Data from each supported event is collected locally in an After Action Report and entered into the Counterdrug Management Information System (CMIS), a national level reporting system,

Validity: The local database system functions as a primary source of information for tracking and tabulating event support provided, while CMIS input acts as the method to capture the monetary value of delivered support. Numbers can be cross-checked at the National level if a discrepancy is identified. National Guard Bureau reviews CMIS data quarterly.

Reliability: The use of the two systems, CMIS and a localized database, ensures that records are complete and accurate. A different person operates each system and then the supervisor of the program reviews all data. CMIS data is quarterly reviewed by National Guard Bureau.

Office of Policy and Budget – July, 2007

	LRPP Exhibit V: Identification of Associated Activity Contributing to Performance Measures		
Measure Number	**Approved Performance Measures for FY 2007-08 (Words)**		**Associated Activities Title**
1	Percent of law enforcement officers trained that rate the training as relevant and valuable		Readiness and Response Drug Interdiction and Prevention
2	Number of staff days devoted to counterdrug tasks		Readiness and Response Drug Interdiction and Prevention
3	Number of high school students attending drug awareness presentations		Readiness and Response Drug Interdiction and Prevention
4	Number of law enforcement personnel trained (Counterdrug Training Academy Camp Blanding		Readiness and Response Drug Interdiction and Prevention
5	Number of law enforcement personnel trained (Multi-jurisdictional Counter drug Training in St. Petersburg)		Readiness and Response Drug Interdiction and Prevention

Office of Policy and Budget – July, 2007

LRPP Exhibit V: Identification of Associated Activity Contributing to Performance Measures			
Measure Number	**Approved Performance Measures for FY 2007-08 (Words)**		**Associated Activities Title**
6	Percent of funded positions available for state deployment		Military Readiness
7	Number/percent of armories rated adequate		Military Readiness
8	Percent of satisfaction with training facilities at Camp Blanding		Military Readiness
9	Number of annual training days at Camp Blanding		Military Readiness
10	Percent of supported agencies reporting satisfaction with the Departments support for specific missions		Military Readiness

Office of Policy and Budget – July, 2007

LRPP Exhibit V: Identification of Associated Activity Contributing to Performance Measures			
Measure Number	**Approved Performance Measures for FY 2007-08 (Words)**		**Associated Activities Title**
11	Number of new recruits using State Education Assistance Program		Military Readiness
12	Number of crisis response exercises conducted annually		Military Readiness
13	Number of Soldiers for whom the Florida National Guard provides recruitment, retention, and administrative services		Military Readiness
14	Number of readiness centers under maintenance and repair		Military Readiness
15	Number of Guard personnel using Camp Blanding training area		Military Readiness

Office of Policy and Budget – July, 2007

LRPP Exhibit V: Identification of Associated Activity Contributing to Performance Measures			
Measure Number	**Approved Performance Measures for FY 2007-08 (Words)**		**Associated Activities Title**
16	Number of liaison teams trained		Military Response
17	Number agencies supported		Military Response
18	Percent of agency administration and support costs and positions compared to total agency costs and positions		Executive Direction and Support Services
19	Percent of federal funds executed per year to assist in the administration and operations of community outreach programs (Youth Challenge)		Federal /State Cooperative Agreements

Office of Policy and Budget – July, 2007

DEPARTMENT OF MILITARY AFFAIRS

	FISCAL YEAR 2006-07	
SECTION I: BUDGET	**OPERATING**	**FIXED CAPITAL OUTLAY**
TOTAL ALL FUNDS GENERAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT	57,305,268	23,544,300
ADJUSTMENTS TO GENERAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT (Supplementals, Vetoes, Budget Amendments, etc.)	13,341,689	51,457,014
FINAL BUDGET FOR AGENCY	70,646,957	75,001,314

SECTION II: ACTIVITIES * MEASURES	Number of Units	(1) Unit Cost	(2) Expenditures (Allocated)	(3) FCO
Executive Direction, Administrative Support and Information Technology (2)				0
Improve Drug Awareness Among High School Students *Number of school-aged students attending drug awareness presentations	103,410	0.37	38,744	
Number Of Staff Days Devoted To Counterdrug Tasks *	43,380	3.53	153,198	
Provide Counter-drug Training To Law Enforcement Agencies * Number of law enforcement personnel trained (Counterdrug Training Academy at Camp Blanding)	721	117.56	84,763	
Pass Through Federal Department Of Defense Funds To St. Petersburg Junior College To Conduct Multi- Jurisdictional Counterdrug Training *Number of law enforcement personnel trained (Multi-Jurisdictional Counterdrug Training in St. Petersburg)	210,199	31.94	6,713,000	
Recruit, Retain, And Administer To Personnel In The Florida National Guard *Number of soldiers assigned	11,904	379.67	4,519,548	
Assist New Recruits With The State Education Assistance Program *Number of Guard members using State Education Assistance Program	1,450	1,268.67	1,839,567	
Maintain And Repair Armories * Number of readiness centers under maintenance and repair	54	116,996.44	6,317,808	23,544,300
Provide Quality Training Areas * Number of military and civilian personnel using Camp Blanding training area	70,400	32.80	2,308,939	
Provide Timely Response To Supported Agencies * Number of agencies supported	100	43,485.96	4,348,596	
Provide Liaison Team Training * Number of liaison teams trained	126	2,051.06	258,433	
Execute Department Of Defense Contracts In Florida * Number of Department of Defense contracts in Florida.	126	285,033.96	28,503,396	51,457,014
Execute The About Face Program * Number of participants supported.	126	1,169.06	3,250,000	
Execute The Forward March Program * Number of participants supported.	126	1,978.76	2,050,000	
Execute The Youth Challenge Program * Number of participants who successfully complete the program.	126	10,531.34	2,748,682	
TOTAL			63,134,674	75,001,314

SECTION III: RECONCILIATION TO BUDGET			
PASS THROUGHS			
TRANSFER - STATE AGENCIES			
AID TO LOCAL GOVERNMENTS			
PAYMENT OF PENSIONS, BENEFITS AND CLAIMS			
OTHER			
REVERSIONS		3,235,957	
TOTAL BUDGET FOR AGENCY (Total Activities + Pass Throughs + Reversions) - Should equal Section I above. (4)		66,370,631	75,001,314

EXHIBIT VI: AGENCY-LEVEL UNIT COST SUMMARY

September 2007 SUBMISSION

(1) Some activity unit costs may be overstated due to the allocation of double budgeted items.

(2) Expenditures associated with Executive Direction, Administrative Support and Information Technology have been allocated based on FTE. Other allocation methodologies could result in significantly different unit costs per activity.

(3) Information for FCO depicts amounts for current year appropriations only. Additional information and systems are needed to develop meaningful FCO unit costs.

(4) Final Budget for Agency and Total Budget for Agency may not equal due to rounding.

Office of Policy and Budget – July, 2007

FY 2008-09 THROUGH FY 20012-13

Glossary of Terms and Acronyms

This Appendix provides a brief explanation of key terms used in the Department's Long Range Program Plan.

Active Component (AC) - Individuals and units of the military services (U. S. Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps) in active federal service.

Drug Demand Reduction Program - A Guard program designed to work through Community Drug Free Coalitions to reduce the demand for drugs by youth at risk. This program supports initiatives that include young people in events and activities designed to raise self-esteem, enhance self-discipline, and assist in their development as responsible drug-free members of society.

Force Structure - The mix of combat, combat support, and combat service support units assigned to a military command to accomplish its assigned missions.

Fiscal Year (FY) - Federally, a twelve month period beginning 1 Oct of the preceding year and ending 30 Sep of the designated year. Within terms of Florida, a twelve month period beginning on 1 July and ending on 30 June.

Logistics - The science of planning and carrying out the movement and maintenance of forces. In its most comprehensive sense, it includes those aspects of military operations which deal with:

> a. Design and development, acquisition, storage, movement, distribution, maintenance, evacuation, and disposition of material;
>
> b. Movement, evacuation, and hospitalization of personnel;
>
> c. Acquisition or construction, maintenance, operation, and disposition of facilities; and
>
> d. Acquisition or furnishing of services.

Maintenance - Activities involving logistics support to the existing programs and forces. These activities also include supply, troop support, war reserves, maintenance, transportation, energy management, medical support, logistic quality of life support, installation logistics support, and support to other services and agencies.

Military Occupation Specialty (MOS) – The occupation to which each member of the military is assigned, identified by a five character alphanumeric code.

Military Occupational Specialty Qualified (MOSQ) - Military Occupational Specialty Qualified (MOSQ) is a term used to identify a group of duty positions that require closely related skills. Each MOS has a numeric-alpha designation (e.g., 11B is an Infantryman, 12B is a Combat Engineer, 14S is an AVENGER crew member, etc.). Soldiers are considered MOS qualified (MOSQ) when, as the result of completing an approved training program, they have demonstrated proficiency in the skills typically required for successful performance at the soldier's grade of rank. (AR 611-201, Enlisted Career Management Fields and Military Occupational Specialty).

Mission - The primary task assigned to an individual, unit or force. It usually contains the elements of who, what, when, where and the reasons therefore, but seldom specifies how. The major factors the organization must perform to achieve its purpose. Missions can and will change.

National Guard Bureau (NGB) - The major headquarters of a reserve component of the Army and Air Force, which has organized militia in all states, Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and District of Columbia, whose units and members are federally recognized.

Readiness - A measure of a unit's ability to accomplish its assigned mission. Factors that contribute to readiness are manning, training and equipment.

Reserve Component (RC) - Individuals and units assigned to the National Guard or the Reserves, who are not in active federal service, but who are subject, by law, to be called to active federal service.

Staff-day - A calculation of effort equivalent to the work of one person for one day.

Standard Installation/Division Personnel (SIDPERS) - The U. S. Army's automated personnel management system.

Structuring - Activities involving activations, in-activations, and adjustments of authorized levels of organization, conversion and force manning decisions. This functional area also includes the facilities required to support these activities.