LOUISIANA DEPARTMENT OF WILDLIFE AND FISHERIES

Strategic Plan 2008-09 through 2012-2013

July, 2007

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction	*3*
Department Organization	*4*
Key Contact Persons	*5*
Duplication of Effort	*6*
Vision 2020	*7*
Act 1078 (Women and Families)	*8*
Glossary	*9*
Department Mission, Vision, and Philosophy	*11*

"The Plan"

Management and Finance Program	*12*
Administration Program	*15*
Enforcement Program	*16*
Seafood Promotion and Marketing Program	*18*
Wildlife Program	*20*
Fisheries Program	*26*
Performance Indicator Documentation and Strategy Analysis Checklist – All Programs	*31-418*

INTRODUCTION

The Louisiana Department of Wildlife and Fisheries (LDWF) is the state agency responsible for management of the state's renewable natural resources including all wildlife and all aquatic life. The control and supervision of these resources are assigned to the department in the Constitution of the State of Louisiana of 1974, Article IX, Section 7 and in revised statutes under Title36 and Title 56. Responsibilities related to enforcement of boating safety laws are also assigned to LDWF in Title 34, Chapter 4, Part IV.

Prudent stewardship of the state's renewable natural resources contributes significantly to the quality of life of the state's citizens and to the economic well-being of the state. We serve almost two million direct users and countless others who benefit indirectly.

LDWF supports a strong work ethic in its employees and incorporates the use of good science, accurate information, and technology in carrying out its mission. The agency continually looks for ways to improve the way we manage resources to ensure their sustainability and availability for all users now and in the future.

There are national trends that challenge all fish and wildlife agencies. Some of these include:

- *People have increasingly greater demands on their time.*
- *Access to natural resources in becoming more restricted.*
- *Citizens have less trust in government.*
- *Funding is limited.*
- *The human population is aging.*
- *Complex regulations make it difficult to attract novices to hunting and fishing.*
- *Wildlife habitat is shrinking because of development.*
- *Increasingly urbanized public.*

These national issues in addition to state issues create a challenging climate for natural resource management. To ensure success in maintaining and expanding opportunities to the users of the resources and to ensure continued sustainable populations of fish and wildlife species, the department must enhance citizen participation, create opportunities to inform the public and exchange ideas and concerns, and make decisions that include scientific, social and economic factors.

DEPARTMENT ORGANIZATION

The Department of Wildlife and Fisheries is organized by statute into four offices. Funding is appropriated to these budget units by "program".

Office	Program
Office of Management and Finance	Management and Finance
Office of Secretary	Administration Enforcement Seafood Promotion and Marketing
Office of Wildlife	Wildlife
Office of Fisheries	Fisheries

This strategic plan contains a mission statement, vision statement, and philosophy at the department level, and for each program: mission, goal, objectives, strategies, and performance measures.

KEY CONTACT PERSONS

EXECUTIVE STAFF

Bryant Hammett, Secretary	225-765-2623
Janice Lansing, Undersecretary	225-765-2860
Brandt Savoie, Deputy Assistant Secretary	225-765-2806
John Roussel, Deputy Assistant Secretary	225-765-2801

DIVISION ADMINISTRATORS

Winton Vidrine, Colonel, Enforcement	225-765-2989
Ewell Smith, Executive Director, SPM Board	504-568-5693
Phil Bowman, Fur and Refuge Division	225-765-2811
Dave Moreland, Wildlife Division	225-765-2348
Gary Tilyou, Inland Fish Division	225-765-2330
Karen Foote, Marine Fish Division	225-765-2383

STRATEGIC PLANNING STAFF

Wynnette Kees, Mgmt & Finance, Admin	225-765-2862
Jeff Mayne, Enforcement	225-765-2981
Ewell Smith, SPM Board	504-568-5693
Noel Kinler, Fur and Refuge	337-373-0032
Kyle Balkum, Fur and Refuge	225-765-2367
Mike Olinde, Wildlife	225-765-2353
Gary Tilyou, Inland Fish	225-765-2331
Jim Hanifen, Marine Fish	225-765-2379

DEPARTMENT COORDINATOR

Wynnette Kees, Deputy Undersecretary	225-765-2862

DUPLICATION OF EFFORT

There is minimal duplication of effort in the Department of Wildlife and Fisheries due to careful organization of programs and activities and due to a focus on cooperation and collaboration between programs. Communication among both professional and technical personnel in programs is accomplished through periodic meetings and work groups. Each program has unique goals, objectives, and strategies – all of which are directed toward the successful accomplishment of our mission of overall conservation of the state's wildlife and fisheries resources.

VISION 2020

Louisiana: Vision 2020 is a challenge to create a newer and better Louisiana and a guide to economic renewal and diversification. It is a platform for innovative initiatives. It is a process by which the state's progress toward long-term goals will be managed and monitored.

One objective in Vision 2020 (2003 update version) is impacted by the operations of the Department of Wildlife and Fisheries (DWF). This objective reads:

> "Objective 3.7 – to preserve and develop Louisiana's natural and cultural assets. Louisiana is blessed with vast natural resources and a unique culture that make it a special place to live. While creating a Louisiana for the 21st century, we must also preserve and develop the Louisiana's heritage and natural assets. Those tangibles and intangibles are important for quality of life as well as for their economic value to the state. Louisiana must further protect our natural treasures and market our assets to those who haven't experienced their uniqueness and beauty."

Vision 2020 includes these benchmarks to track progress toward this objective:
:

- Amount of state-owned lands for natural resource management by the Department of Wildlife & Fisheries and the Department of Parks & Recreation
- Total Louisiana species listed as threatened, endangered or rare plants (R/T/E's)

The table below shows the original Vision 2020 baseline and target data and where we stand today:

Objective Name	**Baseline Date**	**Baseline Amount**	**2003 Target**	**2008 Target**	**2004 Current**
Amount of state-owned lands (DWF)	1997	657866	708000	758000	817211
Total LA species listed as threatened	1995	11	10	9	9
LA species listed as endangered	1995	22	21	20	21
LA species listed as rare plants	1997	323	320	318	372*

* The data source for the 1997 rare plant figure is unknown. At this time, the department "tracks" 372 plant species in their database. The ranking of these ranges from critically imperiled to rare to secure to extirpated.

The department's strategic plan does not include objectives specifically related to this Vision 2020 objective; however, land acquisition and management and monitoring R/T/E's are covered by other objectives in the Wildlife Program.

ACT 1078 of 2003 (Women and Families)

The Department of Wildlife and Fisheries conducts two educational programs which benefit women and families. They include:

- Becoming an Outdoors Woman (BOW)

  This program focuses on providing opportunities for women to learn skills that enhance and encourage participation in hunting, fishing and other outdoor activities. The department conducts these weekend workshops once a year for up to 125 participants.

- Families Understand Nature (FUN) Camp

  These camps conducted three times a year offer parents and their children an opportunity to spend a weekend in the outdoors re-establishing bonds and honing outdoor skills. One camp is for fathers and daughters, one for fathers and sons, and one is for mothers and daughters/sons.

These activities are performed by the Wildlife Program along with other educational programs including mandatory hunter/firearm education. The related objective is:

Conduct educational programs to reach 45,000 participants and respond to 80,000 general information questions from the public annually.

Participants in BOW and FUN are part of the performance indicators which measure achievement of this objective.

G L O S S A R Y

Access	*freedom or ability to make use of*
Achieve	*carry out successfully; attain a desired end or aim; perform*
Administration	*manage or supervise the execution, use or conduct of*
Collaboration	*work jointly with others; cooperate*
Conservation	*careful preservation and protection (wise use of resources)*
Control	*exercise restraining or directly influence over; regulate*
Create	*bring into existence; invent; bring about by action or behavior*
Development	*promote the growth of; make available or usable*
Direction	*guidance or supervision; management; authoritative instruction*
Ecology	*interrelationship of organisms and their environments; totality of relationships*
Educate	*develop mentally or morally by instruction; provide knowledge and development*
Enforce	*strengthen; gain or effect by force; carry out effectively*
Enhance	*make greater as in value, desirability or attractiveness*
Enjoy	*take pleasure; have for one's use*
Enjoyment	*possession and use; gives keen satisfaction*
Ensure	*to make certain, guarantee*
Execute	*carry out fully; put into effect; do what is provided by decree/law*
Extirpate	*destroy completely*
Fishery	*the act, process, occupation, or season of taking fish*
Habitat	*place or type of site where a plant or animal naturally lives and grows*

Maintain	*keep in existing state; preserve; defend; sustain, affirm; support*
Manage	*direct with skill; treat with care; alter by manipulation*
Operate	*run or control the functioning of; conduct the affairs of; manage*
Opportunity	*favorable juncture of circumstances; change for progress or advancement*
Optimize	*make as perfect, effective, or functional as possible*
Premier	*number one*
Preserve	*to keep safe from harm, injury or destruction; protect; maintain (generally means "non use")*
Promote	*contribute to the growth or prosperity of; help bring into being*
Protect	*shield from injury or destruction; guard; defend; save from loss*
Recreation	*refreshment of strength and spirits after work*
Regulate	*govern or direct according to rule; bring order, method or uniformity to*
Renewable	*capable of being replaced by natural ecological cycles or sound management practices*
Replenish	*stock; nourish; build up again; replace*
Research	*careful or diligent search; studious inquiry or examination*
Stewardship	*responsibility for management with regard for the rights of others*
Supervision	*critical watching and directing; oversight*
Sustain	*support, nourish, prolong*
Utilization	*practical use or account*

LOUISIANA DEPARTMENT OF WILDLIFE AND FISHERIES

FIVE YEAR STRATEGIC PLAN

FISCAL YEAR 2008-2009 THROUGH 2012-2013

Mission Statement

To manage, conserve, and promote wise utilization of Louisiana's renewable fish and wildlife resources and their supporting habitats through replenishment, protection, enhancement, research, development, and education for the social and economic benefit of current and future generations; to provide opportunities for knowledge of and use and enjoyment of these resources; and to promote a safe and healthy environment for the users of the resources.

Vision Statement

Louisiana's Department of Wildlife and Fisheries will be the premier agency for enhancing the quality of life of the state's citizens through management and protection of wildlife and fish resources and habitats.

Philosophy

The department's mission will be accomplished in a fair and equitable fashion using science-based information, open communication, and collaboration. The policies and actions of the department will be developed and carried out to foster the public's trust and respect and implemented to encourage employee teamwork and partnerships with other entities, both governmental and nongovernmental.

PROGRAM NAME: MANAGEMENT AND FINANCE

Mission

The purpose of the Management and Finance Program is to perform the financial, socioeconomic research, public information, licensing, program evaluation, planning, and general support service functions for the Department of Wildlife and Fisheries so that its mission of conservation of renewable natural resources is accomplished.

Goal

To provide the most effective and efficient services, enforce compliance in all department programs, and promote good customer service; and to increase the public visibility of the department.

Statutory authority: R.S. 36:707

OBJECTIVE 1. To implement sound financial practices and fiscal controls as demonstrated by having no repeat legislative audit findings in the department's biennial audits.

Strategy 1.1. Maintain current job descriptions and procedures manuals on all positions in the program.

Strategy 1.2. Cooperate with the department's internal auditor and other auditors to develop and implement policies and procedures and corrective actions.

Strategy 1.3. Conduct in-service training for all functions regulated and managed by the program.

PERFORMANCE MEASURES:

Outcome Number of repeat audit findings

OBJECTIVE 2. Ensure that all programs in the department are provided support services which enable them to accomplish their goals and objectives.

Strategy 2.1. Conduct process evaluations to improve the flow and timeliness of work products

Strategy 2.2. Maintain an adequate level of staffing

Strategy 2.3. Educate staff on the department's customer service plan

PERFORMANCE MEASURES:

Outcome	No. objectives not met due to failure to provide adequate support services
Input	No. department employees per support service employee

OBJECTIVE 3. To achieve at least a 5-day turnaround on processing of commercial license and boat registration applications received by mail.

Strategy 3.1. Enhance staff recruitment and retention.

Strategy 3.2. Utilize information technology applications to maximize productivity.

PERFORMANCE MEASURES:

Outcome	Commercial license turnaround time
Outcome	Boat registration turnaround time
Input	No. staff assigned to license and registration function

OBJECTIVE 4. To provide opportunities for the public to receive information on the department and resource management through news, publications and internet access.

Strategy 4.1. Maintain a qualifed, professional staff of employees.

Strategy 4.2. Promote departmental activities and events through media opportunity.

Strategy 4.3. Post and maintain department news and activities on the web site.

Strategy 4.4. Respond to media inquiries.

Strategy 4.5. Publish and distribute six issues per year of the Conservationist magazine.

PERFORMANCE MEASURES:

Outcome	No. news releases/features written and distributed
Outcome	Total no. magazines printed and distributed
Outcome	No. departmental activities and events covered and highlighted by media
Outcome	No. of visitors to the department web site
Input	No. paid subscriptions to magazine
Input	Annual direct production cost of magazine

Input Annual revenue from magazine subscriptions

OBJECTIVE 5. To earn 5% reduction of liability insurance premiums by successfully passing the State Loss Prevention Audit.

Strategy 5.1. Ensure safety coordinators in all department facilities are adequately trained.

Strategy 5.2. Conduct and document quarterly safety meetings in all applicable facilities.

Strategy 5.3. Establish and distribute written policies and procedures regarding all aspects of the loss prevention program.

PERFORMANCE MEASURES:

Outcome Percent reduction of insurance premium applied
Outcome Dollars saved from successful completion of audit

Clients and Users:

All department employees
Commercial fishermen
Recreational hunters and fishers
Boaters
Media
Non-consumptive outdoor users
Libraries, schools
State control agencies

PROGRAM NAME: ADMINISTRATION

Mission

The mission of the Administration Program within the Office of the Secretary is to provide executive leadership and legal support to all department programs and staff.

Goal

That all programs will be operated efficiently and effectively through sound planning and decision-making processes resulting in achievement of the department's mission.

Statutory Authority for goal: Title 36, Chapter 13 and Title 56

Activities in this program:

Executive Staff
Legal Section
Internal Audit
Permits Coordinator

OBJECTIVE 1: To ensure that at least 95% of all department objectives are achieved.

Strategy 1.1. Plan and prioritize for the allocation of financial resources.

Strategy 1.2. Encourage staff empowerment and teamwork.

Strategy 1.3. Promote partnerships and collaboration with other state agencies and other entities.

Strategy 1.4. Be responsive to the needs of all external stakeholders.

PERFORMANCE MEASURES:

Outcome Percent of department objectives achieved

PROGRAM NAME: ENFORCEMENT

Mission

The Mission of the Enforcement Division is to establish and maintain compliance through the execution and enforcement of laws, rules and regulations of the state relative to the management, conservation and protection of renewable natural wildlife and fisheries resources and relative to providing public safety on the states waterways and lands for the continued use and enjoyment of current and future generations.

Goal

Achieve public compliance with the department's wildlife and fisheries management and conservation programs which promote positive resource enhancement and public safety, and provide public safety services on our states waterways. Perform successful as search and rescue operations to enhance homeland security for Louisiana citizens.

Statutory authority for goal: R.S. 56:01 et. Seq. and R.S. 36:605 B (4) (a)

OBJECTIVE 1. Reduce the number of boating crashes per 100,000 registered boats.

Strategy 1.1. Increase high visibility patrols in areas where boating crash rates are highest.

Strategy 1.2. Increase availability and delivery of boating education courses.

Strategy 1.3. Increase agent training in boating-while-intoxicated detection and apprehension techniques.

PERFORMANCE MEASURES:
Outcome Number of crashes per 100,000 registered boats
Outcome % Change in boating crashes from previous year
Input Number of boating safety patrol hours
Outcome Number of students completing boating safety course
Outcome Number of boating crashes *
Input Number of registered boats
Outcome Percent of boating crashes with alcohol or drugs were involved
Outcome Number of boating fatalities

* A boating crash is a collision, incident or other casualty involving a recreational vessel and resulting in death, injury (beyond first aid) or property damage in excess of $500.00

OBJECTIVE 2. To increase voluntary compliance by increasing the number of public contacts by wildlife agents.

Strategy 2.1. Maintain an adequate level of staffing.

Strategy 2.2. Decrease administrative time to devote more manpower to field duties.

PERFORMANCE MEASURES:
Outcome Number of public contacts *
Outcome % change in public contacts over previous year
Input Number of field patrol hours
Input Authorized (enforcement agent) positions
Input Man hours – specialized operations units (includes covert section)
Input Agent training hours
Input Number of investigations opened by the covert section

* A public contact is contact made by a wildlife agent with a person who is engaged in a regulated activity and where the agent has personal verbal contact, performs a routine check, issues a warning, issues a citation, or makes an arrest.

OBJECTIVE 3. Plan, coordinate and provide search and rescue operations, supporting public safety for times of emergency.

Strategy 3.1 Enhance coordination, interoperability and promote communications between federal state and local governments towards search and rescue efforts during times of emergencies.

PERFORMANCE MEASURES
Outcome Number of law enforcement first responders trained in maritime search and rescue.
Input Number of non-agency first responders trained in maritime search and rescue.

Clients and Users:

Boaters and users of the state's waterways
Hunters, fishers
Non-consumptive users
All LA citizens
Participants in homeland security

PROGRAM NAME: SEAFOOD PROMOTION AND MARKETING BOARD

Mission

The statutory purpose of the Seafood Promotion and Marketing Board is to give assistance to the state's seafood industry through product promotion and market development in order to enhance the economic well-being of the industry and of the state.

Goal

To increase consumption of Louisiana seafood.

Statutory authority for goal: R.S. 56:578.1 et seq

OBJECTIVE 1. To promote consumption of Louisiana fishery products and enhance existing markets and develop new markets.

Strategy 1.1. Continue to build on existing partnerships and relationships with fishery-related industries and entities and build new ones.

Strategy 1.2. Participate in trade shows and generate trade leads.

Strategy 1.3. Conduct product promotions and special events.

Strategy 1.4. Implement educational programs such as television broadcasts, study units for teachers, and displays at museums.

Strategy 1.5. Conduct advertising campaigns that include ads in print and electronic media with national, regional, and local distribution.

Strategy 1.6. Educate state and national legislators about industry issues.

Strategy 1.7. Implement campaigns on "tag lines".

Strategy 1.8. Issue news releases and radio announcements statewide and nationally.

Strategy 1.9. Maintain the quality and usefulness of the program's web site.

Strategy 1.10. Continue the weekly television show which spotlights LA seafood products.

Strategy 1.11. Engage in partnerships with other state agencies and trade associations for promotional opportunities.

PERFORMANCE MEASURES:

Outcome	Total economic impact from commercial fishing
Output	No. product promotions, special events, and trade shows
Output	No. ads and news releases distributed
Output	No. readers exposed to media campaigns
Output	No. visitors to web site

PROGRAM NAME: WILDLIFE

Mission

The purpose of the Wildlife Program is to provide wise stewardship of the state's wildlife and habitats, to maintain biodiversity, including plant and animal species of special concern, and to provide outdoor opportunities and education for present and future generations to engender a greater appreciation of the natural environment.

Goal

To enhance and conserve the habitat necessary to maintain the state's species diversity and optimum distribution and densities of wildlife populations, and to increase the opportunities for the public to enjoy their outdoor experiences.

Statutory authority for goal: Title 36, Chapter 13 and Title 56

OBJECTIVE 1: To manage the 0.9 million acres in the non-coastal WMA system through maintenance and habitat management activities.

Strategy 1.1 Annually assess and implement management plans developed for each non-coastal Wildlife Management area.

Strategy 1.2 Develop and maintain partnerships with various state and federal agencies as well as conservation organizations, private businesses, and individuals to facilitate management programs.

PERFORMANCE MEASURES:

Output	Number of wildlife habitat management activities
Outcome	Number of user-days
Input	Number of acres in non-coastal wildlife management area system
Output	Number of wood duck boxes maintained
Output	Number of miles of roads and trails maintained
Output	Number of miles of marked boundaries
Efficiency	Number of acres per technician

OBJECTIVE 2: Enhance wildlife habitat on private lands and non-Department public lands by providing 15,000 wildlife management technical assistance responses to the public and other agencies/NGOs.

Strategy 2.1 Maintain a well-trained biological staff

Strategy 2.2 Serve on technical advisory committees of state and federal agencies as well as NGOs that influence land management practices

Output	Number of oral or written technical assistances provided
Input	Number of acres in the Deer Management Assistance Program (DMAP)
Input	Number of acres in the Landowner Antlerless Deer Tag Program (LADT)
Outcome	Number of acres in Louisiana Waterfowl Program (LWP)

OBJECTIVE 3: Manage wildlife populations for sustainable harvest and/or other recreational opportunities through survey and research resulting in 238 days of hunting opportunity for game species.

Strategy 3.1 Develop and maintain a tracking system of survey/research projects on WMAs and off WMAs when through Division cooperative/collaborative endeavors

Strategy 3.2 Annually develop hunting seasons, bag limits, and regulations that provide optimal opportunity and sustainable game populations

Output	Number of species surveys/habitat/population evaluations
Outcome	Total number of hunter-days annually
Output	Number of wood duck boxes monitored
Output	Number of wood ducks banded

OBJECTIVE 4: Conduct educational programs to reach 45,000 participants and respond to 80,000 general information questions from the public annually.

Strategy 4.1 Maintain a well-trained full-time education staff

Strategy 4.2 Maintain well-trained volunteer hunter and aquatic education instructors

Strategy 4.3 Develop new and/or update existing educational programs to increase the public's awareness and knowledge of the state's diverse natural resources

Output	Number of hunter education participants
Input	Number of hunter education courses offered
Output	Number of requests for general information answered
Output	Number of bowhunter education participants
Output	Number of participants in all educational programs
Input	Number of active hunter education volunteer instructors

OBJECTIVE 5. To manage the alligator resource of the state to provide species protection and to authorize the sustainable harvest of wild alligators.

Strategy 5.1. Conduct population inventory surveys to assess population trends and distribution.

Strategy 5.2. Recommend and implement harvest seasons, quotas and regulations to provide for the sustainable harvest of wild alligators and wild alligator eggs.

Strategy 5.3. Conduct the necessary activities to manage the farm/ranching and wild alligator egg collection program to ensure adequate controls to protect the wild alligator resource.

Strategy 5.4. Conduct various research and monitoring activities to provide an adequate database of information to manage the wild alligator population.

PERFORMANCE MEASURES:

Outcome	No. of wild alligators harvested
Output	No. of acres surveyed during coast wide nest inventory
Output	No. of licensed alligator hunters
Outcome	No. of wild alligator eggs collected by farmers
Output	No. of tags issued for harvest of farm raised alligators
Outcome	No. of farm raised alligators released to the wild
Output	No. of farm alligator releases conducted
Output	No. of alligator hide inspections conducted
Output	No. of tags issued for harvest of nuisance alligators

OBJECTIVE 6. To manage the furbearer resources of the state to provide for species protection, sustainable harvest and through the Coastwide Nutria Control Program provide incentive payments for nutria harvest to reduce the negative impact of this non-native species on coastal wetland habitats.

Strategy 6.1. Recommend and implement harvest seasons and regulations to provide for the harvest of all furbearers.

Strategy 6.2. Conduct the necessary activities to administer the Coastwide Nutria Control Program, meeting all requirements set forth by the CWPPRA Task Force.

Strategy 6.3. Conduct an annual coastwide survey to assess the impact of nutria on coastal wetland habitats.

PERFORMANCE MEASURES:

Output	No. of participants in the nutria control program
Outcome	No. of nutria harvested in the nutria control program
Outcome	No. of acres of coastal wetlands impacted by nutria herbivory
Outcome	No. of acres of coastal wetlands recovered from nutria herbivory
Outcome	No. of total furbearers harvested
Output	No. of licensed trappers

OBJECTIVE 7. To perform habitat management, maintenance, and monitoring activities to conserve 627,279 acres in the coastal Wildlife Management Area (WMA) and Refuge system for fish and wildlife populations and associated recreational and commercial opportunities.

Strategy 7.1. Assess, conduct, monitor, and implement marsh management activities on the coastal Wildlife Management Areas and Refuges.

Strategy 7.2. Assess, monitor, and implement development activities on the coastal Wildlife Management Areas and Refuges.

Strategy 7.3. Develop and maintain partnerships with various state and federal agencies as well as conservation groups to facilitate management programs.

Strategy 7.4. Provide recreational and commercial opportunities on coastal Wildlife Management Areas and Refuges.

Strategy 7.5. Conduct necessary preparations to minimize impacts from catastrophic events; assess impacts and implement all necessary recovery activities.

PERFORMANCE MEASURES

Input	No. of acres in the coastal WMA and Refuge system
Output	No. of habitat enhancement projects under development
Output	No. of acres impacted by habitat enhancement projects and activities
Outcome	No. of visitors to coastal WMAs and Refuges
Outcome	No. of individuals participating annually in youth hunting activities
Outcome	No. of mineral projects

OBJECTIVE 8. To promote the conservation of non-game species through the solicitation and approval of grant-funded projects, by monitoring the relative occurrence of Louisiana's rare threatened and endangered species, by continuously updating the data base with site specific occurrence records of targeted species, and by managing nuisance wildlife control operators and rehabilitators.

Strategy 8.1. To annually enter new or updated Element Occurrence Records (EORs) in our non-game, rare, threatened and endangered species data base. An EOR is a single record showing the location and status of one of the species of concern in Louisiana.

Strategy 8.2. Manage and issue permits for nuisance wildlife control operators and wildlife rehabilitators.

Strategy 8.3. Respond and provide technical assistance to the public concerning nuisance and injured wildlife

Strategy 8.4. Issue Scientific Collecting permits for wildlife species.

Strategy 8.5. Promote the conservation of non-game species to preclude the need for listing under the Endangered Species Act.

PERFORMANCE MEASURES:

Input	Number of new or updated EORs entered into database
Outcome	Number of nuisance Black Bear problems acted upon
Outcome	Number of man-days expended on biological surveys on populations of non-game, rare, threatened and endangered species and native plants
Outcome	Number of Nuisance Animal Control Operators and Nuisance Animal Control Permits Issued
Outcome	Number of Wildlife Rehabilitator Permits issued
Outcome	Number of Scientific Collecting Permits issued
Outcome	Number of active grant-funded projects managed

OBJECTIVE 9. To avoid, minimize and/or mitigate adverse environmental impacts to fish and wildlife habitat from/by statewide development projects by reviewing and providing technical comments and recommendations on 100 percent of the public notices and permit applications received and by issuing Scenic River Permits as required by statute.

Strategy 9.1. Receive, log in, review and comment on all public notices and permit applications from wetland regulatory agencies, and make recommendations for mitigation actions designed to avoid, minimize, or compensate for damages to fish and wildlife resources and habitat

Strategy 9.2. Work with federal and state regulatory agencies on major projects, which impact fish and wildlife resources and habitat by conducting joint habitat evaluations with those agencies, and formulating mitigation recommendations, which will be mandatory

Strategy 9.3. Assist in the development and operation of mitigation banks

Strategy 9.4. Monitor the State's Natural and Scenic River System to prevent unauthorized uses, initiate enforcement and corrective action against unauthorized activities, and to control impacts to the streams through the established permitting system, which includes mitigation requirements

PERFORMANCE MEASURES:

Input	Number of public notices and permit applications received, logged, and reviewed
Outcome	Number of technical comments and mitigation recommendations provided in response to public notices and permit applications received
Input	Number of Scenic River Permit Applications received and processed
Outcome	Number of Scenic River Permits issued with mitigation requirements

Clients and Users:

Hunters and fishers
Non-consumptive users of natural resources and the outdoors
Fur trappers, buyers, dealers
Alligator hunters, processors
Consumers
Boaters and water recreational users
Advocacy groups
Conservation organizations
Environmentalists
Educators
Tourists
University researchers
Agricultural interests
Forest and wood products industries
Oil/gas and associated industries
Game breeders
General public

Program Name: Fisheries

Mission

The purpose of the Fisheries Program is to ensure that living aquatic resources are sustainable for present and future generations of Louisiana citizens by providing access and scientific management.

Goal

To improve our ability to manage living aquatic resources and their habitats through enhancement and more efficient and effective data collection, analysis, and regulation, and to improve access to and opportunity for users to enjoy those resources.

Statutory authority for goal: LA Constitution of 1974, Article IX, Section 7; R.S. 56:1 et seq.; R.S. 36:601 et seq.; R.S. 30:214 et seq.; R.S. 35:3101 et seq.; and R.S. 30:2451 et seq.

OBJECTIVE 1: Ensure that Louisiana's major marine fish stocks are not overfished.

Strategy 1.1: Enhance the collection of biological and environmental data associated with marine fish and habitat resources from the State's major coastal bay systems and territorial sea.

Strategy 1.2: Develop indices of abundance for age-based stock assessments using enhanced fishery independent data.

Strategy 1.3: Improve the accuracy of and develop new stock assessments by enhancing fishery dependent information collected from the harvesters of the resource.

Strategy 1.4: Prepare and update management plans for major marine species to keep up-to-date with new research findings to improve the accuracy and develop new stock assessments.

Strategy 1.5: Coordinate management of interjurisdictional fisheries with the other Gulf States and Federal government to improve our collective knowledge of species of concern and to continue the development of innovative stock assessments techniques.

Strategy 1.6: Prepare recommendations to the Louisiana Wildlife and Fisheries Commission and the Louisiana Legislature; promulgate, administer, and enforce rules

and regulations as provided for in law; and administer statutorily authorized permit programs.

PERFORMANCE MEASURES:

Input Number of Louisiana's major coastal bay systems with sampling teams collecting fisheries data.
Output Number of fishery-independent data collection stations sampled.
Output Number of saltwater recreational creel interviews/samples taken.
Output Number of management plans written/updated.
Output Number of commercial fishing trips.
Outcome Percent of major fish stocks not overfished.
Outcome National ranking in recreational marine finfishing (# days fished).
Outcome National ranking in commercial marine shellfish landings.
Outcome National ranking in commercial marine finfish landings.
Outcome Number of licensed commercial fishers.
Outcome Number of licensed saltwater recreational fishers.

OBJECTIVE 2: Administer a leasing system for oyster waterbottoms such that 99% of all leases result in no legal challenges related to the leasing system and manage public reefs to fulfill 100% of the industry's seed oyster demand and make at least one area available for sack oyster harvest on the public seed grounds.

Strategy 2.1: Administer a harvest area grid system for oyster lease production information and collect production information from leaseholders.

Strategy 2.2: Streamline processing procedures for increased numbers of renewal lease applications expected because of coastal restoration restrictions on lease time periods.

Strategy 2.3: Manage and maintain the public reefs to produce seed and sacking oysters.

PERFORMANCE MEASURES:

Input Number of oyster lease applications received.
Output Number of barrels of seed oysters available on the public grounds.
Output Number of areas available for harvest of sack oysters on public seed grounds.
Output Number of oyster lease surveys conducted.
Outcome Number of barrels of seed oysters harvested by oyster fishers from the public grounds.
Outcome Number of sacks of oysters harvested from the public grounds.
Outcome Number of lessees adversely affected by lack of timeliness in issuing leases.
Efficiency Percent of leases with no legal challenges.

Efficiency Percent of demand for seed oysters met.

OBJECTIVE 3: To conserve, protect, manage, and improve Louisiana's marine and coastal habitats by participating in 15 major coastal protection/improvement projects.

Strategy 3.1: Conserve, protect, restore, and enhance marine fish habitat in cooperation with other state and federal agencies that share public trust responsibilities for those resources.

Strategy 3.2: Remove derelict crab traps from coastal waters.

Strategy 3.3: Monitor activities of seismic exploration companies to ensure compliance with rules and environmental protection.

Strategy 3.4: Administer the Louisiana Artificial Reef Program to provide hard-bottom habitat for marine fishes.

Strategy 3.5: Enhance the collection of data associated with marine fish and habitat resources from the State's major coastal bay systems and territorial sea.

PERFORMANCE MEASURES:

Input	Number of oyster reefs sampled to monitor health of reef habitat.
Input	Number of spills investigated.
Output	Number of spills requiring restoration.
Outcome	Percent of seismic projects in the state monitored for compliance with DWF rules.
Outcome	Number of abandoned crab trap cleanup areas.
Outcome	Number of platforms added to the Louisiana Artificial Reef Program.
Efficiency	Number of major coastal protection/restoration projects participated in.

OBJECTIVE 4**.** To ensure that all species of sport and commercial freshwater fish are in good condition in at least 91% of all public lakes over 500 acres.

Strategy 4.1. Enhance the collection of fishery information from major freshwater lakes.

Strategy 4.2. Supplement public waters with sport fish and species of concern in support of management plans.

Strategy 4.3. Ensure that aquaculture and other activities involving aquatic, exotic species result in no adverse effects upon native fish populations in Louisiana.

Strategy 4.4. Coordinate management of interjurisdictional fisheries with the other Gulf states and Federal government.

Strategy 4.5. Administer statutorily authorized permit programs.

Strategy 4.6. Develop management plans for any aquatic resources that may be of special concern.

Strategy 4.7. Increase angler participation by providing technical assistance to private pond owners.

PERFORMANCE MEASURES:

Input: Number of fish requested for stocking

Output: Number of fish stocked

Outcome: The percentage of lakes with all fish species in good condition
The number of major fish kills
Fish provided by fish hatcheries as a percentage of fish recommended for stocking public water bodies.

OBJECTIVE 5. To treat at least 82,000 acres of waterbodies to control nuisance aquatic vegetation.

Strategy 5.1. Determine statewide infestations of problematic aquatic plants (water hyacinth, hydrilla, salvinia, alligator weed, etc.).

Strategy 5.2. Investigate aquatic vegetation infestations in selected public lakes.

Strategy 5.3. Perform maintenance and control operations.

PERFORMANCE MEASURES:

Input: Number of acres of nuisance aquatic plants measured annually in late summer/fall
Output: Number of acres of nuisance aquatic plants treated
Outcome: Percent of nuisance aquatic plants treated statewide

OBJECTIVE 6. To improve or construct four boating access projects a year.

Strategy 6.1: Increase local government awareness of Department's boating access project through direct correspondence.

Strategy 6.2: Reduce time for project initiation by increasing information to project sponsors.

Strategy 6.3: Closely monitor Federal funds available for projects to maximize utilization of boating access funds.

PERFORMANCE MEASURES:

Input: Number of requests for assistance in improving or constructing boating access facilities
Outcome: The number of new or improved boating access facilities completed.

Clients and Users:

Commercial fishers
Recreational fishers
Legislators
State/federal agencies
Scientists, teachers
Environmentalists
Consumers
Oil/gas industry
Seismic industry
Private pond owners
Boating industry
Marina and boat launch owners and operators
Agricultural interests
Boaters
Water resource users

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **Management and Finance**

Objective: **To implement sound financial practices and fiscal controls as demonstrated by having no repeat audit findings in the department's biennial audits.**

Indicator Name: **Number of repeat audit findings**

1. Type and Level: What is the type of the indicator (input, output, outcome, efficiency, quality)? What is the level at which the indicator will be reported (key, supporting, general performance information)?

   Outcome; key

2. Rationale: What is the rationale for the indicator? Why was it selected? How does it help measure achievement of the objective?

   It is a direct measure of the objective.

3. Use: How will the indicator be used in management decision-making and other agency processes? Will it be used only for internal management purposes or will it also be used for budgeted purposes?

   It can be used to determine level of performance by employees and level of training needed to achieve required skills.

4. Clarity: Does the indicator name clearly identify what is being measured? If the name contains jargon, acronyms, or unclear terms, define or clarify them here.

   No further explanation needed.

5. Validity, Reliability, and Accuracy: Has the indicator been audited by the Office of the Legislative Auditor? If so, what was the result/finding? If not, how can you assure that the indicator is valid, reliable and accurate?

   It has not been audited.

6. Data Source, Collection and Reporting: What is the source of data to be reported? What is the frequency and timing of collection and reporting (monthly, quarterly, annual)?

   Legislative audit findings are clear and distinct; a comparison of findings from year to year shows any repeat findings. Audits are conducted every other year, and this is the frequency of reporting.

7. Calculation and Methodology: How is the indicator calculated?

   See No. 6

8. Scope: Is the indicator aggregated or disaggregated (is it a sum of smaller parts or is it a part of a larger whole)? Example – if the indicator is a statewide figure, can it be broken down by parish or region?

   Disaggregate.

9. Caveats: Does the indicator have limitations or weaknesses (lack of precision or timeliness, difficult to collect, external factors)?

   The only limitation is that we are audited every other year rather than every year, so performance can only be reported every other year.

10. Responsible Person: Who is responsible for data collection, analysis and quality? Provide name, title, and contact information for all persons involved in collection and reporting.

    Wynnette Kees, Fiscal Officer 765-2862

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **Management and Finance**

Objective: **Ensure that all programs in the department are provided support services which enable them to accomplish their goals and objectives.**

Indicator Name: **Number of department objectives not met due to failure to provide adequate support services.**

1. Type and Level: What is the type of the indicator (input, output, outcome, efficiency, quality)? What is the level at which the indicator will be reported (key, supporting, general performance information)?

   Outcome; key

2. Rationale: What is the rationale for the indicator? Why was it selected? How does it help measure achievement of the objective?

   This indicator (and objective) is recommended (mandated?) by the Office of Planning and Budget.

3. Use: How will the indicator be used in management decision-making and other agency processes? Will it be used only for internal management purposes or will it also be used for budgeted purposes?

   This indicator is not used by the agency.

4. Clarity: Does the indicator name clearly identify what is being measured? If the name contains jargon, acronyms, or unclear terms, define or clarify them here.

   No further explanation needed.

5. Validity, Reliability, and Accuracy: Has the indicator been audited by the Office of the Legislative Auditor? If so, what was the result/finding? If not, how can you assure that the indicator is valid, reliable and accurate?

   This indicator has not been audited. We cannot assure its validity, reliability, or accuracy.

6. Data Source, Collection and Reporting: What is the source of data to be reported? What is the frequency and timing of collection and reporting (monthly, quarterly, annual)?

This is an annual indicator. There is no method of measuring this indicator; measurement is purely subjective.

7. Calculation and Methodology: How is the indicator calculated?

   No calculations are performed.

8. Scope: Is the indicator aggregated or disaggregated (is it a sum of smaller parts or is it a part of a larger whole)? Example – if the indicator is a statewide figure, can it be broken down by parish or region?

   Not applicable.

9. Caveats: Does the indicator have limitations or weaknesses (lack of precision or timeliness, difficult to collect, external factors)?

   This indicator cannot be measured.

10. Responsible Person: Who is responsible for data collection, analysis and quality? Provide name, title, and contact information for all persons involved in collection and reporting.

    Wynnette Kees, Fiscal Officer 765-2862

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **Management and Finance**

Objective: **Ensure that all programs in the department are provided support services which enable them to accomplish their goals and objectives.**

Indicator Name: **Number of department employees per support services employee**

1. Type and Level: What is the type of the indicator (input, output, outcome, efficiency, quality)? What is the level at which the indicator will be reported (key, supporting, general performance information)?

   Input; supporting

2. Rationale: What is the rationale for the indicator? Why was it selected? How does it help measure achievement of the objective?

   This indicator indicates the level of service which can, theoretically, be provided. When programmatic employees are increased without additional resources for support services, this can affect successful provision of adequate support services.

3. Use: How will the indicator be used in management decision-making and other agency processes? Will it be used only for internal management purposes or will it also be used for budgeted purposes?

   It could be used to justify additional resources (employees) needed in the support services function and could be compared to other agencies.

4. Clarity: Does the indicator name clearly identify what is being measured? If the name contains jargon, acronyms, or unclear terms, define or clarify them here.

   The number reported is total head count authorized for the Office of Management and Finance.

5. Validity, Reliability, and Accuracy: Has the indicator been audited by the Office of the Legislative Auditor? If so, what was the result/finding? If not, how can you assure that the indicator is valid, reliable and accurate?

   This indicator has not been audited. Its accuracy can be verified by the appropriations bill.

6. Data Source, Collection and Reporting: What is the source of data to be reported? What is the frequency and timing of collection and reporting (monthly, quarterly, annual)?

   This is an annual indicator.

7. Calculation and Methodology: How is the indicator calculated?

   No calculations are required.

8. Scope: Is the indicator aggregated or disaggregated (is it a sum of smaller parts or is it a part of a larger whole)? Example – if the indicator is a statewide figure, can it be broken down by parish or region?

   Aggregate.

9. Caveats: Does the indicator have limitations or weaknesses (lack of precision or timeliness, difficult to collect, external factors)?

   No limitations or weaknesses.

10. Responsible Person: Who is responsible for data collection, analysis and quality? Provide name, title, and contact information for all persons involved in collection and reporting.

    Wynnette Kees, Fiscal Officer 765-2862

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **Management and Finance**

Objective: **To achieve at least a 7-day turnaround on processing of commercial license and boat registration applications received by mail.**

Indicator Name: **Commercial license turnaround time**

1. Type and Level: What is the type of the indicator (input, output, outcome, efficiency, quality)? What is the level at which the indicator will be reported (key, supporting, general performance information)?

   Outcome; key

2. Rationale: What is the rationale for the indicator? Why was it selected? How does it help measure achievement of the objective?

   It is a direct measure of the objective.

3. Use: How will the indicator be used in management decision-making and other agency processes? Will it be used only for internal management purposes or will it also be used for budgeted purposes?

   For internal management purposes only.

4. Clarity: Does the indicator name clearly identify what is being measured? If the name contains jargon, acronyms, or unclear terms, define or clarify them here.

   No further explanation needed.

5. Validity, Reliability, and Accuracy: Has the indicator been audited by the Office of the Legislative Auditor? If so, what was the result/finding? If not, how can you assure that the indicator is valid, reliable and accurate?

   It has not been audited.

6. Data Source, Collection and Reporting: What is the source of data to be reported? What is the frequency and timing of collection and reporting (monthly, quarterly, annual)?

   Incoming mail trays are dated and processing time tracked by the License Section. This indicator is reported quarterly.

7. Calculation and Methodology: How is the indicator calculated?

   See No. 6

8. Scope: Is the indicator aggregated or disaggregated (is it a sum of smaller parts or is it a part of a larger whole)? Example – if the indicator is a statewide figure, can it be broken down by parish or region?

   Disaggregate.

9. Caveats: Does the indicator have limitations or weaknesses (lack of precision or timeliness, difficult to collect, external factors)?

   It is not exactly precise since the volume of mail precludes recording the receipt and processing date of each piece. An observation of mail tray dates shows the efficiency of processing.

10. Responsible Person: Who is responsible for data collection, analysis and quality? Provide name, title, and contact information for all persons involved in collection and reporting.

    Janis Landry, License Section Manager 765-2881

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **Management and Finance**

Objective: **To achieve at least a 7-day turnaround on processing of commercial license and boat registration applications received by mail.**

Indicator Name: **Boat registration turnaround time**

1. Type and Level: What is the type of the indicator (input, output, outcome, efficiency, quality)? What is the level at which the indicator will be reported (key, supporting, general performance information)?

   Outcome; key

2. Rationale: What is the rationale for the indicator? Why was it selected? How does it help measure achievement of the objective?

   It is a direct measure of the objective.

3. Use: How will the indicator be used in management decision-making and other agency processes? Will it be used only for internal management purposes or will it also be used for budgeted purposes?

   For internal management purposes only.

4. Clarity: Does the indicator name clearly identify what is being measured? If the name contains jargon, acronyms, or unclear terms, define or clarify them here.

   No further explanation needed.

5. Validity, Reliability, and Accuracy: Has the indicator been audited by the Office of the Legislative Auditor? If so, what was the result/finding? If not, how can you assure that the indicator is valid, reliable and accurate?

   It has not been audited.

6. Data Source, Collection and Reporting: What is the source of data to be reported? What is the frequency and timing of collection and reporting (monthly, quarterly, annual)?

   Incoming mail trays are dated and processing time tracked by the License Section. This indicator is reported quarterly.

7. Calculation and Methodology: How is the indicator calculated?

   See No. 6

8. Scope: Is the indicator aggregated or disaggregated (is it a sum of smaller parts or is it a part of a larger whole)? Example – if the indicator is a statewide figure, can it be broken down by parish or region?

   Disaggregate.

9. Caveats: Does the indicator have limitations or weaknesses (lack of precision or timeliness, difficult to collect, external factors)?

   It is not exactly precise since the volume of mail precludes recording the receipt and processing date of each piece. An observation of mail tray dates shows the efficiency of processing.

10. Responsible Person: Who is responsible for data collection, analysis and quality? Provide name, title, and contact information for all persons involved in collection and reporting.

    Janis Landry, License Section Manager 765-2881

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **Management and Finance**

Objective: **To achieve at least a 7-day turnaround on processing of commercial license and boat registration applications received by mail.**

Indicator Name: **Number staff assigned to license and registration functions**

1. Type and Level: What is the type of the indicator (input, output, outcome, efficiency, quality)? What is the level at which the indicator will be reported (key, supporting, general performance information)?

   Input; supporting

2. Rationale: What is the rationale for the indicator? Why was it selected? How does it help measure achievement of the objective?

   Turnaround is directly related, in part, to the number of employees who process applications.

3. Use: How will the indicator be used in management decision-making and other agency processes? Will it be used only for internal management purposes or will it also be used for budgeted purposes?

   It can be used to justify staffing requirements.

4. Clarity: Does the indicator name clearly identify what is being measured? If the name contains jargon, acronyms, or unclear terms, define or clarify them here.

   No further explanation needed.

5. Validity, Reliability, and Accuracy: Has the indicator been audited by the Office of the Legislative Auditor? If so, what was the result/finding? If not, how can you assure that the indicator is valid, reliable and accurate?

   It has not been audited.

6. Data Source, Collection and Reporting: What is the source of data to be reported? What is the frequency and timing of collection and reporting (monthly, quarterly, annual)?

   Source of data is authorized head count; it is reported quarterly.

7. Calculation and Methodology: How is the indicator calculated?

   No calculation required.

8. Scope: Is the indicator aggregated or disaggregated (is it a sum of smaller parts or is it a part of a larger whole)? Example – if the indicator is a statewide figure, can it be broken down by parish or region?

   Disaggregate.

9. Caveats: Does the indicator have limitations or weaknesses (lack of precision or timeliness, difficult to collect, external factors)?

   No limitations or weaknesses.

10. Responsible Person: Who is responsible for data collection, analysis and quality? Provide name, title, and contact information for all persons involved in collection and reporting.

    Janis Landry, License Section Manager 765-2881

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **Management and Finance**

Objective: **To provide opportunities for the public to receive information about the department and about resource management through news releases and features and publication of the Conservationist Magazine.**

Indicator Name: **Number news releases/features written and distributed**

1. Type and Level: What is the type of the indicator (input, output, outcome, efficiency, quality)? What is the level at which the indicator will be reported (key, supporting, general performance information)?

   Outcome; key

2. Rationale: What is the rationale for the indicator? Why was it selected? How does it help measure achievement of the objective?

   It indicates level of effort toward accomplishment of the objective.

3. Use: How will the indicator be used in management decision-making and other agency processes? Will it be used only for internal management purposes or will it also be used for budgeted purposes?

   Internal management purposes only.

4. Clarity: Does the indicator name clearly identify what is being measured? If the name contains jargon, acronyms, or unclear terms, define or clarify them here.

   No further explanation needed.

5. Validity, Reliability, and Accuracy: Has the indicator been audited by the Office of the Legislative Auditor? If so, what was the result/finding? If not, how can you assure that the indicator is valid, reliable and accurate?

   It has not been audited.

6. Data Source, Collection and Reporting: What is the source of data to be reported? What is the frequency and timing of collection and reporting (monthly, quarterly, annual)?

   News releases and features are maintained in a file and counted for reporting. It is reported quarterly.

7. Calculation and Methodology: How is the indicator calculated?

   See No. 6

8. Scope: Is the indicator aggregated or disaggregated (is it a sum of smaller parts or is it a part of a larger whole)? Example – if the indicator is a statewide figure, can it be broken down by parish or region?

   Aggregate.

9. Caveats: Does the indicator have limitations or weaknesses (lack of precision or timeliness, difficult to collect, external factors)?

   No limitations or weaknesses.

10. Responsible Person: Who is responsible for data collection, analysis and quality? Provide name, title, and contact information for all persons involved in collection and reporting.

    Marianne Burke, Public Information Director 765-2917

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **Management and Finance**

Objective: **To provide opportunities for the public to receive information about the department and about resource management through news releases and features and publication of the Conservationist Magazine.**

Indicator Name: **Total number magazines printed and distributed**

1. Type and Level: What is the type of the indicator (input, output, outcome, efficiency, quality)? What is the level at which the indicator will be reported (key, supporting, general performance information)?

   Outcome; key

2. Rationale: What is the rationale for the indicator? Why was it selected? How does it help measure achievement of the objective?

   It shows level of effort towards providing informational opportunities to the public.

3. Use: How will the indicator be used in management decision-making and other agency processes? Will it be used only for internal management purposes or will it also be used for budgeted purposes?

   Internal management purposes only.

4. Clarity: Does the indicator name clearly identify what is being measured? If the name contains jargon, acronyms, or unclear terms, define or clarify them here.

   No further explanation needed.

5. Validity, Reliability, and Accuracy: Has the indicator been audited by the Office of the Legislative Auditor? If so, what was the result/finding? If not, how can you assure that the indicator is valid, reliable and accurate?

   It has not been audited.

6. Data Source, Collection and Reporting: What is the source of data to be reported? What is the frequency and timing of collection and reporting (monthly, quarterly, annual)?

   The number of magazines printed is documented by the invoice from the printer. It is reported annually.

7. Calculation and Methodology: How is the indicator calculated?

   No calculation required; invoice from printer is used to record the number printed and distributed.

8. Scope: Is the indicator aggregated or disaggregated (is it a sum of smaller parts or is it a part of a larger whole)? Example – if the indicator is a statewide figure, can it be broken down by parish or region?

   Disaggregate.

9. Caveats: Does the indicator have limitations or weaknesses (lack of precision or timeliness, difficult to collect, external factors)?

   No limitations or weaknesses.

10. Responsible Person: Who is responsible for data collection, analysis and quality? Provide name, title, and contact information for all persons involved in collection and reporting.

    Marianne Burke, Public Information Director 765-2917

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **Management and Finance**

Objective: **To provide opportunities for the public to receive information about the department and about resource management through news releases and features and publication of the Conservationist Magazine.**

Indicator Name: **Number departmental activities and events covered and highlighted by media.**

1. Type and Level: What is the type of the indicator (input, output, outcome, efficiency, quality)? What is the level at which the indicator will be reported (key, supporting, general performance information)?

   Input; supporting

2. Rationale: What is the rationale for the indicator? Why was it selected? How does it help measure achievement of the objective?

   It measures level of effort towards informing the public.

3. Use: How will the indicator be used in management decision-making and other agency processes? Will it be used only for internal management purposes or will it also be used for budgeted purposes?

   Internal management purposes only.

4. Clarity: Does the indicator name clearly identify what is being measured? If the name contains jargon, acronyms, or unclear terms, define or clarify them here.

   No further explanation needed.

5. Validity, Reliability, and Accuracy: Has the indicator been audited by the Office of the Legislative Auditor? If so, what was the result/finding? If not, how can you assure that the indicator is valid, reliable and accurate?

   It has not been audited.

6. Data Source, Collection and Reporting: What is the source of data to be reported? What is the frequency and timing of collection and reporting (monthly, quarterly, annual)?

   Events and activities are counted manually and reported quarterly.

7. Calculation and Methodology: How is the indicator calculated?

   See No. 6

8. Scope: Is the indicator aggregated or disaggregated (is it a sum of smaller parts or is it a part of a larger whole)? Example – if the indicator is a statewide figure, can it be broken down by parish or region?

   Disaggregate.

9. Caveats: Does the indicator have limitations or weaknesses (lack of precision or timeliness, difficult to collect, external factors)?

   No limitations or weaknesses.

10. Responsible Person: Who is responsible for data collection, analysis and quality? Provide name, title, and contact information for all persons involved in collection and reporting.

    Marianne Burke, Public Information Director 765-2917

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **Management and Finance**

Objective: **To provide opportunities for the public to receive information about the department and about resource management through news releases and features and publication of the Conservationist Magazine.**

Indicator Name: **Number paid subscriptions to magazine**

1. Type and Level: What is the type of the indicator (input, output, outcome, efficiency, quality)? What is the level at which the indicator will be reported (key, supporting, general performance information)?

   Outcome; key

2. Rationale: What is the rationale for the indicator? Why was it selected? How does it help measure achievement of the objective?

   It measures success of the magazine program and level of interest by the public.

3. Use: How will the indicator be used in management decision-making and other agency processes? Will it be used only for internal management purposes or will it also be used for budgeted purposes?

   Internal management purposes only.

4. Clarity: Does the indicator name clearly identify what is being measured? If the name contains jargon, acronyms, or unclear terms, define or clarify them here.

   No further explanation needed.

5. Validity, Reliability, and Accuracy: Has the indicator been audited by the Office of the Legislative Auditor? If so, what was the result/finding? If not, how can you assure that the indicator is valid, reliable and accurate?

   It has not been audited.

6. Data Source, Collection and Reporting: What is the source of data to be reported? What is the frequency and timing of collection and reporting (monthly, quarterly, annual)?

   An automated system is used to track subscriptions; it is reported quarterly.

7. Calculation and Methodology: How is the indicator calculated?

   See No. 6

8. Scope: Is the indicator aggregated or disaggregated (is it a sum of smaller parts or is it a part of a larger whole)? Example – if the indicator is a statewide figure, can it be broken down by parish or region?

   Disaggregate.

9. Caveats: Does the indicator have limitations or weaknesses (lack of precision or timeliness, difficult to collect, external factors)?

   No limitations or weaknesses.

10. Responsible Person: Who is responsible for data collection, analysis and quality? Provide name, title, and contact information for all persons involved in collection and reporting.

    Marianne Burke, Public Information Director 765-2917

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **Management and Finance**

Objective: **To provide opportunities for the public to receive information about the department and about resource management through news releases and features and publication of the Conservationist Magazine.**

Indicator Name: **Annual direct production cost of magazine**

1. Type and Level: What is the type of the indicator (input, output, outcome, efficiency, quality)? What is the level at which the indicator will be reported (key, supporting, general performance information)?

   Input; supporting

2. Rationale: What is the rationale for the indicator? Why was it selected? How does it help measure achievement of the objective?

   It shows the level of financial resources directed toward this activity.

3. Use: How will the indicator be used in management decision-making and other agency processes? Will it be used only for internal management purposes or will it also be used for budgeted purposes?

   Internal management purposes only.

4. Clarity: Does the indicator name clearly identify what is being measured? If the name contains jargon, acronyms, or unclear terms, define or clarify them here.

   No further explanation needed.

5. Validity, Reliability, and Accuracy: Has the indicator been audited by the Office of the Legislative Auditor? If so, what was the result/finding? If not, how can you assure that the indicator is valid, reliable and accurate?

   It has not been audited.

6. Data Source, Collection and Reporting: What is the source of data to be reported? What is the frequency and timing of collection and reporting (monthly, quarterly, annual)?

   Costs are obtained from the state's financial accounting system and reported quarterly.

7. Calculation and Methodology: How is the indicator calculated?

   See no. 6

8. Scope: Is the indicator aggregated or disaggregated (is it a sum of smaller parts or is it a part of a larger whole)? Example – if the indicator is a statewide figure, can it be broken down by parish or region?

   Aggregate.

9. Caveats: Does the indicator have limitations or weaknesses (lack of precision or timeliness, difficult to collect, external factors)?

   No limitations or weaknesses.

10. Responsible Person: Who is responsible for data collection, analysis and quality? Provide name, title, and contact information for all persons involved in collection and reporting.

    Marianne Burke, Public Information Director 765-2917

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **Management and Finance**

Objective: **To provide opportunities for the public to receive information about the department and about resource management through news releases and features and publication of the Conservationist Magazine.**

Indicator Name: **Annual revenue from magazine subscriptions**

1. Type and Level: What is the type of the indicator (input, output, outcome, efficiency, quality)? What is the level at which the indicator will be reported (key, supporting, general performance information)?

   Input; supporting

2. Rationale: What is the rationale for the indicator? Why was it selected? How does it help measure achievement of the objective?

   It shows level of demand for the magazine and is a historical indicator.

3. Use: How will the indicator be used in management decision-making and other agency processes? Will it be used only for internal management purposes or will it also be used for budgeted purposes?

   Internal management purposes only.

4. Clarity: Does the indicator name clearly identify what is being measured? If the name contains jargon, acronyms, or unclear terms, define or clarify them here.

   No further explanation needed.

5. Validity, Reliability, and Accuracy: Has the indicator been audited by the Office of the Legislative Auditor? If so, what was the result/finding? If not, how can you assure that the indicator is valid, reliable and accurate?

   It has not been audited.

6. Data Source, Collection and Reporting: What is the source of data to be reported? What is the frequency and timing of collection and reporting (monthly, quarterly, annual)?

   Revenue is recorded in the state's financial accounting system.

7. Calculation and Methodology: How is the indicator calculated?

   See no. 6

8. Scope: Is the indicator aggregated or disaggregated (is it a sum of smaller parts or is it a part of a larger whole)? Example – if the indicator is a statewide figure, can it be broken down by parish or region?

   Aggregate.

9. Caveats: Does the indicator have limitations or weaknesses (lack of precision or timeliness, difficult to collect, external factors)?

   No limitations or weaknesses.

10. Responsible Person: Who is responsible for data collection, analysis and quality? Provide name, title, and contact information for all persons involved in collection and reporting.

    Marianne Burke, Public Information Director 765-2917

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **Management and Finance**

Objective: **To earn 5% reduction of liability insurance premiums by successfully passing the State Loss Prevention Audit.**

Indicator Name: **Percent reduction of insurance premiums applied**

1. Type and Level: What is the type of the indicator (input, output, outcome, efficiency, quality)? What is the level at which the indicator will be reported (key, supporting, general performance information)?

   Outcome; key

2. Rationale: What is the rationale for the indicator? Why was it selected? How does it help measure achievement of the objective?

   It is a direct measure of the objective.

3. Use: How will the indicator be used in management decision-making and other agency processes? Will it be used only for internal management purposes or will it also be used for budgeted purposes?

   Internal management purposes only.

4. Clarity: Does the indicator name clearly identify what is being measured? If the name contains jargon, acronyms, or unclear terms, define or clarify them here.

   No further explanation needed.

5. Validity, Reliability, and Accuracy: Has the indicator been audited by the Office of the Legislative Auditor? If so, what was the result/finding? If not, how can you assure that the indicator is valid, reliable and accurate?

   It has not been audited; this is a new objective and indicator.

6. Data Source, Collection and Reporting: What is the source of data to be reported? What is the frequency and timing of collection and reporting (monthly, quarterly, annual)?

   Annual premium invoices from Risk Management indicate reduction when applicable.

7. Calculation and Methodology: How is the indicator calculated?

See No. 6

8. Scope: Is the indicator aggregated or disaggregated (is it a sum of smaller parts or is it a part of a larger whole)? Example – if the indicator is a statewide figure, can it be broken down by parish or region?

   Disaggregate.

9. Caveats: Does the indicator have limitations or weaknesses (lack of precision or timeliness, difficult to collect, external factors)?

   No limitations or weaknesses.

10. Responsible Person: Who is responsible for data collection, analysis and quality? Provide name, title, and contact information for all persons involved in collection and reporting.

    Wynnette Kees, Fiscal Officer 765-2862

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **Management and Finance**

Objective: **To earn 5% reduction of liability insurance premiums by successfully passing the State Loss Prevention Audit.**

Indicator Name: **Dollars saved from successful completion of audit**

1. Type and Level: What is the type of the indicator (input, output, outcome, efficiency, quality)? What is the level at which the indicator will be reported (key, supporting, general performance information)?

   Outcome; supporting

2. Rationale: What is the rationale for the indicator? Why was it selected? How does it help measure achievement of the objective?

   It shows the impact of successfully passing the audit.

3. Use: How will the indicator be used in management decision-making and other agency processes? Will it be used only for internal management purposes or will it also be used for budgeted purposes?

   Internal management purposes only.

4. Clarity: Does the indicator name clearly identify what is being measured? If the name contains jargon, acronyms, or unclear terms, define or clarify them here.

   No further explanation needed.

5. Validity, Reliability, and Accuracy: Has the indicator been audited by the Office of the Legislative Auditor? If so, what was the result/finding? If not, how can you assure that the indicator is valid, reliable and accurate?

   It has not been audited; this is a new objective and indicator.

6. Data Source, Collection and Reporting: What is the source of data to be reported? What is the frequency and timing of collection and reporting (monthly, quarterly, annual)?

   The annual invoice from Risk Management shows the dollar savings.

7. Calculation and Methodology: How is the indicator calculated?

See No. 6

8. Scope: Is the indicator aggregated or disaggregated (is it a sum of smaller parts or is it a part of a larger whole)? Example – if the indicator is a statewide figure, can it be broken down by parish or region?

   Disaggregate.

9. Caveats: Does the indicator have limitations or weaknesses (lack of precision or timeliness, difficult to collect, external factors)?

   No limitations or weaknesses.

10. Responsible Person: Who is responsible for data collection, analysis and quality? Provide name, title, and contact information for all persons involved in collection and reporting.

    Wynnette Kees, Fiscal Officer 765-2862

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **Management and Finance**

Objective: **To earn 5% reduction of liability insurance premiums by successfully passing the State Loss Prevention Audit.**

Indicator Name: **Number facility safety coordinators**

1. Type and Level: What is the type of the indicator (input, output, outcome, efficiency, quality)? What is the level at which the indicator will be reported (key, supporting, general performance information)?

   Input; supporting

2. Rationale: What is the rationale for the indicator? Why was it selected? How does it help measure achievement of the objective?

   It shows the level of effort toward passing the audit.

3. Use: How will the indicator be used in management decision-making and other agency processes? Will it be used only for internal management purposes or will it also be used for budgeted purposes?

   Internal management purposes only.

4. Clarity: Does the indicator name clearly identify what is being measured? If the name contains jargon, acronyms, or unclear terms, define or clarify them here.

   Each major statewide facility has a safety coordinator who reports to the department's lead safety coordinator housed in the Baton Rouge office under Human Resources.

5. Validity, Reliability, and Accuracy: Has the indicator been audited by the Office of the Legislative Auditor? If so, what was the result/finding? If not, how can you assure that the indicator is valid, reliable and accurate?

   It has not been audited; this is a new objective and indicator.

6. Data Source, Collection and Reporting: What is the source of data to be reported? What is the frequency and timing of collection and reporting (monthly, quarterly, annual)?

   The lead safety coordinator tracks and reports this.

7. Calculation and Methodology: How is the indicator calculated?

   See No. 6

8. Scope: Is the indicator aggregated or disaggregated (is it a sum of smaller parts or is it a part of a larger whole)? Example – if the indicator is a statewide figure, can it be broken down by parish or region?

   Aggregate.

9. Caveats: Does the indicator have limitations or weaknesses (lack of precision or timeliness, difficult to collect, external factors)?

   No further explanation needed.

10. Responsible Person: Who is responsible for data collection, analysis and quality? Provide name, title, and contact information for all persons involved in collection and reporting.

    Wynnette Kees, Fiscal Officer 765-2939

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST

Program: **Management and Finance**

Objective: **To implement sound financial practices and fiscal controls as demonstrated by having no repeat legislative audit findings in the department's biennial audits.**

Strategy: **Maintain current job descriptions and procedures manuals on all positions in the program.**

Yes	No	
		Analysis:
	x	Cost/benefit analysis conducted
x		Financial or performance audit used
	x	Benchmarking for best management practices used
	x	Act 160 Reports used
	x	Other analysis or evaluation tools used
	x	Impact on other strategies considered
	x	Stakeholders identified and involved
		Authorization:
x		Authorization exists
		Authorization needed
		Organization Capacity:
	x	Needed structural or procedural changes identified
	x	Resource needs identified
x		Strategies developed to implement needed changes
x		Responsibility assigned
		Time Frame:
x		Already ongoing
		Lifetime of strategy identified
		Fiscal Impact:
	x	Impact on operating budget
	x	Impact on capital outlay budget
	x	Means of Finance identified

x	Return on investment determined to be favorable

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST

Program: Management and Finance

Objective: To implement sound financial practices and fiscal controls as demonstrated by having no repeat legislative audit findings in the department's biennial audits.

Strategy: Cooperate with the department's internal auditor and other auditors to develop and implement policies and procedures and corrective actions.

Yes	No	
		Analysis:
	x	Cost/benefit analysis conducted
	x	Financial or performance audit used
	x	Benchmarking for best management practices used
	x	Act 160 Reports used
	x	Other analysis or evaluation tools used
	x	Impact on other strategies considered
	x	Stakeholders identified and involved
		Authorization:
x		Authorization exists
		Authorization needed
		Organization Capacity:
	x	Needed structural or procedural changes identified
	x	Resource needs identified
	x	Strategies developed to implement needed changes
x		Responsibility assigned
		Time Frame:
x		Already ongoing
		Lifetime of strategy identified
		Fiscal Impact:
	x	Impact on operating budget
	x	Impact on capital outlay budget
	x	Means of Finance identified

x	Return on investment determined to be favorable

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST

Program: **Management and Finance**

Objective: **To implement sound financial practices and fiscal controls as demonstrated by having no repeat legislative audit findings in the department's biennial audits.**

Strategy: **Conduct in-service training for all functions regulated and managed by the program**

Yes	No	
		Analysis:
	x	Cost/benefit analysis conducted
	x	Financial or performance audit used
	x	Benchmarking for best management practices used
	x	Act 160 Reports used
	x	Other analysis or evaluation tools used
	x	Impact on other strategies considered
x		Stakeholders identified and involved
		Authorization:
x		Authorization exists
		Authorization needed
		Organization Capacity:
x		Needed structural or procedural changes identified
x		Resource needs identified
x		Strategies developed to implement needed changes
x		Responsibility assigned
		Time Frame:
x		Already ongoing
		Lifetime of strategy identified
		Fiscal Impact:
x		Impact on operating budget
	x	Impact on capital outlay budget
x		Means of Finance identified

x	Return on investment determined to be favorable

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST

Program: **Management and Finance**

Objective: **Ensure that all programs in the department are provided support services which enable them to accomplish their goals and objectives.**

Strategy: **Conduct process evaluations to improve the flow and timeliness of work products.**

Yes	No	
		Analysis:
	x	Cost/benefit analysis conducted
	x	Financial or performance audit used
	x	Benchmarking for best management practices used
	x	Act 160 Reports used
	x	Other analysis or evaluation tools used
	x	Impact on other strategies considered
	x	Stakeholders identified and involved
		Authorization:
x		Authorization exists
		Authorization needed
		Organization Capacity:
	x	Needed structural or procedural changes identified
	x	Resource needs identified
	x	Strategies developed to implement needed changes
x		Responsibility assigned
		Time Frame:
x		Already ongoing
		Lifetime of strategy identified
		Fiscal Impact:
	x	Impact on operating budget
	x	Impact on capital outlay budget
	x	Means of Finance identified

x	Return on investment determined to be favorable

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST

Program: **Management and Finance**

Objective: **Ensure that all programs in the department are provided support services which enable them to accomplish their goals and objectives.**

Strategy: **Maintain an adequate level of staffing.**

Yes	No	
		Analysis:
	x	Cost/benefit analysis conducted
	x	Financial or performance audit used
	x	Benchmarking for best management practices used
	x	Act 160 Reports used
	x	Other analysis or evaluation tools used
	x	Impact on other strategies considered
	x	Stakeholders identified and involved
		Authorization:
x		Authorization exists
		Authorization needed
		Organization Capacity:
	x	Needed structural or procedural changes identified
	x	Resource needs identified
	x	Strategies developed to implement needed changes
	x	Responsibility assigned
		Time Frame:
x		Already ongoing
		Lifetime of strategy identified
		Fiscal Impact:
	x	Impact on operating budget
	x	Impact on capital outlay budget
	x	Means of Finance identified

x	Return on investment determined to be favorable

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST

Program: **Management and Finance**

Objective: **Ensure that all programs in the department are provided support services which enable them to accomplish their goals and objectives.**

Strategy: **Educate staff on the department's customer service plan.**

Yes	No	
		Analysis:
	x	Cost/benefit analysis conducted
	x	Financial or performance audit used
	x	Benchmarking for best management practices used
	x	Act 160 Reports used
x		Other analysis or evaluation tools used
	x	Impact on other strategies considered
	x	Stakeholders identified and involved
		Authorization:
x		Authorization exists
		Authorization needed
		Organization Capacity:
	x	Needed structural or procedural changes identified
x		Resource needs identified
	x	Strategies developed to implement needed changes
x		Responsibility assigned
		Time Frame:
x		Already ongoing
		Lifetime of strategy identified
		Fiscal Impact:
	x	Impact on operating budget
	x	Impact on capital outlay budget
	x	Means of Finance identified

x	Return on investment determined to be favorable

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST

Program: **Management and Finance**

Objective: **To achieve at least a 7-day turnaround on processing of commercial license and boat registrations received by mail.**

Strategy: **Enhance staff recruitment and retention.**

Yes	No	
		Analysis:
	x	Cost/benefit analysis conducted
	x	Financial or performance audit used
	x	Benchmarking for best management practices used
	x	Act 160 Reports used
	x	Other analysis or evaluation tools used
	x	Impact on other strategies considered
	x	Stakeholders identified and involved
		Authorization:
x		Authorization exists
		Authorization needed
		Organization Capacity:
x		Needed structural or procedural changes identified
x		Resource needs identified
x		Strategies developed to implement needed changes
x		Responsibility assigned
		Time Frame:
x		Already ongoing
		Lifetime of strategy identified
		Fiscal Impact:
	x	Impact on operating budget
	x	Impact on capital outlay budget
	x	Means of Finance identified

x	Return on investment determined to be favorable

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST

Program: **Management and Finance**

Objective: **To achieve at least a 7-day turnaround on processing of commercial license and boat registrations received by mail.**

Strategy: **Utilize information technology applications to maximize productivity.**

Yes	No	
		Analysis:
	x	Cost/benefit analysis conducted
	x	Financial or performance audit used
	x	Benchmarking for best management practices used
	x	Act 160 Reports used
	x	Other analysis or evaluation tools used
	x	Impact on other strategies considered
	x	Stakeholders identified and involved
		Authorization:
x		Authorization exists
		Authorization needed
		Organization Capacity:
x		Needed structural or procedural changes identified
	x	Resource needs identified
x		Strategies developed to implement needed changes
x		Responsibility assigned
		Time Frame:
x		Already ongoing
		Lifetime of strategy identified
		Fiscal Impact:
	x	Impact on operating budget
	x	Impact on capital outlay budget
	x	Means of Finance identified

x	Return on investment determined to be favorable

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST

Program: **Management and Finance**

Objective: **To provide opportunities for the public to receive information about the department and about resource management through news releases and features and publication of the *Conservationist* Magazine.**

Strategy: **Maintain a qualified, professional staff of employees**

Yes	No	
		Analysis:
	x	Cost/benefit analysis conducted
	x	Financial or performance audit used
	x	Benchmarking for best management practices used
	x	Act 160 Reports used
	x	Other analysis or evaluation tools used
	x	Impact on other strategies considered
	x	Stakeholders identified and involved
		Authorization:
x		Authorization exists
		Authorization needed
		Organization Capacity:
	x	Needed structural or procedural changes identified
	x	Resource needs identified
	x	Strategies developed to implement needed changes
x		Responsibility assigned
		Time Frame:
x		Already ongoing
		Lifetime of strategy identified
		Fiscal Impact:
	x	Impact on operating budget
	x	Impact on capital outlay budget
	x	Means of Finance identified

x	Return on investment determined to be favorable

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST

Program: **Management and Finance**

Objective: **To provide opportunities for the public to receive information about the department and about resource management through news releases and features and publication of the *Conservationist* Magazine.**

Strategy: **Promote departmental activities and events through media opportunity.**

Yes	No	
		Analysis:
	x	Cost/benefit analysis conducted
	x	Financial or performance audit used
	x	Benchmarking for best management practices used
	x	Act 160 Reports used
	x	Other analysis or evaluation tools used
	x	Impact on other strategies considered
	x	Stakeholders identified and involved
		Authorization:
x		Authorization exists
		Authorization needed
		Organization Capacity:
	x	Needed structural or procedural changes identified
	x	Resource needs identified
	x	Strategies developed to implement needed changes
x		Responsibility assigned
		Time Frame:
x		Already ongoing
		Lifetime of strategy identified
		Fiscal Impact:
	x	Impact on operating budget
	x	Impact on capital outlay budget
	x	Means of Finance identified

x	Return on investment determined to be favorable

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST

Program: **Management and Finance**

Objective: **To provide opportunities for the public to receive information about the department and about resource management through news releases and features and publication of the *Conservationist* Magazine.**

Strategy: **Post and maintain department news and activities on web site.**

Yes	No	
		Analysis:
	x	Cost/benefit analysis conducted
	x	Financial or performance audit used
	x	Benchmarking for best management practices used
	x	Act 160 Reports used
	x	Other analysis or evaluation tools used
	x	Impact on other strategies considered
	x	Stakeholders identified and involved
		Authorization:
x		Authorization exists
		Authorization needed
		Organization Capacity:
	x	Needed structural or procedural changes identified
	x	Resource needs identified
	x	Strategies developed to implement needed changes
x		Responsibility assigned
		Time Frame:
x		Already ongoing
		Lifetime of strategy identified
		Fiscal Impact:
	x	Impact on operating budget
	x	Impact on capital outlay budget
	x	Means of Finance identified

x	Return on investment determined to be favorable

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST

Program: **Management and Finance**

Objective: **To provide opportunities for the public to receive information about the department and about resource management through news releases and features and publication of the *Conservationist* Magazine.**

Strategy: **Respond to media inquiries.**

Yes	No	
		Analysis:
	x	Cost/benefit analysis conducted
	x	Financial or performance audit used
	x	Benchmarking for best management practices used
	x	Act 160 Reports used
	x	Other analysis or evaluation tools used
	x	Impact on other strategies considered
	x	Stakeholders identified and involved
		Authorization:
x		Authorization exists
		Authorization needed
		Organization Capacity:
	x	Needed structural or procedural changes identified
	x	Resource needs identified
	x	Strategies developed to implement needed changes
x		Responsibility assigned
		Time Frame:
x		Already ongoing
		Lifetime of strategy identified
		Fiscal Impact:
	x	Impact on operating budget
	x	Impact on capital outlay budget
	x	Means of Finance identified

x	Return on investment determined to be favorable

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST

Program: **Management and Finance**

Objective: **To provide opportunities for the public to receive information about the department and about resource management through news releases and features and publication of the *Conservationist* Magazine.**

Strategy: **Publish and distribute six issues per year of the Conservationist Magazine**

Yes	No	
		Analysis:
	x	Cost/benefit analysis conducted
	x	Financial or performance audit used
	x	Benchmarking for best management practices used
	x	Act 160 Reports used
	x	Other analysis or evaluation tools used
	x	Impact on other strategies considered
	x	Stakeholders identified and involved
		Authorization:
x		Authorization exists
		Authorization needed
		Organization Capacity:
	x	Needed structural or procedural changes identified
	x	Resource needs identified
	x	Strategies developed to implement needed changes
x		Responsibility assigned
		Time Frame:
x		Already ongoing
		Lifetime of strategy identified
		Fiscal Impact:
	x	Impact on operating budget
	x	Impact on capital outlay budget
	x	Means of Finance identified

x	Return on investment determined to be favorable

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST

Program: **Management and Finance**

Objective: **To earn 5% reduction of liability insurance premiums by successfully passing the State Loss Prevention Audit.**

Strategy: **Ensure safety coordinators in all department facilities are adequately trained.**

Yes	No	
		Analysis:
	x	Cost/benefit analysis conducted
	x	Financial or performance audit used
	x	Benchmarking for best management practices used
	x	Act 160 Reports used
	x	Other analysis or evaluation tools used
	x	Impact on other strategies considered
	x	Stakeholders identified and involved
		Authorization:
x		Authorization exists
		Authorization needed
		Organization Capacity:
	x	Needed structural or procedural changes identified
	x	Resource needs identified
	x	Strategies developed to implement needed changes
x		Responsibility assigned
		Time Frame:
x		Already ongoing
		Lifetime of strategy identified
		Fiscal Impact:
x		Impact on operating budget
	x	Impact on capital outlay budget
	x	Means of Finance identified

x	Return on investment determined to be favorable

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST

Program: **Management and Finance**

Objective: **To earn 5% reduction of liability insurance premiums by successfully passing the State Loss Prevention Audit.**

Strategy: **Conduct and document quarterly safety meetings in all applicable facilities.**

Yes	No	
		Analysis:
	x	Cost/benefit analysis conducted
	x	Financial or performance audit used
	x	Benchmarking for best management practices used
	x	Act 160 Reports used
	x	Other analysis or evaluation tools used
	x	Impact on other strategies considered
	x	Stakeholders identified and involved
		Authorization:
x		Authorization exists
		Authorization needed
		Organization Capacity:
	x	Needed structural or procedural changes identified
	x	Resource needs identified
	x	Strategies developed to implement needed changes
x		Responsibility assigned
		Time Frame:
x		Already ongoing
		Lifetime of strategy identified
		Fiscal Impact:
	x	Impact on operating budget
	x	Impact on capital outlay budget
	x	Means of Finance identified

x	Return on investment determined to be favorable

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST

Program: **Management and Finance**

Objective: **To earn 5% reduction of liability insurance premiums by successfully passing the State Loss Prevention Audit.**

Strategy: **Establish and distribute written policies and procedures regarding all aspects of the loss prevention program.**

Yes	No	
		Analysis:
	x	Cost/benefit analysis conducted
	x	Financial or performance audit used
	x	Benchmarking for best management practices used
	x	Act 160 Reports used
x		Other analysis or evaluation tools used
	x	Impact on other strategies considered
	x	Stakeholders identified and involved
		Authorization:
x		Authorization exists
		Authorization needed
		Organization Capacity:
x		Needed structural or procedural changes identified
	x	Resource needs identified
	x	Strategies developed to implement needed changes
x		Responsibility assigned
		Time Frame:
x		Already ongoing
		Lifetime of strategy identified
		Fiscal Impact:
	x	Impact on operating budget
	x	Impact on capital outlay budget
	x	Means of Finance identified

x	Return on investment determined to be favorable

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **Administration**

Objective: **To ensure that at least 95% of all department objectives are achieved.**

Indicator Name: **Percent of department objectives achieved**

11. Type and Level: What is the type of the indicator (input, output, outcome, efficiency, quality)? What is the level at which the indicator will be reported (key, supporting, general performance information)?

    Outcome; key

12. Rationale: What is the rationale for the indicator? Why was it selected? How does it help measure achievement of the objective?

    It is the purest measure of the objective

13. Use: How will the indicator be used in management decision-making and other agency processes? Will it be used only for internal management purposes or will it also be used for budgeted purposes?

    Internal management purposes.

14. Clarity: Does the indicator name clearly identify what is being measured? If the name contains jargon, acronyms, or unclear terms, define or clarify them here.

    No further explanation needed.

15. Validity, Reliability, and Accuracy: Has the indicator been audited by the Office of the Legislative Auditor? If so, what was the result/finding? If not, how can you assure that the indicator is valid, reliable and accurate?

    This indicator has not been audited. It is recommended by the Office of Planning and Budget. The department has no real method to measure this.

16. Data Source, Collection and Reporting: What is the source of data to be reported? What is the frequency and timing of collection and reporting (monthly, quarterly, annual)?

    There is no data to track this indicator; reporting is subjective and standard.

17. Calculation and Methodology: How is the indicator calculated?

The indicator is not calculated except by subjective evaluation as to whether objectives are achieved.

18. Scope: Is the indicator aggregated or disaggregated (is it a sum of smaller parts or is it a part of a larger whole)? Example – if the indicator is a statewide figure, can it be broken down by parish or region?

    Aggregate.

19. Caveats: Does the indicator have limitations or weaknesses (lack of precision or timeliness, difficult to collect, external factors)?

    It is a very weak indicator but we are required to use it.

20. Responsible Person: Who is responsible for data collection, analysis and quality? Provide name, title, and contact information for all persons involved in collection and reporting.

    Wynnette Kees, Fiscal Officer 765-2862

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST

Program: **Administration**

Objective: **To ensure that at least 95% of all department objectives are achieved.**

Strategy: **Plan and prioritize for the allocation of financial resources.**

Yes	No	
		Analysis:
	x	Cost/benefit analysis conducted
	x	Financial or performance audit used
	x	Benchmarking for best management practices used
	x	Act 160 Reports used
	x	Other analysis or evaluation tools used
	x	Impact on other strategies considered
	x	Stakeholders identified and involved
		Authorization:
x		Authorization exists
		Authorization needed
		Organization Capacity:
x		Needed structural or procedural changes identified
x		Resource needs identified
		Strategies developed to implement needed changes
x		Responsibility assigned
		Time Frame:
x		Already ongoing
x		Lifetime of strategy identified
		Fiscal Impact:
	x	Impact on operating budget
	x	Impact on capital outlay budget
	x	Means of Finance identified

	x	Return on investment determined to be favorable

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST

Program: **Administration**

Objective: **To ensure that at least 95% of all department objectives are achieved.**

Strategy: **Encourage staff empowerment and teamwork.**

Yes	No	
		Analysis:
	x	Cost/benefit analysis conducted
	x	Financial or performance audit used
	x	Benchmarking for best management practices used
	x	Act 160 Reports used
	x	Other analysis or evaluation tools used
	x	Impact on other strategies considered
	x	Stakeholders identified and involved
		Authorization:
x		Authorization exists
		Authorization needed
		Organization Capacity:
x		Needed structural or procedural changes identified
x		Resource needs identified
		Strategies developed to implement needed changes
x		Responsibility assigned
		Time Frame:
x		Already ongoing
		Lifetime of strategy identified
		Fiscal Impact:

x	Impact on operating budget
x	Impact on capital outlay budget
x	Means of Finance identified
x	Return on investment determined to be favorable

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST

Program: **Administration**

Objective: **To ensure that at least 95% of all department objectives are achieved.**

Strategy: **Promote partnerships and collaboration with other state agencies and other entities.**

Yes	No	
		Analysis:
	x	Cost/benefit analysis conducted
	x	Financial or performance audit used
	x	Benchmarking for best management practices used
	x	Act 160 Reports used
	x	Other analysis or evaluation tools used
	x	Impact on other strategies considered
	x	Stakeholders identified and involved
		Authorization:
x		Authorization exists
		Authorization needed
		Organization Capacity:
x		Needed structural or procedural changes identified
x		Resource needs identified
		Strategies developed to implement needed changes
x		Responsibility assigned
		Time Frame:
x		Already ongoing
		Lifetime of strategy identified
		Fiscal Impact:

x	Impact on operating budget
x	Impact on capital outlay budget
x	Means of Finance identified
x	Return on investment determined to be favorable

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST

Program: **Administration**

Objective: **To ensure that at least 95% of all department objectives are achieved.**

Strategy: **Be responsive to the needs of all external stakeholders.**

Yes	No	
		Analysis:
	x	Cost/benefit analysis conducted
	x	Financial or performance audit used
	x	Benchmarking for best management practices used
	x	Act 160 Reports used
	x	Other analysis or evaluation tools used
	x	Impact on other strategies considered
	x	Stakeholders identified and involved
		Authorization:
x		Authorization exists
		Authorization needed
		Organization Capacity:
x		Needed structural or procedural changes identified
x		Resource needs identified
		Strategies developed to implement needed changes
x		Responsibility assigned
		Time Frame:
x		Already ongoing
		Lifetime of strategy identified

Fiscal Impact:

x	Impact on operating budget
x	Impact on capital outlay budget
x	Means of Finance identified
x	Return on investment determined to be favorable

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **ENFORCEMENT**

Objective: **Reduce the number of boating crashes per 100,000 registered boats.**

Indicator Name: **Number of crashes per 100,000 registered boats.**

21. Type and Level: What is the type of the indicator (input, output, outcome, efficiency, quality)? What is the level at which the indicator will be reported (key, supporting, general performance information)?

    This is an outcome indicator and will be reported as a key indicator.

22. Rationale: What is the rationale for the indicator? Why was it selected? How does it help measure achievement of the objective?

    This indicator was chosen because it is an accurate representation of the number of crashes in relation to number of registered boats. It has been used for approximately six years and is a direct measure of the objective.

23. Use: How will the indicator be used in management decision-making and other agency processes? Will it be used only for internal management purposes or will it also be used for budgeted purposes?

    This indicator will be used to identify trends in numbers of crashes and to address those trends with manpower allocation.

24. Clarity: Does the indicator name clearly identify what is being measured? If the name contains jargon, acronyms, or unclear terms, define or clarify them here.

    The name clearly identifies what is being measured. A recreational boating crash is defined as: a collision, incident or other casualty involving a recreational vessel and resulting in death, injury (beyond first aid) or property damage in excess of $500.00.

25. Validity, Reliability, and Accuracy: Has the indicator been audited by the Office of the Legislative Auditor? If so, what was the result/finding? If not, how can you assure that the indicator is valid, reliable and accurate?

This indicator was audited by the Office of Legislative Auditor in a performance audit released in January 2002 and found to be valid.

26. Data Source, Collection and Reporting: What is the source of data to be reported? What is the frequency and timing of collection and reporting (monthly, quarterly, annual)?

The number of crashes is reported as they occur. The number of registered boats is reported quarterly.

27. Calculation and Methodology: How is the indicator calculated?

The actual number of registered boats is divided by 100,000 and that quotient is divided into the actual number of recreational boating crashes.

28. Scope: Is the indicator aggregated or disaggregated (is it a sum of smaller parts or is it a part of a larger whole)? Example – if the indicator is a statewide figure, can it be broken down by parish or region?

This indicator is disaggregated since the number of registered boats is a statewide number and cannot be broken down by parish or region since the boats are movable and may be used in a parish other than where they are domiciled.

29. Caveats: Does the indicator have limitations or weaknesses (lack of precision or timeliness, difficult to collect, external factors)?

There are no weaknesses or limitations to the numbers reported, however many external factors affect the outcome.

30. Responsible Person: Who is responsible for data collection, analysis and quality? Provide name, title, and contact information for all persons involved in collection and reporting.

Boating crashes are reported to and collected by Captain Ronald Morris of the

Enforcement Division. Boat registrations are managed by Janis Landry of the Office of Management and Finance. All information is forwarded to Lt. Colonel Jeff Mayne of the Enforcement Division, who analyzes and reports the data.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **ENFORCEMENT**

Objective: **Reduce the number of boating crashes per 100,000 registered boats.**

Indicator Name: **Number of boating safety patrol hours**

1. Type and Level: What is the type of the indicator (input, output, outcome, efficiency, quality)? What is the level at which the indicator will be reported (key, supporting, general performance information)?

This is an input indicator and will be reported as supporting.

2. Rationale: What is the rationale for the indicator? Why was it selected? How does it help measure achievement of the objective?

This indicator provides the actual number of hours agents spend on boating safety patrol. It was selected to gauge the level of enforcement presence in boating safety and how it relates to the number of boating crashes.

3. Use: How will the indicator be used in management decision-making and other agency processes? Will it be used only for internal management purposes or will it also be used for budgeted purposes?

We will strive to increase our presence through increased patrols and this indicator will tell us how we're achieving this.

4. Clarity: Does the indicator name clearly identify what is being measured? If the name contains jargon, acronyms, or unclear terms, define or clarify them here.

The indicator relates to boating safety patrol hours, which are hours spent by Wildlife Agents in the field conducting boating safety patrols.

5. Validity, Reliability, and Accuracy: Has the indicator been audited by the Office of the Legislative Auditor? If so, what was the result/finding? If not, how can you assure that the indicator is valid, reliable and accurate?

This indicator has not been audited, however, there is a clear connection between law enforcement presence and decreased crashes.

6. Data Source, Collection and Reporting: What is the source of data to be reported? What is the frequency and timing of collection and reporting (monthly, quarterly, annual)?

The data reported in this indicator is taken from Wildlife Agent timesheets, which are scanned bi-weekly into a database.

7. Calculation and Methodology: How is the indicator calculated?

It is an actual number.

8. Scope: Is the indicator aggregated or disaggregated (is it a sum of smaller parts or is it a part of a larger whole)? Example – if the indicator is a statewide figure, can it be broken down by parish or region?

The indicator is aggregated.

9. Caveats: Does the indicator have limitations or weaknesses (lack of precision or timeliness, difficult to collect, external factors)?

The indicator is limited only in the fact that an increase in patrol hours cannot guarantee a reduction in boating crashes.

10. Responsible Person: Who is responsible for data collection, analysis and quality? Provide name, title, and contact information for all persons involved in collection and reporting.

The data is collected and reported from the database by Lt. Colonel Jeff Mayne of the Enforcement Division.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **ENFORCEMENT**

Objective: **Reduce the number of boating crashes per 100,000 registered boats.**

Indicator Name: **Number of students completing the boating safety course.**

1. Type and Level: What is the type of the indicator (input, output, outcome, efficiency, quality)? What is the level at which the indicator will be reported (key, supporting, general performance information)?

This indicator is an outcome indicator and will be reported as supporting.

2. Rationale: What is the rationale for the indicator? Why was it selected? How does it help measure achievement of the objective?

This indicator relates to the objective using the assumption that persons that are better educated about boating are less likely to make a mistake that could lead to a reportable crash.

3. Use: How will the indicator be used in management decision-making and other agency processes? Will it be used only for internal management purposes or will it also be used for budgeted purposes?

This indicator will be used internally to make decisions about course curriculum and to address needs of the training program.

4. Clarity: Does the indicator name clearly identify what is being measured? If the name contains jargon, acronyms, or unclear terms, define or clarify them here.

The indicator represents the actual number of persons completing the departments approved course that is now required for certain persons pursuant to Act 921 of the 2003 Regular Session of the legislature.

5. Validity, Reliability, and Accuracy: Has the indicator been audited by the Office of the Legislative Auditor? If so, what was the result/finding? If not, how can you assure that the indicator is valid, reliable and accurate?

This indicator was audited by the Office of Legislative Auditor in a performance audit that was released in January 2002 and was found to be valid.

6. Data Source, Collection and Reporting: What is the source of data to be reported? What is the frequency and timing of collection and reporting (monthly, quarterly, annual)?

The source of this data is the department's database of students that have completed the course. This database is updated weekly.

7. Calculation and Methodology: How is the indicator calculated?

This is a whole number.

8. Scope: Is the indicator aggregated or disaggregated (is it a sum of smaller parts or is it a part of a larger whole)? Example – if the indicator is a statewide figure, can it be broken down by parish or region?

This indicator is aggregated.

9. Caveats: Does the indicator have limitations or weaknesses (lack of precision or timeliness, difficult to collect, external factors)?

There are no known limitations to this indicator.

10. Responsible Person: Who is responsible for data collection, analysis and quality? Provide name, title, and contact information for all persons involved in collection and reporting.

Sgt. Rachael Zechenelly of the Enforcement Division collects this data. It is reported by Lt. Colonel Jeff Mayne of the Enforcement Division.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **ENFORCEMENT**

Objective: **Reduce the number of boating crashes per 100,000 registered boats.**

Indicator Name: **Number of boating crashes**

1. Type and Level: What is the type of the indicator (input, output, outcome, efficiency, quality)? What is the level at which the indicator will be reported (key, supporting, general performance information)?

This is an outcome indicator and is reported in the general performance tables.

2. Rationale: What is the rationale for the indicator? Why was it selected? How does it help measure achievement of the objective?

This indicator represents the actual number of recreational boating crashes that occur and is directly related to the objective.

3. Use: How will the indicator be used in management decision-making and other agency processes? Will it be used only for internal management purposes or will it also be used for budgeted purposes?

   This indicator is used internally to address manpower allotment and needs.

4. Clarity: Does the indicator name clearly identify what is being measured? If the name contains jargon, acronyms, or unclear terms, define or clarify them here.

A recreational boating crash is defined as: a collision, crash or other casualty involving a recreational vessel and resulting in death, injury (beyond first aid) or property damage in excess of $500.00.

5. Validity, Reliability, and Accuracy: Has the indicator been audited by the Office of the Legislative Auditor? If so, what was the result/finding? If not, how can you assure that the indicator is valid, reliable and accurate?

This indicator was audited by the Office of the Legislative Auditor in a performance audit that was released in January 2002 and found to be valid.

6. Data Source, Collection and Reporting: What is the source of data to be reported? What is the frequency and timing of collection and reporting (monthly, quarterly, annual)?

This data comes all crashes reported to the department through the Boating Crash Report Form. Crashes are reported as they occur.

7. Calculation and Methodology: How is the indicator calculated?

The indicator is a whole number.

8. Scope: Is the indicator aggregated or disaggregated (is it a sum of smaller parts or is it a part of a larger whole)? Example – if the indicator is a statewide figure, can it be broken down by parish or region?

The indicator is aggregated.

9. Caveats: Does the indicator have limitations or weaknesses (lack of precision or timeliness, difficult to collect, external factors)?

There are no known limitations to the indicator.

10. Responsible Person: Who is responsible for data collection, analysis and quality? Provide name, title, and contact information for all persons involved in collection and reporting.

Captain Ronald Morris of the Enforcement Division is responsible for collecting and documenting all boating crash reports. Lt. Colonel Jeff Mayne is responsible for reporting this data.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **ENFORCEMENT**

Objective: **Reduce the number of boating crashes per 100,000 registered boats.**

Indicator Name: **Number of registered boats**

1. Type and Level: What is the type of the indicator (input, output, outcome, efficiency, quality)? What is the level at which the indicator will be reported (key, supporting, general performance information)?

This is an input indicator and is reported in the general performance tables.

2. Rationale: What is the rationale for the indicator? Why was it selected? How does it help measure achievement of the objective?

This indicator represents the actual number of registered boats in Louisiana.

3. Use: How will the indicator be used in management decision-making and other agency processes? Will it be used only for internal management purposes or will it also be used for budgeted purposes?

This indicator is used internally to make manpower allotment and needs decisions related to boating safety.

4. Clarity: Does the indicator name clearly identify what is being measured? If the name contains jargon, acronyms, or unclear terms, define or clarify them here.

The indicator represents all recreational boats registered by the State of Louisiana.

5. Validity, Reliability, and Accuracy: Has the indicator been audited by the Office of the Legislative Auditor? If so, what was the result/finding? If not, how can you assure that the indicator is valid, reliable and accurate?

This indicator was audited by the Office of Legislative Auditor in a performance audit released in January 2002 and found to be valid.

6. Data Source, Collection and Reporting: What is the source of data to be reported? What is the frequency and timing of collection and reporting (monthly, quarterly, annual)?

This data comes from the department's Motorboat section of the Office of Management and Finance.

7. Calculation and Methodology: How is the indicator calculated?

This is a whole number.

8. Scope: Is the indicator aggregated or disaggregated (is it a sum of smaller parts or is it a part of a larger whole)? Example – if the indicator is a statewide figure, can it be broken down by parish or region?

This indicator is aggregated.

9. Caveats: Does the indicator have limitations or weaknesses (lack of precision or timeliness, difficult to collect, external factors)?

There are no known limitations to this indicator.

10. Responsible Person: Who is responsible for data collection, analysis and quality? Provide name, title, and contact information for all persons involved in collection and reporting.

Janis Landry of the Office of Management and Finance is responsible for collecting and storing this data. Lt. Colonel Jeff Mayne of the Enforcement Division reports the data.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **ENFORCEMENT**

Objective: **Reduce the number of boating crashes per 100,000 registered boats.**

Indicator Name: **Percent of boating crashes with alcohol or drugs were involved.**

1. Type and Level: What is the type of the indicator (input, output, outcome, efficiency, quality)? What is the level at which the indicator will be reported (key, supporting, general performance information)?

This is an outcome indicator and will be reported in the general performance tables.

2. Rationale: What is the rationale for the indicator? Why was it selected? How does it help measure achievement of the objective?

This indicator is reported to reflect those crashes where alcohol or drugs was present, whether the alcohol or drugs was a causative factor, or not. Its role in achievement of the objective is only a factor when used in an awareness campaign or increased enforcement of boating while intoxicated statutes.

3. Use: How will the indicator be used in management decision-making and other agency processes? Will it be used only for internal management purposes or will it also be used for budgeted purposes?

This indicator will be used internally and externally by the agency to report the role of alcohol and drugs in boating crashes.

4. Clarity: Does the indicator name clearly identify what is being measured? If the name contains jargon, acronyms, or unclear terms, define or clarify them here.

Crashes involving alcohol or drugs are those crashes where the investigating agent notes alcohol and/or drugs are present, whether its presence was a factor in the crash, or not.

5. Validity, Reliability, and Accuracy: Has the indicator been audited by the Office of the Legislative Auditor? If so, what was the result/finding? If not, how can you assure that the indicator is valid, reliable and accurate?

This is a new indicator and has not been audited. The indicator is considered valid by its value as evidence of involvement of alcohol and drugs in boating crashes.

6. Data Source, Collection and Reporting: What is the source of data to be reported? What is the frequency and timing of collection and reporting (monthly, quarterly, annual)?

The data is reported by investigating agents on Boating Crash Reports.

7. Calculation and Methodology: How is the indicator calculated?

The indicator is the percentage of all Boating Crash Reports that denote the presence of alcohol and/or drugs.

8. Scope: Is the indicator aggregated or disaggregated (is it a sum of smaller parts or is it a part of a larger whole)? Example – if the indicator is a statewide figure, can it be broken down by parish or region?

The indicator is aggregated.

9. Caveats: Does the indicator have limitations or weaknesses (lack of precision or timeliness, difficult to collect, external factors)?

The limitations of the indicator are that in some cases the presence of alcohol and/or drugs is not reported due to that evidence being lost, removed, or undetected.

10. Responsible Person: Who is responsible for data collection, analysis and quality? Provide name, title, and contact information for all persons involved in collection and reporting.

    Sgt. Rachel Zechenelly of the Enforcement Division is responsible for collecting this information. Lt. Colonel Jeff Mayne of the Enforcement Division reports the indicator.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **ENFORCEMENT**

Objective: **To increase voluntary compliance by increasing the number of public contacts by wildlife agents.**

Indicator Name: **Number of public contacts**

1. Type and Level: What is the type of the indicator (input, output, outcome, efficiency, quality)? What is the level at which the indicator will be reported (key, supporting, general performance information)?

This indicator is an outcome indicator and will be reported as a key indicator.

2. Rationale: What is the rationale for the indicator? Why was it selected? How does it help measure achievement of the objective?

This indicator was chosen for its relationship with providing the service the program is required to perform. It is a direct measure of the objective.

3. Use: How will the indicator be used in management decision-making and other agency processes? Will it be used only for internal management purposes or will it also be used for budgeted purposes?

This indicator will be used as a barometer of the amount of time Wildlife Agents spend interacting with our stakeholders.

4. Clarity: Does the indicator name clearly identify what is being measured? If the name contains jargon, acronyms, or unclear terms, define or clarify them here.

This indicator measures the objective. A public contact is defines as: a contact made by a wildlife agent with a person who is engaged in a specific, coded activity with which the agent has personal verbal contact, checks, issues a warning, issues a citation, or makes an arrest.

5. Validity, Reliability, and Accuracy: Has the indicator been audited by the Office of the Legislative Auditor? If so, what was the result/finding? If not, how can you assure that the indicator is valid, reliable and accurate?

It has not been audited. It is deemed to be a valid indicator due to its relationship with the actual job duties. Its accuracy and reliability are assured by the history of reporting this indicator for the last three years (baseline data).

6. Data Source, Collection and Reporting: What is the source of data to be reported? What is the frequency and timing of collection and reporting (monthly, quarterly, annual)?

   The data is recorded by Wildlife Agents daily on time and attendance reports and collected bi-weekly from those timesheets to an internal database.

7. Calculation and Methodology: How is the indicator calculated?

By adding the numbers reported by the Wildlife Agents on their time and attendance reports.

8. Scope: Is the indicator aggregated or disaggregated (is it a sum of smaller parts or is it a part of a larger whole)? Example – if the indicator is a statewide figure, can it be broken down by parish or region?

This indicator is aggregated.

9. Caveats: Does the indicator have limitations or weaknesses (lack of precision or timeliness, difficult to collect, external factors)?

The only known limitation would be from errors in reporting by the Wildlife Agents.

10. Responsible Person: Who is responsible for data collection, analysis and quality? Provide name, title, and contact information for all persons involved in collection and reporting.

Individual Wildlife Agents record the daily number of contacts on their time and attendance reports. Those reports are scanned into a database in Baton Rouge. Lt. Colonel Jeff Mayne of the Enforcement Division retrieves the information from the database, analyzes and reports the data.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **ENFORCEMENT**

Objective: **To increase voluntary compliance by increasing the number of public contacts by wildlife agents.**

Indicator Name: **Number of field patrol hours**

1. Type and Level: What is the type of the indicator (input, output, outcome, efficiency, quality)? What is the level at which the indicator will be reported (key, supporting, general performance information)?

This is an input indicator and it will be reported as a supporting indicator.

2. Rationale: What is the rationale for the indicator? Why was it selected? How does it help measure achievement of the objective?

This indicator measures the number of hours spent by Wildlife Agents performing field-work, as opposed to administrative and other non-patrol time. It was selected because of its relationship to achieving the objective.

3. Use: How will the indicator be used in management decision-making and other agency processes? Will it be used only for internal management purposes or will it also be used for budgeted purposes?

This indicator will be used internally to make decisions regarding manpower allotment and scheduling.

4. Clarity: Does the indicator name clearly identify what is being measured? If the name contains jargon, acronyms, or unclear terms, define or clarify them here.

The indicator is clearly identified by its title. Field patrol hours are those hours spent by Wildlife Agents in the field performing their duties.

5. Validity, Reliability, and Accuracy: Has the indicator been audited by the Office of the Legislative Auditor? If so, what was the result/finding? If not, how can you assure that the indicator is valid, reliable and accurate?

This indicator has not been audited. Its validity is based on the fact that number of field patrol hours directly relates to achieving the objective by placing Wildlife Agents in the arena from which public contacts are made.

6. Data Source, Collection and Reporting: What is the source of data to be reported? What is the frequency and timing of collection and reporting (monthly, quarterly, annual)?

This data is taken from time and attendance reports recorded daily and filed bi-weekly by individual Wildlife Agents. The reports are scanned in Baton Rouge by the Information Technology staff and reside in a database.

7. Calculation and Methodology: How is the indicator calculated?

The numbers of recorded field patrol hours are added together for each reporting period.

8. Scope: Is the indicator aggregated or disaggregated (is it a sum of smaller parts or is it a part of a larger whole)? Example – if the indicator is a statewide figure, can it be broken down by parish or region?

The indicator is aggregated.

9. Caveats: Does the indicator have limitations or weaknesses (lack of precision or timeliness, difficult to collect, external factors)?

   The only known limitations would be from errors in reporting by Wildlife Agents.

10. Responsible Person: Who is responsible for data collection, analysis and quality? Provide name, title, and contact information for all persons involved in collection and reporting.

Individual Wildlife Agents record the daily number of contacts on their time and attendance reports. Those reports are scanned into a database in Baton Rouge. Lt. Colonel Jeff Mayne of the Enforcement Division retrieves the information from the database, analyzes and reports the data.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **ENFORCEMENT**

Objective: **To increase voluntary compliance by increasing the number of public contacts by wildlife agents.**

Indicator Name: **Authorized wildlife agent positions**

1. Type and Level: What is the type of the indicator (input, output, outcome, efficiency, quality)? What is the level at which the indicator will be reported (key, supporting, general performance information)?

This is an input indicator and will be reported in the general performance tables.

2. Rationale: What is the rationale for the indicator? Why was it selected? How does it help measure achievement of the objective?

This indicator is a factor in measuring the objective since the number of authorized positions can affect the number of public contacts which is associated with compliance and public safety. It was selected to show the correlation between the number of agents available and the amount of activity recorded.

3. Use: How will the indicator be used in management decision-making and other agency processes? Will it be used only for internal management purposes or will it also be used for budgeted purposes?

This indicator will be used by decision makers, both internally and externally, to show how the number of positions can affect the amount of work product provided.

4. Clarity: Does the indicator name clearly identify what is being measured? If the name contains jargon, acronyms, or unclear terms, define or clarify them here.

Authorized Wildlife Agent positions are the number of sworn law enforcement agents within the total division table of organization.

5. Validity, Reliability, and Accuracy: Has the indicator been audited by the Office of the Legislative Auditor? If so, what was the result/finding? If not, how can you assure that the indicator is valid, reliable and accurate?

This indicator has not been audited. It is deemed to be valid since the number of public contacts can be affected through a change in the number of Wildlife Agent positions. Its reliability and accuracy can be assured by referring to the program's annual approved budget.

6. Data Source, Collection and Reporting: What is the source of data to be reported? What is the frequency and timing of collection and reporting (monthly, quarterly, annual)?

This data comes from the program's annual operating budget.

7. Calculation and Methodology: How is the indicator calculated?

The indicator is calculated by subtracting the number of non-sworn, civilian employees of the program from the approved table of organization.

8. Scope: Is the indicator aggregated or disaggregated (is it a sum of smaller parts or is it a part of a larger whole)? Example – if the indicator is a statewide figure, can it be broken down by parish or region?

The indicator is aggregated.

9. Caveats: Does the indicator have limitations or weaknesses (lack of precision or timeliness, difficult to collect, external factors)?

There are no known weaknesses or limitations to the indicator.

10. Responsible Person: Who is responsible for data collection, analysis and quality? Provide name, title, and contact information for all persons involved in collection and reporting.

This information is reported by Lt. Colonel Jeff Mayne of the Enforcement Division.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **ENFORCEMENT**

Objective: **To increase voluntary compliance by increasing the number of public contacts by wildlife agents.**

Indicator Name: **Man hours – Specialized Operational Units**

1. Type and Level: What is the type of the indicator (input, output, outcome, efficiency, quality)? What is the level at which the indicator will be reported (key, supporting, general performance information)?

   This is an input indicator and will be reported in the general performance tables.

2. Rationale: What is the rationale for the indicator? Why was it selected? How does it help measure achievement of the objective?

This indicator represents the number of hours worked by the five specialized units within the program. It was selected in response to a performance audit by the Office of Legislative Auditor that recommended the program develop indicators that identify these units. These man-hours represent work that will be included in the objective.

3. Use: How will the indicator be used in management decision-making and other agency processes? Will it be used only for internal management purposes or will it also be used for budgeted purposes?

   This indicator will be used internally to track man-hours performed by the specialized operational units.

4. Clarity: Does the indicator name clearly identify what is being measured? If the name contains jargon, acronyms, or unclear terms, define or clarify them here.

The indicator's name clearly states what is being measured. The units that comprise the specialized operational units are: Oyster Strike Force, Statewide Strike Force, Special Investigations, Special Operations, and Boating Safety.

5. Validity, Reliability, and Accuracy: Has the indicator been audited by the Office of the Legislative Auditor? If so, what was the result/finding? If not, how can you assure that the indicator is valid, reliable and accurate?

This indicator has not been audited. It is considered valid because it was recommended by the Office of Legislative Auditor.

6. Data Source, Collection and Reporting: What is the source of data to be reported? What is the frequency and timing of collection and reporting (monthly, quarterly, annual)?

Data reported for this indicator is taken from the specialized operational units time and attendance reports, which are completed daily and reported bi-weekly.

7. Calculation and Methodology: How is the indicator calculated?

By adding all man-hours from the specialized operational units.

8. Scope: Is the indicator aggregated or disaggregated (is it a sum of smaller parts or is it a part of a larger whole)? Example – if the indicator is a statewide figure, can it be broken down by parish or region?

The indicator is aggregated.

9. Caveats: Does the indicator have limitations or weaknesses (lack of precision or timeliness, difficult to collect, external factors)?

There are no known limitations to this indicator.

10. Responsible Person: Who is responsible for data collection, analysis and quality? Provide name, title, and contact information for all persons involved in collection and reporting.

Individual Wildlife Agents record the daily hours on their time and attendance reports. Those reports are scanned into a database in Baton Rouge. Lt. Colonel Jeff Mayne of the Enforcement Division retrieves the information from the database, analyzes and reports the data.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **ENFORCEMENT**

Objective: **To increase voluntary compliance by increasing the number of public contacts by wildlife agents.**

Indicator Name: **Number of wildlife agent training hours**

1. Type and Level: What is the type of the indicator (input, output, outcome, efficiency, quality)? What is the level at which the indicator will be reported (key, supporting, general performance information)?

   This is an input indicator and will be reported in the general performance tables.

2. Rationale: What is the rationale for the indicator? Why was it selected? How does it help measure achievement of the objective?

This indicator was selected based upon its relevance to meeting the objective by providing our clients with the best-trained and knowledgeable Wildlife Agents possible. It helps to measure achievement of the objective by insuring those public contacts are carried out in a fact-based, professional fashion.

3. Use: How will the indicator be used in management decision-making and other agency processes? Will it be used only for internal management purposes or will it also be used for budgeted purposes?

   This indicator will be used internally to identify needs and set standards for training. It will also be used for budgetary purposes in determining funding levels for the training program.

4. Clarity: Does the indicator name clearly identify what is being measured? If the name contains jargon, acronyms, or unclear terms, define or clarify them here.

The title clearly identifies its purpose.

5. Validity, Reliability, and Accuracy: Has the indicator been audited by the Office of the Legislative Auditor? If so, what was the result/finding? If not, how can you assure that the indicator is valid, reliable and accurate?

This indicator has not been audited. It is deemed to be valid, reliable and accurate since it represents actual training hours performed by Wildlife Agents toward bettering themselves as professional law enforcement agents.

6. Data Source, Collection and Reporting: What is the source of data to be reported? What is the frequency and timing of collection and reporting (monthly, quarterly, annual)?

This data is collected from individual Wildlife Agent's time and attendance reports, where specific activity codes are used for training hours. It is reported bi-weekly.

7. Calculation and Methodology: How is the indicator calculated?

By adding the total number of hours coded to training on the time and attendance reports.

8. Scope: Is the indicator aggregated or disaggregated (is it a sum of smaller parts or is it a part of a larger whole)? Example – if the indicator is a statewide figure, can it be broken down by parish or region?

This indicator is aggregated.

9. Caveats: Does the indicator have limitations or weaknesses (lack of precision or timeliness, difficult to collect, external factors)?

There are no known weaknesses or limitations to this indicator.

10. Responsible Person: Who is responsible for data collection, analysis and quality? Provide name, title, and contact information for all persons involved in collection and reporting.

    Individual Wildlife Agents record training hours on their time and attendance reports. Those reports are scanned into a database in Baton Rouge. Lt. Colonel Jeff Mayne of the Enforcement Division retrieves, analyzes and reports the information from the database.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **ENFORCEMENT**

Objective: **Plan, Coordinate and provide search and rescue operations, supporting public safety for times of emergency.**

Indicator Name: **Number of non-agency law enforcement first responders trained in maritime search and rescue.**

1. Type and Level: What is the type of the indicator (input, output, outcome, efficiency, quality)? What is the level at which the indicator will be reported (key, supporting, general performance information)?

   This is an input indicator and will be reported in the general performance tables.

2. Rationale: What is the rationale for the indicator? Why was it selected? How does it help measure achievement of the objective?

This indicator was selected based upon its relevance to meeting the objective by providing our clients with the professional service as related to our agencies emergency response functions.

3. Use: How will the indicator be used in management decision-making and other agency processes? Will it be used only for internal management purposes or will it also be used for budgeted purposes?

   This indicator will be used identify the increased work demand associated with our agencies responsibilities as being designated lead agency for search and rescue and added training and coordination of work with other first responders during times of emergency.

4. Clarity: Does the indicator name clearly identify what is being measured? If the name contains jargon, acronyms, or unclear terms, define or clarify them here.

The title clearly identifies its purpose.

5. Validity, Reliability, and Accuracy: Has the indicator been audited by the Office of the Legislative Auditor? If so, what was the result/finding? If not, how can you assure that the indicator is valid, reliable and accurate?

This indicator has not been audited. It is deemed to be valid, reliable and accurate since it represents actual training conducted by Wildlife Agents to other non-agency first responders.

6. Data Source, Collection and Reporting: What is the source of data to be reported? What is the frequency and timing of collection and reporting (monthly, quarterly, annual)?

This data is collected from training classes conducted during the year; classes will be variable and depended on scheduling coordination between Wildlife and Fisheries and of the emergency first responders.

7. Calculation and Methodology: How is the indicator calculated?

By identifying the number of emergency first responders taught maritime related search and rescue and coordination.

8. Scope: Is the indicator aggregated or disaggregated (is it a sum of smaller parts or is it a part of a larger whole)? Example – if the indicator is a statewide figure, can it be broken down by parish or region?

This indicator is aggregated.

9. Caveats: Does the indicator have limitations or weaknesses (lack of precision or timeliness, difficult to collect, external factors)?

There are no known weaknesses or limitations to this indicator.

10. Responsible Person: Who is responsible for data collection, analysis and quality? Provide name, title, and contact information for all persons involved in collection and reporting.

Sgt. Rachel Zechenelly will report the number of first responders trained quarterly. Lt. Colonel Jeff Mayne of the Enforcement Division will analyze and report the information.

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST

Program: **ENFORCEMENT**

Objective: **Reduce the number of boating crashes per 100,000 registered boats.**

Strategy: **Increase high visibility patrols in areas where boating crash rates are highest.**

Yes	No	
		Analysis:
	x	Cost/benefit analysis conducted
	x	Financial or performance audit used
	x	Benchmarking for best management practices used
	x	Act 160 Reports used
x		Other analysis or evaluation tools used
x		Impact on other strategies considered
x		Stakeholders identified and involved
		Authorization:
x		Authorization exists
	x	Authorization needed
		Organization Capacity:
x		Needed structural or procedural changes identified
x		Resource needs identified
x		Strategies developed to implement needed changes
x		Responsibility assigned
		Time Frame:
x		Already ongoing
x		Lifetime of strategy identified
		Fiscal Impact:
	x	Impact on operating budget
	x	Impact on capital outlay budget
x		Means of Finance identified

x		Return on investment determined to be favorable

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST

Program: **ENFORCEMENT**

Objective: **Reduce the number of boating crashes per 100,000 registered boats.**

Strategy: **Increase availability and delivery of boating education courses.**

Yes	No	
		Analysis:
	x	Cost/benefit analysis conducted
	x	Financial or performance audit used
	x	Benchmarking for best management practices used
	x	Act 160 Reports used
x		Other analysis or evaluation tools used
x		Impact on other strategies considered
x		Stakeholders identified and involved
		Authorization:
x		Authorization exists
	x	Authorization needed
		Organization Capacity:
x		Needed structural or procedural changes identified
x		Resource needs identified
x		Strategies developed to implement needed changes
x		Responsibility assigned
		Time Frame:
x		Already ongoing
x		Lifetime of strategy identified
		Fiscal Impact:
	x	Impact on operating budget

	x	Impact on capital outlay budget
x		Means of Finance identified
x		Return on investment determined to be favorable

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST

Program: **ENFORCEMENT**

Objective: **Reduce the number of boating crashes per 100,000 registered boats.**

Strategy: **Increase agent training in boating while intoxicated detection and apprehension techniques**

Yes	No	
		Analysis:
	x	Cost/benefit analysis conducted
	x	Financial or performance audit used
	x	Benchmarking for best management practices used
	x	Act 160 Reports used
x		Other analysis or evaluation tools used
x		Impact on other strategies considered
x		Stakeholders identified and involved
		Authorization:
x		Authorization exists
	x	Authorization needed
		Organization Capacity:
x		Needed structural or procedural changes identified
x		Resource needs identified
x		Strategies developed to implement needed changes
x		Responsibility assigned
		Time Frame:
x		Already ongoing
x		Lifetime of strategy identified
		Fiscal Impact:

	x	Impact on operating budget
	x	Impact on capital outlay budget
x		Means of Finance identified
x		Return on investment determined to be favorable

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST

Program: **ENFORCEMENT**

Objective: **To increase voluntary compliance by increasing the number of public contacts by wildlife agents.**

Strategy: **Maintain an adequate level of staffing**

Yes	No	
		Analysis:
	x	Cost/benefit analysis conducted
	x	Financial or performance audit used
	x	Benchmarking for best management practices used
	x	Act 160 Reports used
x		Other analysis or evaluation tools used
x		Impact on other strategies considered
x		Stakeholders identified and involved
		Authorization:
x		Authorization exists
	x	Authorization needed
		Organization Capacity:
x		Needed structural or procedural changes identified
x		Resource needs identified
x		Strategies developed to implement needed changes
x		Responsibility assigned
		Time Frame:
x		Already ongoing
x		Lifetime of strategy identified

		Fiscal Impact:
	x	Impact on operating budget
	x	Impact on capital outlay budget
x		Means of Finance identified
x		Return on investment determined to be favorable

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST

Program: **ENFORCEMENT**

Objective: **To increase voluntary compliance by increasing the number of public contacts by wildlife agents.**

Strategy: **Decrease administrative time to devote more manpower to field duties.**

Yes	No	
		Analysis:
	x	Cost/benefit analysis conducted
	x	Financial or performance audit used
	x	Benchmarking for best management practices used
	x	Act 160 Reports used
x		Other analysis or evaluation tools used
x		Impact on other strategies considered
x		Stakeholders identified and involved
		Authorization:
x		Authorization exists
	x	Authorization needed
		Organization Capacity:
x		Needed structural or procedural changes identified
x		Resource needs identified
x		Strategies developed to implement needed changes
x		Responsibility assigned
		Time Frame:

x		Already ongoing
x		Lifetime of strategy identified
		Fiscal Impact:
	x	Impact on operating budget
	x	Impact on capital outlay budget
x		Means of Finance identified
x		Return on investment determined to be favorable

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST

Program: **ENFORCEMENT**

Objective: **Plan, coordinate and provide search and rescue operations, supporting public safety for times of emergency.**

Strategy: **Enhance coordination, interoperability and promote communications between federal state and local governments towards search and rescue efforts during times of emergencies.**

Yes	No	
		Analysis:
	x	Cost/benefit analysis conducted
	x	Financial or performance audit used
	x	Benchmarking for best management practices used
	x	Act 160 Reports used
x		Other analysis or evaluation tools used
x		Impact on other strategies considered
x		Stakeholders identified and involved
		Authorization:
x		Authorization exists
	x	Authorization needed
		Organization Capacity:
x		Needed structural or procedural changes identified
x		Resource needs identified
x		Strategies developed to implement needed changes
x		Responsibility assigned

		Time Frame:
x		Already ongoing
x		Lifetime of strategy identified
		Fiscal Impact:
	x	Impact on operating budget
	x	Impact on capital outlay budget
x		Means of Finance identified
x		Return on investment determined to be favorable

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **Wildlife**

Objective: **To manage the 0.9 million acres in the non-coastal WMA system through maintenance and habitat management activities.**

Indicator Name: **Number wildlife habitat management activities**

1. Type and Level: What is the type of the indicator (input, output, outcome, efficiency, quality)? What is the level at which the indicator will be reported (key, supporting, general performance information)?

   Output; Key.

2. Rationale: What is the rationale for the indicator? Why was it selected? How does it help measure achievement of the objective?

   It is a measure of activity that is part of stewardship and contributes to the overall goal of maintaining wildlife populations and increasing the opportunities for the public to enjoy their outdoor experiences.

3. Use: How will the indicator be used in management decision-making and other agency processes? Will it be used only for internal management purposes or will it also be used for budgeted purposes?

   Budget dollars are assigned to various management activities. Depending on available funding, new activities can be planned or current levels maintained. For example, waterfowl use of managed impoundments is usually very high because of the excellent food production and ideal water conditions. However, impoundments are also very expensive to manage and maintain. As a consequence, only a limited number of additional acres of impoundments can be added to the Wildlife Management Area systems without increases in funding.

4. Clarity: Does the indicator name clearly identify what is being measured? If the name contains jargon, acronyms, or unclear terms, define or clarify them here.

   Yes;
   Wildlife Habitat Management Activities: This refers to the cumulative number of types of management projects. A management activity falls into one of the following categories: *Vegetation Management*, *Impoundment/Greentree Reservoir Management*, *Forestry Practices*, *Food Plots*, and *Nest Boxes*.
   Vegetation Management: Prescribed Fire, Mowing, Disking, Chopping, Herbicides

Impoundment/Greentree Reservoir Management: Water Control Structures, Levees
Forestry Practices: Harvest, Reforestation, Timber Stand Improvement, Timber Marking, Inventory, Prescription Development

Food Plots: Site preparation and planting, mowing of perennial/reseeding annual such as clover
Nest Boxes: Self Explanatory
Count of Activities: The cumulative total for all WMAs of the tally of each of the management activities that occurs on individual WMAs.
Example: WMA X has food plots, maintains an opening through mowing, has a greentree reservoir and roller chopped the land within the reservoir. The activity tally for WMA X would be 3 (Vegetation Management – 2 projects, Food Plots, and Impoundment/Greentree Reservoir). If no mowing had occurred, the count still would have been 3 since Vegetation Management was also activity within the Impoundment/Greentree Reservoir.

5. Validity, Reliability, and Accuracy: Has the indicator been audited by the Office of the Legislative Auditor? If so, what was the result/finding? If not, how can you assure that the indicator is valid, reliable and accurate?

   No. The count will be developed at the regional level based on its activity. These activities are currently reported annually in the Wildlife Division's federal aid document.

6. Data Source, Collection and Reporting: What is the source of data to be reported? What is the frequency and timing of collection and reporting (monthly, quarterly, annual)?

   Management plans are developed annually with projects included. Monitoring occurs monthly, but reported annually to prevent double counting.

7. Calculation and Methodology: How is the indicator calculated?

   See Question 4.

8. Scope: Is the indicator Aggregated or DisAggregated (is it a sum of smaller parts or is it a part of a larger whole)? Example – if the indicator is a statewide figure, can it be broken down by parish or region?

   Aggregated.

9. Caveats: Does the indicator have limitations or weaknesses (lack of precision or timeliness, difficult to collect, external factors)?

   In times of tight or reduced budgets, the acreage impacted by Vegetation Management and Food Plots could be reduced and the activity count remains the same. However, these acres

are few relative compared to those within impoundments. In extremely tight budget years, less active management (reduced disturbance regime) of impoundments can increase, thus not optimizing potential habitat improvement. As a consequence, activities can remain unchanged or even increase, but the quality may decrease.

10. Responsible Person: Who is responsible for data collection, analysis and quality? Provide name, title, and contact information for all persons involved in collection and reporting.

Steve Hebert, Regional Supervisor, 318/371-3050

Jerald Owens, Regional Supervisor, 318/343-4044
Czerny Newland, Regional Supervisor,318/487-5887
Reggie Wycoff, Regional Supervisor,318/757-4571
John Robinette, Regional Supervisor,337/491-2575
Kerney Sonnier, Regional Supervisor,337/948-0255
John Mullins, Regional Supervisor,225/765-2361
Kenny Ribbeck, Forestry Supervisor, 225/765-2350

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **Wildlife**

Objective: **To manage the 0.9 million acres in the non-coastal WMA system through maintenance and habitat management activities.**

Indicator Name: **Number of user-days**

1. Type and Level: What is the type of the indicator (input, output, outcome, efficiency, quality)? What is the level at which the indicator will be reported (key, supporting, general performance information)?

Outcome; Key.

2. Rationale: What is the rationale for the indicator? Why was it selected? How does it help measure achievement of the objective?

It is a measurable activity that is part of stewardship and contributes to the overall goal of maintaining wildlife populations and increasing the opportunities for the public to enjoy their outdoor experiences.

3. Use: How will the indicator be used in management decision-making and other agency processes? Will it be used only for internal management purposes or will it also be used for budgeted purposes?

It provides an index to the degree of public use of the non-coastal Wildlife Management Areas. It also provides insight into major user groups. Evaluation of use data in conjunction with surveys can provide the department with ways to optimize public use of its lands.

4. Clarity: Does the indicator name clearly identify what is being measured? If the name contains jargon, acronyms, or unclear terms, define or clarify them here.

No.

5. Validity, Reliability, and Accuracy: Has the indicator been audited by the Office of the Legislative Auditor? If so, what was the result/finding? If not, how can you assure that the indicator is valid, reliable and accurate?

No. Historically, estimates have been developed as a result of user checks. Mandatory self-clearing permits will be used on the majority of the areas beginning in September 2001. Primary data for activities are collected through the use of self-clearing permit stations on

most areas. However, not all areas or activities lend themselves to the use of self-clearing permits. Estimates based on user checks and past experience also will be used on areas when necessary and on areas.

6. Data Source, Collection and Reporting: What is the source of data to be reported? What is the frequency and timing of collection and reporting (monthly, quarterly, annual)?

Data are collected continuously and reported monthly to quarterly.

7. Calculation and Methodology: How is the indicator calculated?

Depending on the area and compliance, data are simple counts of user permits or estimations. No standard extrapolation method is used because many areas are not similar relative to potential uses and compliance.

8. Scope: Is the indicator Aggregated or DisAggregated (is it a sum of smaller parts or is it a part of a larger whole)? Example – if the indicator is a statewide figure, can it be broken down by parish or region?

Aggregated.

9. Caveats: Does the indicator have limitations or weaknesses (lack of precision or timeliness, difficult to collect, external factors)?

   It is unlikely that WMA staffing level results in 100% compliance with mandatory self-clearing. Similarly, the user check intensity has been greatly reduced. As a result, accuracy of the estimates may be reduced. There is no standard for extrapolating estimates from user checks because areas are frequently very different from one another.

10. Responsible Person: Who is responsible for data collection, analysis and quality? Provide name, title, and contact information for all persons involved in collection and reporting.

Steve Hebert, Regional Supervisor, 318/371-3050
Jerald Owens, Regional Supervisor, 318/343-4044
Czerny Newland, Regional Supervisor, 318/487-5887
Reggie Wycoff, Regional Supervisor, 318/757-4571
John Robinette, Regional Supervisor, 337/491-2575
Kerney Sonnier, Regional Supervisor, 337/948-0255
John Mullins, Regional Supervisor, 225/765-2361

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **Wildlife**

Objective: **To manage the 0.9 million acres in the non-coastal WMA system through maintenance and habitat management activities.**

Indicator Name: **Number of wood duck boxes maintained**

1. Type and Level: What is the type of the indicator (input, output, outcome, efficiency, quality)? What is the level at which the indicator will be reported (key, supporting, general performance information)?

Output; Supporting.

2. Rationale: What is the rationale for the indicator? Why was it selected? How does it help measure achievement of the objective?

It is a measurable activity that is part of stewardship and contributes to the overall goal of maintaining wildlife populations and increasing the opportunities for the public to enjoy their outdoor experiences.

3. Use: How will the indicator be used in management decision-making and other agency processes? Will it be used only for internal management purposes or will it also be used for budgeted purposes?

The Wildlife Division made a concerted effort about 15 years ago to expand its wood duck nest box program on its lands because the lack of quality nesting cavities is a limiting factor for wood ducks in many areas. This activity is a time consuming one. The count is a measure of the progress/success of the program. It will be used for both purposes.

4. Clarity: Does the indicator name clearly identify what is being measured? If the name contains jargon, acronyms, or unclear terms, define or clarify them here.

   Yes; **Maintained** refers to the total number of functional wood duck boxes on non-coastal WMAs and includes boxes that are either simply maintained by inspecting and performing any necessary maintenance as well as the placement of new boxes.

5. Validity, Reliability, and Accuracy: Has the indicator been audited by the Office of the Legislative Auditor? If so, what was the result/finding? If not, how can you assure that the indicator is valid, reliable and accurate?

No. See Questions 2-4.

6. Data Source, Collection and Reporting: What is the source of data to be reported? What is the frequency and timing of collection and reporting (monthly, quarterly, annual)?

Annually.

7. Calculation and Methodology: How is the indicator calculated?

It is a simple count.

8. Scope: Is the indicator Aggregated or DisAggregated (is it a sum of smaller parts or is it a part of a larger whole)? Example – if the indicator is a statewide figure, can it be broken down by parish or region?

Aggregated.

9. Caveats: Does the indicator have limitations or weaknesses (lack of precision or timeliness, difficult to collect, external factors)?

No.

10. Responsible Person: Who is responsible for data collection, analysis and quality? Provide name, title, and contact information for all persons involved in collection and reporting.

Steve Hebert, Regional Supervisor, 318/371-3050

Jerald Owens, Regional Supervisor, 318/343-4044
Czerny Newland, Regional Supervisor, 318/487-5887
Reggie Wycoff, Regional Supervisor, 318/757-4571
John Robinette, Regional Supervisor, 337/491-2575
Kerney Sonnier, Regional Supervisor, 337/948-0255
John Mullins, Regional Supervisor, 225/765-2361

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **Wildlife**

Objective: **To manage the 0.9 million acres in the non-coastal WMA system through maintenance and habitat management activities.**

Indicator Name: **Number of acres in the non-coastal WMA system**

1. Type and Level: What is the type of the indicator (input, output, outcome, efficiency, quality)? What is the level at which the indicator will be reported (key, supporting, general performance information)?

Output; Key.

2. Rationale: What is the rationale for the indicator? Why was it selected? How does it help measure achievement of the objective?

It documents the acres in the non-coastal WMA system. As such, it is a measure the status of the acreage under conservation management by Wildlife Division relative to the base acreage at the start of the plan.

3. Use: How will the indicator be used in management decision-making and other agency processes? Will it be used only for internal management purposes or will it also be used for budgeted purposes?

Land management and associated costs accounts for the majority of the Division's expenditures. While the Department will continue to be as aggressive as possible concerning acquiring lands that ensure Louisiana's wildlife heritage, the level of active management may need to be reduced on some areas if operating funds are not provided with acquisition funds.

4. Clarity: Does the indicator name clearly identify what is being measured? If the name contains jargon, acronyms, or unclear terms, define or clarify them here.

Yes; **Non-coastal Wildlife Management Areas**: The non-coastal WMAs include: Acadiana Conservation Corridor, Alexander State Forest, Attakapas, Bayou Macon, Bayou Pierre, Bens Creek, Big Lake, Boeuf, Boise-Vernon, Buckhorn, Camp Beauregard, Dewey W. Wills, Elbow Slough, Elm Hall, Floy McElroy, Fort Polk, Grassy Lake, Hutchinson Creek, Jackson-Bienville, Joyce, Lake Ramsey, Little River, Loggy Bayou, Manchac, Marsh Bayou, Maurepas Swamp, Ouachita, Pearl River, Peason Ridge, Pomme de Terre, Red River, Russell Sage, Sabine, Sabine Island, Sandy Hollow, Sherburne, Sicily Island Hills, Soda Lake,

Spring Bayou, Tangipahoa Parish School Board, Thistlethwaite, Three Rivers, Tunica Hills, Union, Walnut Hill, and West Bay

5. Validity, Reliability, and Accuracy: Has the indicator been audited by the Office of the Legislative Auditor? If so, what was the result/finding? If not, how can you assure that the indicator is valid, reliable and accurate?

It is a simple tabulation of the current acres in the non-coastal Wildlife Management Areas.

6. What is the frequency and timing of collection and reporting (monthly, quarterly, annual)?

Data are collected with each land transaction and reported quarterly.

7. Calculation and Methodology: How is the indicator calculated?

See Question 5.

8. Scope: Is the indicator Aggregated or DisAggregated (is it a sum of smaller parts or is it a part of a larger whole)? Example – if the indicator is a statewide figure, can it be broken down by parish or region?

Aggregated.

9. Caveats: Does the indicator have limitations or weaknesses (lack of precision or timeliness, difficult to collect, external factors)?

No.

10. Responsible Person: Who is responsible for data collection, analysis and quality? Provide name, title, and contact information for all persons involved in collection and reporting.

    Randy Myers, Land Acquisition Coordinator, 225/765-2350

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **Wildlife**

Objective: **To manage the 0.9 million acres in the non-coastal WMA system through maintenance and habitat management activities.**

Indicator Name: **Number of miles of roads and trails**

1. Type and Level: What is the type of the indicator (input, output, outcome, efficiency, quality)? What is the level at which the indicator will be reported (key, supporting, general performance information)?

Outcome; Supporting.

2. Rationale: What is the rationale for the indicator? Why was it selected? How does it help measure achievement of the objective?

   It is a measurable infrastructure that is part of stewardship and contributes to the overall goal of increasing the opportunities for the public to enjoy their outdoor experiences.

3. Use: How will the indicator be used in management decision-making and other agency processes? Will it be used only for internal management purposes or will it also be used for budgeted purposes?

Road/trail maintenance and construction comprise a significant amount of the Wildlife Management Area systems' budget. Road /trail closure or conversion to a downgraded use may be required if budget resources are insufficient or structural conditions degrade sufficiently to deem higher use unsafe or too costly to maintain. Similarly, a downgrade can occur for biological reasons. This can result in reduced opportunity for use of the areas. Conversely, upgrades of some infrastructure may be developed in consort with downgrade or elimination of others to optimize access, biological, and budgetary concerns.

4. Clarity: Does the indicator name clearly identify what is being measured? If the name contains jargon, acronyms, or unclear terms, define or clarify them here.

   Yes; **Roads and Trails**: Refers to all road and trail infrastructure that provide public access to the non-coastal Wildlife Management Areas, including those maintained by the lessors.

5. Validity, Reliability, and Accuracy: Has the indicator been audited by the Office of the Legislative Auditor? If so, what was the result/finding? If not, how can you assure that the indicator is valid, reliable and accurate?

No. It is a simple tally of the roads and trails providing access for the public into the non-coastal Wildlife Management Areas.

6. Data Source, Collection and Reporting: What is the source of data to be reported? What is the frequency and timing of collection and reporting (monthly, quarterly, annual)?

Annual.

7. Calculation and Methodology: How is the indicator calculated?

It is estimated from maps or actual measurements with GPS units and vehicles' odometers.

8. Scope: Is the indicator Aggregated or DisAggregated (is it a sum of smaller parts or is it a part of a larger whole)? Example – if the indicator is a statewide figure, can it be broken down by parish or region?

Aggregated.

9. Caveats: Does the indicator have limitations or weaknesses (lack of precision or timeliness, difficult to collect, external factors)?

   No, not at the level provided (nearest 25 miles). But, in times of tight or reduced budgets, the degree of maintenance, particularly on major (graveled) roads can vary greatly.

10. Responsible Person: Who is responsible for data collection, analysis and quality? Provide name, title, and contact information for all persons involved in collection and reporting.

Steve Hebert, Regional Supervisor, 318/371-3050
Jerald Owens, Regional Supervisor, 318/343-4044
Czerny Newland, Regional Supervisor, 318/487-5887
Reggie Wycoff, Regional Supervisor, 318/757-4571
John Robinette, Regional Supervisor, 337/491-2575
Kerney Sonnier, Regional Supervisor, 337/948-0255
John Mullins, Regional Supervisor, 225/765-2361

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **Wildlife**

Objective: **To manage the 0.9 million acres in the non-coastal WMA system through maintenance and habitat management activities.**

Indicator Name: **Number of miles of roads and trails maintained**

1. Type and Level: What is the type of the indicator (input, output, outcome, efficiency, quality)? What is the level at which the indicator will be reported (key, supporting, general performance information)?

Output; Key.

2. Rationale: What is the rationale for the indicator? Why was it selected? How does it help measure achievement of the objective?

   It is a measurable infrastructure that is part of stewardship and contributes to the overall goal of increasing the opportunities for the public to enjoy their outdoor experiences.

3. Use: How will the indicator be used in management decision-making and other agency processes? Will it be used only for internal management purposes or will it also be used for budgeted purposes?

Road/trail maintenance and construction comprise a significant amount of the Wildlife Management Area systems' budget. Road /trail closure or conversion to a downgraded use may be required if budget resources are insufficient or structural conditions degrade sufficiently to deem higher use unsafe or too costly to maintain. Similarly, a downgrade can occur for biological reasons. This can result in reduced opportunity for use of the areas. Conversely, upgrades of some infrastructure may be developed in consort with downgrade or elimination of others to optimize access, biological, and budgetary concerns.

4. Clarity: Does the indicator name clearly identify what is being measured? If the name contains jargon, acronyms, or unclear terms, define or clarify them here.

   Yes;
   Roads and Trails Maintained: Refers to all road and trail infrastructure maintained that provide public access to the non-coastal Wildlife Management Areas, including those maintained by the lessors, during the year.
   Maintained: Refers to any type of maintenance performed including, but not limited, to mowing, grading, adding gravel, culvert replacement, etc.

5. Validity, Reliability, and Accuracy: Has the indicator been audited by the Office of the Legislative Auditor? If so, what was the result/finding? If not, how can you assure that the indicator is valid, reliable and accurate?

No. It is a simple tally of the roads and trails maintained that providing access for the public into the non-coastal Wildlife Management Areas.

6. Data Source, Collection and Reporting: What is the source of data to be reported? What is the frequency and timing of collection and reporting (monthly, quarterly, annual)?

Annual.

7. Calculation and Methodology: How is the indicator calculated?

It is estimated from maps or actual measurements with GPS units and vehicles' odometers.

8. Scope: Is the indicator Aggregated or DisAggregated (is it a sum of smaller parts or is it a part of a larger whole)? Example – if the indicator is a statewide figure, can it be broken down by parish or region?

Aggregated.

9. Caveats: Does the indicator have limitations or weaknesses (lack of precision or timeliness, difficult to collect, external factors)?

No, not at the level provided (nearest 25 miles).

10. Responsible Person: Who is responsible for data collection, analysis and quality? Provide name, title, and contact information for all persons involved in collection and reporting.

Steve Hebert, Regional Supervisor, 318/371-3050
Jerald Owens, Regional Supervisor, 318/343-4044
Czerny Newland, Regional Supervisor, 318/487-5887
Reggie Wycoff, Regional Supervisor, 318/757-4571
John Robinette, Regional Supervisor, 337/491-2575
Kerney Sonnier, Regional Supervisor, 337/948-0255
John Mullins, Regional Supervisor, 225/765-2361

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **Wildlife**

Objective: **To manage the 0.9 million acres in the non-coastal WMA system through maintenance and habitat management activities.**

Indicator Name: **Number of miles of marked boundary**

1. Type and Level: What is the type of the indicator (input, output, outcome, efficiency, quality)? What is the level at which the indicator will be reported (key, supporting, general performance information)?

Outcome; Supporting.

2. Rationale: What is the rationale for the indicator? Why was it selected? How does it help measure achievement of the objective?

   It is a measurable part of stewardship and contributes to the overall goal of increasing the opportunities for the public to enjoy their outdoor experiences.

3. Use: How will the indicator be used in management decision-making and other agency processes? Will it be used only for internal management purposes or will it also be used for budgeted purposes?

Boundary signage/marking is a major component of the non-coastal WMA budget. Without well-marked boundaries, the public could inadvertently hunt on private lands adjoining WMAs.

4. Clarity: Does the indicator name clearly identify what is being measured? If the name contains jargon, acronyms, or unclear terms, define or clarify them here.

   Yes; **Marked Boundary**: Refers to all perimeters of the non-coastal WMAs that are marked with signs and/or paint.

5. Validity, Reliability, and Accuracy: Has the indicator been audited by the Office of the Legislative Auditor? If so, what was the result/finding? If not, how can you assure that the indicator is valid, reliable and accurate?

No. It is a simple tally of the boundary perimeter for the non-coastal Wildlife Management Areas.

6. Data Source, Collection and Reporting: What is the source of data to be reported? What is the frequency and timing of collection and reporting (monthly, quarterly, annual)?

Monthly and Quarterly.

7. Calculation and Methodology: How is the indicator calculated?

It is the simple addition of the perimeters as determined by GIS.

8. Scope: Is the indicator Aggregated or DisAggregated (is it a sum of smaller parts or is it a part of a larger whole)? Example – if the indicator is a statewide figure, can it be broken down by parish or region?

Aggregated.

9. Caveats: Does the indicator have limitations or weaknesses (lack of precision or timeliness, difficult to collect, external factors)?

No.

10. Responsible Person: Who is responsible for data collection, analysis and quality? Provide name, title, and contact information for all persons involved in collection and reporting.

Doug Albert, GIS Specialists, 225/765-2404

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **Wildlife**

Objective: **To manage the 0.9 million acres in the non-coastal WMA system through maintenance and habitat management activities.**

Indicator Name: **Number of miles of boundaries maintained**

1. Type and Level: What is the type of the indicator (input, output, outcome, efficiency, quality)? What is the level at which the indicator will be reported (key, supporting, general performance information)?

Output; Supporting.

2. Rationale: What is the rationale for the indicator? Why was it selected? How does it help measure achievement of the objective?

   It is a measurable infrastructure that is part of stewardship and contributes to the overall goal of increasing the opportunities for the public to enjoy their outdoor experiences.

3. Use: How will the indicator be used in management decision-making and other agency processes? Will it be used only for internal management purposes or will it also be used for budgeted purposes?

Boundary maintenance can be a major budget item for the non-coastal WMAs. Quality (maintenance frequency and method) can vary depending on budget allocation.

4. Clarity: Does the indicator name clearly identify what is being measured? If the name contains jargon, acronyms, or unclear terms, define or clarify them here.

   Yes;
   Maintained: Refers to any type of maintenance performed including, but not limited, to checking, blazing and painting, signing, and mowing.

5. Validity, Reliability, and Accuracy: Has the indicator been audited by the Office of the Legislative Auditor? If so, what was the result/finding? If not, how can you assure that the indicator is valid, reliable and accurate?

No. It is a simple tally of the boundary maintained on the non-coastal Wildlife Management Areas.

6. Data Source, Collection and Reporting: What is the source of data to be reported? What is the frequency and timing of collection and reporting (monthly, quarterly, annual)?

Monthly and Quarterly.

7. Calculation and Methodology: How is the indicator calculated?

It is estimated from maps or actual measurements with GPS units and vehicles' odometers.

8. Scope: Is the indicator Aggregated or DisAggregated (is it a sum of smaller parts or is it a part of a larger whole)? Example – if the indicator is a statewide figure, can it be broken down by parish or region?

Aggregated.

9. Caveats: Does the indicator have limitations or weaknesses (lack of precision or timeliness, difficult to collect, external factors)?

No, not at the level provided (nearest 25 miles).

10. Responsible Person: Who is responsible for data collection, analysis and quality? Provide name, title, and contact information for all persons involved in collection and reporting.

Steve Hebert, Regional Supervisor, 318/371-3050

Jerald Owens, Regional Supervisor, 318/343-4044
Czerny Newland, Regional Supervisor, 318/487-5887
Reggie Wycoff, Regional Supervisor, 318/757-4571
John Robinette, Regional Supervisor, 337/491-2575
Kerney Sonnier, Regional Supervisor, 337/948-0255
John Mullins, Regional Supervisor, 225/765-2361

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **Wildlife**

Objective: **To manage the 0.9 million acres in the non-coastal WMA system through maintenance and habitat management activities.**

Indicator Name: **Number of acres per technician**

1. Type and Level: What is the type of the indicator (input, output, outcome, efficiency, quality)? What is the level at which the indicator will be reported (key, supporting, general performance information)?

Efficiency;Supporting.

2. Rationale: What is the rationale for the indicator? Why was it selected? How does it help measure achievement of the objective?

It is a measure of efficiency in the use of staff.

3. Use: How will the indicator be used in management decision-making and other agency processes? Will it be used only for internal management purposes or will it also be used for budgeted purposes?

It provides an index to efficiency when compared to other state and federal systems with comparable management programs.

4. Clarity: Does the indicator name clearly identify what is being measured? If the name contains jargon, acronyms, or unclear terms, define or clarify them here.

   Yes;
   Technician Staff: The average number of full-time staff below the biologist level assigned to work on non-coastal WMAs. This is not the simple position count, but rather the average filled count.

5. Validity, Reliability, and Accuracy: Has the indicator been audited by the Office of the Legislative Auditor? If so, what was the result/finding? If not, how can you assure that the indicator is valid, reliable and accurate?

No, it is a simple ratio of the number of acres in the non-coastal WMA system per technician.

6. Data Source, Collection and Reporting: What is the source of data to be reported? What is the frequency and timing of collection and reporting (monthly, quarterly, annual)?

Annual

7. Calculation and Methodology: How is the indicator calculated?

See Question 6.

8. Scope: Is the indicator Aggregated or DisAggregated (is it a sum of smaller parts or is it a part of a larger whole)? Example – if the indicator is a statewide figure, can it be broken down by parish or region?

Aggregated.

9. Caveats: Does the indicator have limitations or weaknesses (lack of precision or timeliness, difficult to collect, external factors)?

   There is no measurable quality modifier. As a result, greater efficiency may be "apparent" by simply reducing staff when just the opposite may be true. The trend for this indicator should be negative.

10. Responsible Person: Who is responsible for data collection, analysis and quality? Provide name, title, and contact information for all persons involved in collection and reporting.

    Dave Arnoldi, Asst. Wildlife Division Administrator, 225/765-2346
    Randy Myers, Land Acquisition Coordinator, 225/765-2350

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **Wildlife**

Objective: **To enhance wildlife habitat on private lands and non-Department public lands by providing 15,000 wildlife management technical assistance responses to the public and other agencies/NGOs.**

Indicator Name: **Number of written or oral technical assistances provided**

1. Type and Level: What is the type of the indicator (input, output, outcome, efficiency, quality)? What is the level at which the indicator will be reported (key, supporting, general performance information)?

Output; Key.

2. Rationale: What is the rationale for the indicator? Why was it selected? How does it help measure achievement of the objective?

It is one measure of the workload of the Wildlife Division's technical staff.

3. Use: How will the indicator be used in management decision-making and other agency processes? Will it be used only for internal management purposes or will it also be used for budgeted purposes?

It provides an index to workload of the Division's biological staff. A limit to the number or extent of assistances can be implemented when necessary to also accomplish other Wildlife Division activities.

4. Clarity: Does the indicator name clearly identify what is being measured? If the name contains jargon, acronyms, or unclear terms, define or clarify them here.

   Yes;
   Technical Assistance Request: Any request of a technical nature from the public, media or other agencies/NGOs for recommendations, technical guidance, biological data or reviews; i.e., habitat management, biology, identification, "how to", etc.
   Technical Assistance Responses: A response includes any documentation, written or verbal, that is necessary to adequately address the issue or concern. It is recognized that some responses may only take a few minutes while others may take considerable more, including on-site inspections. However, because of the volume of requests, the "few minute" ones constitute a considerable amount of the technical personnel's time;

therefore, no differentiation is made between the types of responses. The total responses provide a better indicator of staff activity.

5. Validity, Reliability, and Accuracy: Has the indicator been audited by the Office of the Legislative Auditor? If so, what was the result/finding? If not, how can you assure that the indicator is valid, reliable and accurate?

No, it is one measure of the workload of the Wildlife Division's technical staff.

6. Data Source, Collection and Reporting: What is the source of data to be reported? What is the frequency and timing of collection and reporting (monthly, quarterly, annual)?

Monthly; Quarterly

7. Calculation and Methodology: How is the indicator calculated?

   It is a simple count of the number of technical assistance requests to the technical staff. The technical staff is the average number of full-time biological staff at the Program Manager level and below.

8. Scope: Is the indicator Aggregated or DisAggregated (is it a sum of smaller parts or is it a part of a larger whole)? Example – if the indicator is a statewide figure, can it be broken down by parish or region?

Disaggregated because some technical assistance requests are answered by the Division Administrators.

9. Caveats: Does the indicator have limitations or weaknesses (lack of precision or timeliness, difficult to collect, external factors)?

There is no quality assessment. The Wildlife Division has no control over the number of technical assistance requests received.

10. Responsible Person: Who is responsible for data collection, analysis and quality? Provide name, title, and contact information for all persons involved in collection and reporting.

Steve Hebert, Regional Supervisor, 318/371-3050

Jerald Owens, Regional Supervisor, 318/343-4044
Czerny Newland, Regional Supervisor, 318/487-5887
Reggie Wycoff, Regional Supervisor, 318/757-4571

John Robinette, Regional Supervisor, 337/491-2575
Kerney Sonnier, Regional Supervisor, 337/948-0255
John Mullins, Regional Supervisor, 225/765-2361
Kenny Ribbeck, Forestry Supervisor, 225/765-2350
David Moreland, Deer Program Manager, 225/765-2350
Robert Helm, Waterfowl Program Manager, 225/765-2350
Fred Kimmel, Upland Program Manager, 225/765-2350
Mike Olinde, Research Program Manager, 225/765-2350
Jimmy Anthony, Federal Aid Coordinator, 225/765-2350
Randy Myers, Land Acquisition Coordinator, 225/765-2350

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **Wildlife**

Objective: **To enhance wildlife habitat on private lands and non-Department public lands by providing 15,000 wildlife management technical assistance responses to the public and other agencies/NGOs.**

Indicator Name: **Number of technical assistances provided per technical staff**

1. Type and Level: What is the type of the indicator (input, output, outcome, efficiency, quality)? What is the level at which the indicator will be reported (key, supporting, general performance information)?

Efficiency; Supporting

2. Rationale: What is the rationale for the indicator? Why was it selected? How does it help measure achievement of the objective?

It is one measure of the workload of the Division's technical staff.

11. Use: How will the indicator be used in management decision-making and other agency processes? Will it be used only for internal management purposes or will it also be used for budgeted purposes?

It provides an index to workload of the Division's biological staff. A limit to the number or extent of assistances can be implemented when necessary to also accomplish other Wildlife Division activities.

12. Clarity: Does the indicator name clearly identify what is being measured? If the name contains jargon, acronyms, or unclear terms, define or clarify them here.

    Yes;
    Technical Assistance Request: Any request of a technical nature from the public, media or other agencies/NGOs for recommendations, technical guidance, biological data or reviews; i.e., habitat management, biology, identification, "how to", etc.
    Technical Assistance Responses: A response includes any documentation, written or verbal, that is necessary o adequately address the issue or concern. It is recognized that some responses may only take a few minutes while others may take considerable more, including on-site inspections. However, because of the volume of requests, the "few minute" ones constitute a considerable amount of the technical personnel's time;

therefore, no differentiation is made between the types of responses. The total responses provide a better indicator of staff activity.
Technical Staff: The average number of filled full-time biologists in the Wildlife Division below the level of Administrators.

13. Validity, Reliability, and Accuracy: Has the indicator been audited by the Office of the Legislative Auditor? If so, what was the result/finding? If not, how can you assure that the indicator is valid, reliable and accurate?

No, it is one measure of the workload of the Wildlife Division's technical staff.

14. Data Source, Collection and Reporting: What is the source of data to be reported? What is the frequency and timing of collection and reporting (monthly, quarterly, annual)?

Annual

15. Calculation and Methodology: How is the indicator calculated?

It is a simple count of the number of technical assistance requests to the technical staff. The technical staff is the average number of full-time biological staff at the Program Manager level and below.

16. Scope: Is the indicator Aggregated or DisAggregated (is it a sum of smaller parts or is it a part of a larger whole)? Example – if the indicator is a statewide figure, can it be broken down by parish or region?

Disaggregated because some technical assistance requests are answered by the Division Administrators.

17. Caveats: Does the indicator have limitations or weaknesses (lack of precision or timeliness, difficult to collect, external factors)?

There is no quality assessment. The Wildlife Division has no control over the number of technical assistance requests received.

18. Responsible Person: Who is responsible for data collection, analysis and quality? Provide name, title, and contact information for all persons involved in collection and reporting.

Steve Hebert, Regional Supervisor, 318/371-3050
Jerald Owens, Regional Supervisor, 318/343-4044
Czerny Newland, Regional Supervisor, 318/487-5887

Reggie Wycoff, Regional Supervisor, 318/757-4571
John Robinette, Regional Supervisor, 337/491-2575
Kerney Sonnier, Regional Supervisor, 337/948-0255
John Mullins, Regional Supervisor, 225/765-2361
Kenny Ribbeck, Forestry Supervisor, 225/765-2350
David Moreland, Deer Program Manager, 225/765-2350
Robert Helm, Waterfowl Program Manager, 225/765-2350
Fred Kimmel, Upland Program Manager, 225/765-2350
Mike Olinde, Research Program Manager, 225/765-2350
Jimmy Anthony, Federal Aid Coordinator, 225/765-2350
Randy Myers, Land Acquisition Coordinator, 225/765-2350
Dave Arnoldi, Asst. Admin. Wildl. Division, 225/765-2346

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **Wildlife**

Objective: **To enhance wildlife habitat on private lands and non-Department public lands by providing 15,000 wildlife management technical assistance responses to the public and other agencies/NGOs.**

Indicator Name: **Number of participants in the Deer Management Assistance Program (DMAP)**

1. Type and Level: What is the type of the indicator (input, output, outcome, efficiency, quality)? What is the level at which the indicator will be reported (key, supporting, general performance information)?

Input; Key

2. Rationale: What is the rationale for the indicator? Why was it selected? How does it help measure achievement of the objective?

It is one measure of the workload of the Division's technical staff.

3. Use: How will the indicator be used in management decision-making and other agency processes? Will it be used only for internal management purposes or will it also be used for budgeted purposes?

It provides an index to workload of the Division's biological staff. A limit to the number of participants or extent of assistance can be implemented when necessary to also accomplish other Division activities.

4. Clarity: Does the indicator name clearly identify what is being measured? If the name contains jargon, acronyms, or unclear terms, define or clarify them here.

   Yes;
   Deer Management Assistance Program (DMAP): DMAP is a deer management program that allows persons with 500 acres or more apply for antlerless deer tags that can be used during any part of the deer season and mandatory reporting of physical deer data.

5. Validity, Reliability, and Accuracy: Has the indicator been audited by the Office of the Legislative Auditor? If so, what was the result/finding? If not, how can you assure that the indicator is valid, reliable and accurate?

No. Participants are determined through the application and fee payment process.

6. Data Source, Collection and Reporting: What is the source of data to be reported? What is the frequency and timing of collection and reporting (monthly, quarterly, annual)?

Annual.

7. Calculation and Methodology: How is the indicator calculated?

It is the simple count of the number of participants in DMAP.

8. Scope: Is the indicator Aggregated or DisAggregated (is it a sum of smaller parts or is it a part of a larger whole)? Example – if the indicator is a statewide figure, can it be broken down by parish or region?

Aggregated.

9. Caveats: Does the indicator have limitations or weaknesses (lack of precision or timeliness, difficult to collect, external factors)?

The Wildlife Division has no control over the number of participants. Changes from current deer hunting regulations could greatly influence the number of participants enrolled.

10. Responsible Person: Who is responsible for data collection, analysis and quality? Provide name, title, and contact information for all persons involved in collection and reporting.

    Larry Savage, DMAP Coordinator, 225/765-2350

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **Wildlife**

Objective: **To enhance wildlife habitat on private lands and non-Department public lands by providing 15,000 wildlife management technical assistance responses to the public and other agencies/NGOs.**

Indicator Name: **Number of acres in the DMAP**

1. Type and Level: What is the type of the indicator (input, output, outcome, efficiency, quality)? What is the level at which the indicator will be reported (key, supporting, general performance information)?

Input; Key

2. Rationale: What is the rationale for the indicator? Why was it selected? How does it help measure achievement of the objective?

   It is one measure of the extent of reach of the Division's technical staff.

3. Use: How will the indicator be used in management decision-making and other agency processes? Will it be used only for internal management purposes or will it also be used for budgeted purposes?

   It provides an index to workload of the Division's biological staff since number of acres is correlated to number of participants. A limit to the number of participants or extent of assistance can be implemented when necessary to also accomplish other Division activities.

4. Clarity: Does the indicator name clearly identify what is being measured? If the name contains jargon, acronyms, or unclear terms, define or clarify them here.

   Yes;
   DMAP: DMAP is a deer management program that allows persons with 500 acres or more apply for antlerless deer tags that can be used during any part of the deer season and mandatory reporting of physical deer data.

5. Validity, Reliability, and Accuracy: Has the indicator been audited by the Office of the Legislative Auditor? If so, what was the result/finding? If not, how can you assure that the indicator is valid, reliable and accurate?

   No. Participants are determined through the application and fee payment process based on

acres.

6. Data Source, Collection and Reporting: What is the source of data to be reported? What is the frequency and timing of collection and reporting (monthly, quarterly, annual)?

   Annual.

7. Calculation and Methodology: How is the indicator calculated?

   It is the simple count of the number of participants in DMAP.

8. Scope: Is the indicator Aggregated or DisAggregated (is it a sum of smaller parts or is it a part of a larger whole)? Example – if the indicator is a statewide figure, can it be broken down by parish or region?

   Aggregated.

9. Caveats: Does the indicator have limitations or weaknesses (lack of precision or timeliness, difficult to collect, external factors)?

   The Wildlife Division has no control over the number of participants. Changes from current deer hunting regulations could greatly influence the number of participants enrolled.

10. Responsible Person: Who is responsible for data collection, analysis and quality? Provide name, title, and contact information for all persons involved in collection and reporting.

    Larry Savage, DMAP Coordinator, 225/765-2350

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **Wildlife**

Objective: **To enhance wildlife habitat on private lands and non-Department public lands by providing 15,000 wildlife management technical assistance responses to the public and other agencies/NGOs.**

Indicator Name: **Number of DMAP tags used**

1. Type and Level: What is the type of the indicator (input, output, outcome, efficiency, quality)? What is the level at which the indicator will be reported (key, supporting, general performance information)?

Input; Supporting

2. Rationale: What is the rationale for the indicator? Why was it selected? How does it help measure achievement of the objective?

   It provides an index to effectiveness of the Wildlife Division's technical staff.

3. Use: How will the indicator be used in management decision-making and other agency processes? Will it be used only for internal management purposes or will it also be used for budgeted purposes?

   Tag usage in conjunction with habitat and animal characteristics are used to assess the status of deer herds. Adjustments in tag allocations by habitat type can be made based on these evaluations.

4. Clarity: Does the indicator name clearly identify what is being measured? If the name contains jargon, acronyms, or unclear terms, define or clarify them here.

   Yes;
   DMAP: DMAP is a deer management program that allows persons with 500 acres or more apply for antlerless deer tags that can be used during any part of the deer season and mandatory reporting of physical deer data.

5. Validity, Reliability, and Accuracy: Has the indicator been audited by the Office of the Legislative Auditor? If so, what was the result/finding? If not, how can you assure that the indicator is valid, reliable and accurate?

   No. Tag allocation is determined after the application process. Participants are required to keep records and return unused tags.

6. Data Source, Collection and Reporting: What is the source of data to be reported? What is the frequency and timing of collection and reporting (monthly, quarterly, annual)?

   Annual.

7. Calculation and Methodology: How is the indicator calculated?

   It is the simple ratio of the tags allocated to tags used in DMAP.

8. Scope: Is the indicator Aggregated or DisAggregated (is it a sum of smaller parts or is it a part of a larger whole)? Example – if the indicator is a statewide figure, can it be broken down by parish or region?

   Aggregated.

9. Caveats: Does the indicator have limitations or weaknesses (lack of precision or timeliness, difficult to collect, external factors)?

   The Wildlife Division has no control over whether participants used their allotted tags. Changes from current deer hunting regulations could greatly influence the number of tags issued.

10. Responsible Person: Who is responsible for data collection, analysis and quality? Provide name, title, and contact information for all persons involved in collection and reporting.

    Larry Savage, DMAP Coordinator, 225/765-2350

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **Wildlife**

Objective: **To enhance wildlife habitat on private lands and non-Department public lands by providing 15,000 wildlife management technical assistance responses to the public and other agencies/NGOs.**

Indicator Name: Number of participants in the Landowner Antlerless Deer Tag Program (LATD)

1. Type and Level: What is the type of the indicator (input, output, outcome, efficiency, quality)? What is the level at which the indicator will be reported (key, supporting, general performance information)?

Input; Key

2. Rationale: What is the rationale for the indicator? Why was it selected? How does it help measure achievement of the objective?

   It is one measure of the workload of the Division's technical staff.

3. Use: How will the indicator be used in management decision-making and other agency processes? Will it be used only for internal management purposes or will it also be used for budgeted purposes?

   It provides an index to workload of the Division's biological staff. A limit to the number of participants or extent of assistance can be implemented when necessary to also accomplish other Division activities.

4. Clarity: Does the indicator name clearly identify what is being measured? If the name contains jargon, acronyms, or unclear terms, define or clarify them here.

   Yes;
   Landowner Antlerless Deer Tag Program (LADT): LADT is a deer management program that allows persons with greater than 40 acres apply for antlerless deer tags that can be used during any part of the deer season and only basic harvest data reporting is required.

5. Validity, Reliability, and Accuracy: Has the indicator been audited by the Office of the Legislative Auditor? If so, what was the result/finding? If not, how can you assure that the indicator is valid, reliable and accurate?

   No. Participants are determined through the application and fee payment process.

6. Data Source, Collection and Reporting: What is the source of data to be reported? What is the frequency and timing of collection and reporting (monthly, quarterly, annual)?

   Annual.

7. Calculation and Methodology: How is the indicator calculated?

   It is the simple count of the number of participants in LADT.

8. Scope: Is the indicator Aggregated or DisAggregated (is it a sum of smaller parts or is it a part of a larger whole)? Example – if the indicator is a statewide figure, can it be broken down by parish or region?

   Aggregated.

9. Caveats: Does the indicator have limitations or weaknesses (lack of precision or timeliness, difficult to collect, external factors)?

   The Wildlife Division has no control over the number of participants. Changes from current deer hunting regulations could greatly influence the number of participants enrolled.

10. Responsible Person: Who is responsible for data collection, analysis and quality? Provide name, title, and contact information for all persons involved in collection and reporting.

    Dave Moreland, Deer Program Manager, 225/765-2350

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **Wildlife**

Objective: **To enhance wildlife habitat on private lands and non-Department public lands by providing 15,000 wildlife management technical assistance responses to the public and other agencies/NGOs.**

Indicator Name: Number of acres LADT

1. Type and Level: What is the type of the indicator (input, output, outcome, efficiency, quality)? What is the level at which the indicator will be reported (key, supporting, general performance information)?

   Input; Key

2. Rationale: What is the rationale for the indicator? Why was it selected? How does it help measure achievement of the objective?

   It is one measure of the extent of reach of the Division's technical staff.

3. Use: How will the indicator be used in management decision-making and other agency processes? Will it be used only for internal management purposes or will it also be used for budgeted purposes?

   It provides an index to workload of the Division's biological staff since number of acres is correlated to number of participants. A limit to the number of participants or extent of assistance can be implemented when necessary to also accomplish other Division activities.

4. Clarity: Does the indicator name clearly identify what is being measured? If the name contains jargon, acronyms, or unclear terms, define or clarify them here.

   Yes;
   LADT: LADT is a deer management program that allows persons with greater than 40 acres apply for antlerless deer tags that can be used during any part of the deer season and only basic harvest data reporting is required.

5. Validity, Reliability, and Accuracy: Has the indicator been audited by the Office of the Legislative Auditor? If so, what was the result/finding? If not, how can you assure that the indicator is valid, reliable and accurate?

   No. Participants are determined through the application and fee payment process based on

acres.

6. Data Source, Collection and Reporting: What is the source of data to be reported? What is the frequency and timing of collection and reporting (monthly, quarterly, annual)?

   Annual.

7. Calculation and Methodology: How is the indicator calculated?

   It is the simple count of the number of participants in LADT.

8. Scope: Is the indicator Aggregated or DisAggregated (is it a sum of smaller parts or is it a part of a larger whole)? Example – if the indicator is a statewide figure, can it be broken down by parish or region?

   Aggregated.

9. Caveats: Does the indicator have limitations or weaknesses (lack of precision or timeliness, difficult to collect, external factors)?

   The Wildlife Division has no control over the number of participants. Changes from current deer hunting regulations could greatly influence the number of participants enrolled.

10. Responsible Person: Who is responsible for data collection, analysis and quality? Provide name, title, and contact information for all persons involved in collection and reporting.

    Dave Moreland, Deer Program Manager, 225/765-2350

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **Wildlife**

Objective: **To enhance wildlife habitat on private lands and non-Department public lands by providing 15,000 wildlife management technical assistance responses to the public and other agencies/NGOs.**

Indicator Name: Number of LADT tags used

1. Type and Level: What is the type of the indicator (input, output, outcome, efficiency, quality)? What is the level at which the indicator will be reported (key, supporting, general performance information)?

   Outcome; Supporting

2. Rationale: What is the rationale for the indicator? Why was it selected? How does it help measure achievement of the objective?

   It provides an index to effectiveness of the Wildlife Division's technical staff.

3. Use: How will the indicator be used in management decision-making and other agency processes? Will it be used only for internal management purposes or will it also be used for budgeted purposes?

   Tag usage in conjunction with habitat and animal characteristics are used to assess the status of deer herds. Adjustments in tag allocations by habitat type can be made based on these evaluations.

4. Clarity: Does the indicator name clearly identify what is being measured? If the name contains jargon, acronyms, or unclear terms, define or clarify them here.

   Yes;
   LADT: LADT is a deer management program that allows persons with greater than 40 acres apply for antlerless deer tags that can be used during any part of the deer season and only basic harvest data reporting is required.

5. Validity, Reliability, and Accuracy: Has the indicator been audited by the Office of the Legislative Auditor? If so, what was the result/finding? If not, how can you assure that the indicator is valid, reliable and accurate?

   No. Tag allocation is determined after the application process. Participants are required to keep records and return unused tags.

6. Data Source, Collection and Reporting: What is the source of data to be reported? What is the frequency and timing of collection and reporting (monthly, quarterly, annual)?

   Annual.

7. Calculation and Methodology: How is the indicator calculated?

   It is the simple ratio of the tags allocated to tags used in LADT.

8. Scope: Is the indicator Aggregated or DisAggregated (is it a sum of smaller parts or is it a part of a larger whole)? Example – if the indicator is a statewide figure, can it be broken down by parish or region?

   Aggregated.

9. Caveats: Does the indicator have limitations or weaknesses (lack of precision or timeliness, difficult to collect, external factors)?

   The Wildlife Division has no control over whether participants used their allotted tags. Changes from current deer hunting regulations could greatly influence the number of tags issued.

10. Responsible Person: Who is responsible for data collection, analysis and quality? Provide name, title, and contact information for all persons involved in collection and reporting.

    Dave Moreland, Deer Program Manager, 225/765-2350

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **Wildlife**

Objective: **To enhance wildlife habitat on private lands and non-Department public lands by providing 15,000 wildlife management technical assistance responses to the public and other agencies/NGOs.**

Indicator Name: **Number of participants in the Forest Stewardship Program**

1. Type and Level: What is the type of the indicator (input, output, outcome, efficiency, quality)? What is the level at which the indicator will be reported (key, supporting, general performance information)?

Input; Key

2. Rationale: What is the rationale for the indicator? Why was it selected? How does it help measure achievement of the objective?

   It is one measure of the workload of the Division's technical staff.

3. Use: How will the indicator be used in management decision-making and other agency processes? Will it be used only for internal management purposes or will it also be used for budgeted purposes?

   It provides an index to workload of the Division's biological staff. A limit to the number of participants or extent of assistance can be implemented when necessary to also accomplish other Division activities.

4. Clarity: Does the indicator name clearly identify what is being measured? If the name contains jargon, acronyms, or unclear terms, define or clarify them here.

   Yes;
   Forest Stewardship Program: Forest Stewardship is a multiple resource management program under the Office of Forestry. A LDWF Wildlife Division biologist develops management plans for participants that are interested in wildlife.

5. Validity, Reliability, and Accuracy: Has the indicator been audited by the Office of the Legislative Auditor? If so, what was the result/finding? If not, how can you assure that the indicator is valid, reliable and accurate?

   No. Participants are determined through the application process.

6. Data Source, Collection and Reporting: What is the source of data to be reported? What is the frequency and timing of collection and reporting (monthly, quarterly, annual)?

   Annual.

7. Calculation and Methodology: How is the indicator calculated?

   It is the simple count of the number of participants in Forest Stewardship. Note: Enrollment is multi-year. Additions and deletions are made as they occur.

8. Scope: Is the indicator Aggregated or DisAggregated (is it a sum of smaller parts or is it a part of a larger whole)? Example – if the indicator is a statewide figure, can it be broken down by parish or region?

   Aggregated.

9. Caveats: Does the indicator have limitations or weaknesses (lack of precision or timeliness, difficult to collect, external factors)?

   The Wildlife Division has no control over the number of participants. Changes the forest products market can change how people want to manage their forestlands.

10. Responsible Person: Who is responsible for data collection, analysis and quality? Provide name, title, and contact information for all persons involved in collection and reporting.

    Kenny Ribbeck, Forestry Supervisor, 225/765-2350

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **Wildlife**

Objective: **To enhance wildlife habitat on private lands and non-Department public lands by providing 15,000 wildlife management technical assistance responses to the public and other agencies/NGOs.**

Indicator Name: **Number of acres in the Forest Stewardship Program**

1. Type and Level: What is the type of the indicator (input, output, outcome, efficiency, quality)? What is the level at which the indicator will be reported (key, supporting, general performance information)?

Input; Supporting

2. Rationale: What is the rationale for the indicator? Why was it selected? How does it help measure achievement of the objective?

   It is one measure of the extent of reach of the Wildlife Division's technical staff.

3. Use: How will the indicator be used in management decision-making and other agency processes? Will it be used only for internal management purposes or will it also be used for budgeted purposes?

   It provides an index to workload of the Division's biological staff since number of acres is correlated to number of participants. A limit to the number of participants or extent of assistance can be implemented when necessary to also accomplish other Division activities.

4. Clarity: Does the indicator name clearly identify what is being measured? If the name contains jargon, acronyms, or unclear terms, define or clarify them here.

   Yes;
   Forest Stewardship Program: Forest Stewardship is a multiple resource management program under the Office of Forestry. A LDWF Wildlife Division biologist develops management plans for participants that are interested in wildlife.

5. Validity, Reliability, and Accuracy: Has the indicator been audited by the Office of the Legislative Auditor? If so, what was the result/finding? If not, how can you assure that the indicator is valid, reliable and accurate?

   No. Acreage is based on the application process.

6. Data Source, Collection and Reporting: What is the source of data to be reported? What is the frequency and timing of collection and reporting (monthly, quarterly, annual)?

   Annual.

7. Calculation and Methodology: How is the indicator calculated?

   It is the simple count of the number of acres in LADT. Note: Enrollment is multi-year. Additions and deletions are made as they occur.

8. Scope: Is the indicator Aggregated or DisAggregated (is it a sum of smaller parts or is it a part of a larger whole)? Example – if the indicator is a statewide figure, can it be broken down by parish or region?

   Aggregated.

9. Caveats: Does the indicator have limitations or weaknesses (lack of precision or timeliness, difficult to collect, external factors)?

   The Wildlife Division has no control over the number of participants. Changes the forest products market can change how people want to manage their forestlands.

10. Responsible Person: Who is responsible for data collection, analysis and quality? Provide name, title, and contact information for all persons involved in collection and reporting.

    Kenny Ribbeck, Forestry Supervisor, 225/765-2350

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **Wildlife**

Objective: **To enhance wildlife habitat on private lands and non-Department public lands by providing 15,000 wildlife management technical assistance responses to the public and other agencies/NGOs.**

Indicator Name: Number of acres in the Louisiana Waterfowl Program (LWP)

1. Type and Level: What is the type of the indicator (input, output, outcome, efficiency, quality)? What is the level at which the indicator will be reported (key, supporting, general performance information)?

Input; Supporting

2. Rationale: What is the rationale for the indicator? Why was it selected? How does it help measure achievement of the objective?

   It is one measure of the extent of reach of the Wildlife Division's technical staff through applicant review and, to a lesser extent, field inspections.

3. Use: How will the indicator be used in management decision-making and other agency processes? Will it be used only for internal management purposes or will it also be used for budgeted purposes?

   It provides an index to Wildlife Division's commitment to wetland and waterfowl management as well as technical staff workload. Budgetary constraints could result in restructuring of how LWP operates.

4. Clarity: Does the indicator name clearly identify what is being measured? If the name contains jargon, acronyms, or unclear terms, define or clarify them here.

   Yes;
   Louisiana Waterfowl Program: LWP is a wetlands and waterfowl habitat development program that is administered by Ducks Unlimited. The LDWF provides major funding for the program as well as technical review and approval of proposed projects.

5. Validity, Reliability, and Accuracy: Has the indicator been audited by the Office of the Legislative Auditor? If so, what was the result/finding? If not, how can you assure that the indicator is valid, reliable and accurate?

No. Acreage is based on the application process.

6. Data Source, Collection and Reporting: What is the source of data to be reported? What is the frequency and timing of collection and reporting (monthly, quarterly, annual)?

   Quarterly.

7. Calculation and Methodology: How is the indicator calculated?

   It is the simple count of the number of acres in LWP. Note: Enrollment is multi-year. Additions and deletions are made as they occur.

8. Scope: Is the indicator Aggregated or DisAggregated (is it a sum of smaller parts or is it a part of a larger whole)? Example – if the indicator is a statewide figure, can it be broken down by parish or region?

   Aggregated.

9. Caveats: Does the indicator have limitations or weaknesses (lack of precision or timeliness, difficult to collect, external factors)?

   The Wildlife Division has no control over the number of participants. Changes in agriculture commodity prices, economic health, and continental waterfowl populations can change how people want to manage their lands.

10. Responsible Person: Who is responsible for data collection, analysis and quality? Provide name, title, and contact information for all persons involved in collection and reporting.

    Robert Helm, Waterfowl Program Manager, 225/765-2350

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **Wildlife**

Objective: **To enhance wildlife habitat on private lands and non-Department public lands by providing 15,000 wildlife management technical assistance responses to the public and other agencies/NGOs.**

Indicator Name: **Number of state, regional, national, and international agency/NGO committees with biological staff representation**

1. Type and Level: What is the type of the indicator (input, output, outcome, efficiency, quality)? What is the level at which the indicator will be reported (key, supporting, general performance information)?

   Input; Supporting

2. Rationale: What is the rationale for the indicator? Why was it selected? How does it help measure achievement of the objective?

Technical advisory committees often have large impacts on the development and implementation of potentially wildlife friendly programs at the state, national, and international level such as the conservation provisions of the 2002 Farm Bill and the North American Waterfowl Management Plan.

3. Use: How will the indicator be used in management decision-making and other agency processes? Will it be used only for internal management purposes or will it also be used for budgeted purposes?

It provides an index to Wildlife Division's commitment to wildlife management at state, regional, national, and international levels as well as technical staff workload. A limit to the number or extent of technical advisory committee activity and travel can be implemented when necessary because of staff or budgetary constraints.

4. Clarity: Does the indicator name clearly identify what is being measured? If the name contains jargon, acronyms, or unclear terms, define or clarify them here.

Yes;

Biological Staff: All full-time professional biological staff at the Program Manager level and below.

Committees: These vary from state fish and wildlife director's study committees to federal committees to local conservation organization boards and other wildlife NGOs.

5. Validity, Reliability, and Accuracy: Has the indicator been audited by the Office of the Legislative Auditor? If so, what was the result/finding? If not, how can you assure that the indicator is valid, reliable and accurate?

No. It is a simple count of the number of committees on which the technical staff serves.

6. Data Source, Collection and Reporting: What is the source of data to be reported? What is the frequency and timing of collection and reporting (monthly, quarterly, annual)?

Annual.

7. Calculation and Methodology: How is the indicator calculated?

It is a simple count of the number of technical advisory committees on which the technical staff serves.

8. Scope: Is the indicator Aggregated or DisAggregated (is it a sum of smaller parts or is it a part of a larger whole)? Example – if the indicator is a statewide figure, can it be broken down by parish or region?

Disaggregated because the value does not include administrative level biological staff that also serve on a number of committees.

9. Caveats: Does the indicator have limitations or weaknesses (lack of precision or timeliness, difficult to collect, external factors)?

Budgetary constraints can limit the degree which technical staff participates on committees. Also, different committees are more active and require more time while others may be less active but ultimately have greater influence. However, all can contribute to implementation of sound management policies.

10. Responsible Person: Who is responsible for data collection, analysis and quality? Provide name, title, and contact information for all persons involved in collection and reporting.

Steve Hebert, Regional Supervisor, 318/371-3050

Jerald Owens, Regional Supervisor, 318/343-4044
Czerny Newland, Regional Supervisor, 318/487-5887
Reggie Wycoff, Regional Supervisor, 318/757-4571
John Robinette, Regional Supervisor, 337/491-2575
Kerney Sonnier, Regional Supervisor, 337/948-0255
John Mullins, Regional Supervisor, 225/765-2361
Kenny Ribbeck, Forestry Supervisor, 225/765-2350
David Moreland, Deer Program Manager, 225/765-2350
Robert Helm, Waterfowl Program Manager, 225/765-2350
Fred Kimmel, Upland Program Manager, 225/765-2350
Mike Olinde, Research Program Manager, 225/765-2350
Jimmy Anthony, Federal Aid Coordinator, 225/765-2350
Randy Myers, Land Acquisition Coordinator, 225/765-2350

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **Wildlife**

Objective: **Manage wildlife populations for sustainable harvest and/or other recreational opportunities through survey and research resulting in 215 days of hunting opportunity for game species.**

Indicator Name: Number of research projects (monitored, leading, supporting, or developed)

1. Type and Level: What is the type of the indicator (input, output, outcome, efficiency, quality)? What is the level at which the indicator will be reported (key, supporting, general performance information)?

Output; Key

2. Rationale: What is the rationale for the indicator? Why was it selected? How does it help measure achievement of the objective?

It is a measure of the magnitude of the Wildlife Division's research and assessment efforts.

3. Use: How will the indicator be used in management decision-making and other agency processes? Will it be used only for internal management purposes or will it also be used for budgeted purposes?

   It provides an index to population status for the regulation process. It also is an index to the workload of the Wildlife Division's biological staff. A limit to the number or extent of research projects involving Division personnel can be implemented when necessary because of staff or budget constraints.

4. Clarity: Does the indicator name clearly identify what is being measured? If the name contains jargon, acronyms, or unclear terms, define or clarify them here.

   Yes;
   Research Projects (monitored, leading, supporting, developed): While the Wildlife Division conducts a number of standard population index surveys, it also is an integral part of many other scientific type projects. These range from development and implementation to contracting with a university or another agency to providing limited-considerable logistical support to providing input into the development to simply tracking. Research projects counted will include all of the above ranges.

5. Validity, Reliability, and Accuracy: Has the indicator been audited by the Office of the Legislative Auditor? If so, what was the result/finding? If not, how can you assure that the indicator is valid, reliable and accurate?

No. Ongoing projects meeting the definition provided will be tracked in a spreadsheet database.

6. Data Source, Collection and Reporting: What is the source of data to be reported? What is the frequency and timing of collection and reporting (monthly, quarterly, annual)?

Monthly; Quarterly

7. Calculation and Methodology: How is the indicator calculated?

It is the simple count of the research projects that are conducted on the non-coastal WMAs and through Wildlife Division cooperative endeavors as defined.

8. Scope: Is the indicator Aggregated or DisAggregated (is it a sum of smaller parts or is it a part of a larger whole)? Example – if the indicator is a statewide figure, can it be broken down by parish or region?

Aggregated.

9. Caveats: Does the indicator have limitations or weaknesses (lack of precision or timeliness, difficult to collect, external factors)?

The Wildlife Division has little control over the number of research projects conducted on the non-coastal WMAs because most are conducted by other entities (primarily universities). Also, any given project may result in the expenditure of considerably more budgetary/logistical support than a number of other projects. As a consequence, the simple count may not always be indicative of Division involvement. However, on average, it should provide a good index.

10. Responsible Person: Who is responsible for data collection, analysis and quality? Provide name, title, and contact information for all persons involved in collection and reporting.

Steve Hebert, Regional Supervisor, 318/371-3050

Jerald Owens, Regional Supervisor, 318/343-4044
Czerny Newland, Regional Supervisor, 318/487-5887
Reggie Wycoff, Regional Supervisor, 318/757-4571
John Robinette, Regional Supervisor, 337/491-2575

Kerney Sonnier, Regional Supervisor, 337/948-0255
John Mullins, Regional Supervisor, 225/765-2361
Kenny Ribbeck, Forestry Supervisor, 225/765-2350
David Moreland, Deer Program Manager, 225/765-2350
Robert Helm, Waterfowl Program Manager, 225/765-2350
Fred Kimmel, Upland Program Manager, 225/765-2350
Mike Olinde, Research Program Manager, 225/765-2350
Jimmy Anthony, Federal Aid Coordinator, 225/765-2350
Randy Myers, Land Acquisition Coordinator, 225/765-2350

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **Wildlife**

Objective: **Manage wildlife populations for sustainable harvest and/or other recreational opportunities through survey and research resulting in 215 days of hunting opportunity for game species.**

Indicator Name: **Number of species surveys/habitat/population evaluations**

1. Type and Level: What is the type of the indicator (input, output, outcome, efficiency, quality)? What is the level at which the indicator will be reported (key, supporting, general performance information)?

Output; Key.

2. Rationale: What is the rationale for the indicator? Why was it selected? How does it help measure achievement of the objective?

Species surveys/habitat/population evaluations provide important data for assessment of management activities and for the regulation setting process.

3. Use: How will the indicator be used in management decision-making and other agency processes? Will it be used only for internal management purposes or will it also be used for budgeted purposes?

It provides an index to species health and is used for developing regulation recommendations. It also is an index to the workload of the Wildlife Division's biological staff. A limit to the number or extent of surveys can be implemented when necessary because of staff or budgetary restrictions.

4. Clarity: Does the indicator name clearly identify what is being measured? If the name contains jargon, acronyms, or unclear terms, define or clarify them here.

   Yes;
   Species surveys/habitat/population evaluations: The Division conducts a number of standard population index surveys. A species survey/habitat/population evaluation will be a formal survey with documentation. For example, approximately 55 quail fall count

and 19 mourning dove coo-count survey routes are located across the state and run each year. Division staff also conducts deer browse surveys to develop indices to number of deer relative to the habitat. Waterfowl surveys are flown monthly during the late fall and winter with indices developed for 5 regions of the state. Additionally, physical data from deer (age, sex, weight, antler development, and/or production) are collected and evaluated to provide a better understanding of the population status and physical condition. Harvest data are developed using mail surveys that also allow the development of another type of index to the population status of various game species.

5. Validity, Reliability, and Accuracy: Has the indicator been audited by the Office of the Legislative Auditor? If so, what was the result/finding? If not, how can you assure that the indicator is valid, reliable and accurate?

No. Data are kept on these activities, which are important functions of the biological staff, and reported monthly to quarterly.

6. Data Source, Collection and Reporting: What is the source of data to be reported? What is the frequency and timing of collection and reporting (monthly, quarterly, annual)?

Monthly; Quarterly

7. Calculation and Methodology: How is the indicator calculated?

It is a simple count of the number of species survey/habitat/population evaluations conducted by full-time technical staff.

8. Scope: Is the indicator Aggregated or DisAggregated (is it a sum of smaller parts or is it a part of a larger whole)? Example – if the indicator is a statewide figure, can it be broken down by parish or region?

Aggregated.

9. Caveats: Does the indicator have limitations or weaknesses (lack of precision or timeliness, difficult to collect, external factors)?

   The Division has no control over the majority of the population index surveys conducted because these are done as a result of requests from landowners and hunting clubs. The time it takes to conduct the different types of surveys/evaluations also varies.

10. Responsible Person: Who is responsible for data collection, analysis and quality? Provide name, title, and contact information for all persons involved in collection and reporting.

Steve Hebert, Regional Supervisor, 318/371-3050

Jerald Owens, Regional Supervisor, 318/343-4044
Czerny Newland, Regional Supervisor, 318/487-5887
Reggie Wycoff, Regional Supervisor, 318/757-4571
John Robinette, Regional Supervisor, 337/491-2575
Kerney Sonnier, Regional Supervisor, 337/948-0255
John Mullins, Regional Supervisor, 225/765-2361
Kenny Ribbeck, Forestry Supervisor, 225/765-2350
David Moreland, Deer Program Manager, 225/765-2350
Robert Helm, Waterfowl Program Manager, 225/765-2350
Fred Kimmel, Upland Program Manager, 225/765-2350
Mike Olinde, Research Program Manager, 225/765-2350
Jimmy Anthony, Federal Aid Coordinator, 225/765-2350
Randy Myers, Land Acquisition Coordinator, 225/765-2350

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **Wildlife**

Objective: **Manage wildlife populations for sustainable harvest and/or other recreational opportunities through survey and research resulting in 215 days of hunting opportunity for game species.**

Indicator Name: **Percent of game species with indices developed**

1. Type and Level: What is the type of the indicator (input, output, outcome, efficiency, quality)? What is the level at which the indicator will be reported (key, supporting, general performance information)?

Output; Supporting.

2. Rationale: What is the rationale for the indicator? Why was it selected? How does it help measure achievement of the objective?

Long-term game species indices provide important data for assessment of the status of game populations and can be used in the regulation setting process.

3. Use: How will the indicator be used in management decision-making and other agency processes? Will it be used only for internal management purposes or will it also be used for budgeted purposes?

It provides an index to game species health and can be used for developing regulation recommendations. Because percent of game species with indices developed is correlated with indices developed, it also is an index to the workload of the Wildlife Division's biological staff. A limit to the number or extent of surveys can be implemented when necessary because of staff or budgetary restrictions.

4. Clarity: Does the indicator name clearly identify what is being measured? If the name contains jargon, acronyms, or unclear terms, define or clarify them here.

   Yes;
   Game Species Index: The Division conducts a number of standard population index surveys. A game species index will be any formal survey with documentation. For example, approximately 55 quail fall count and 19 mourning dove coo-count survey routes are located across the state and run each year. Division staff also conducts deer browse surveys to develop indices to number of deer relative to the habitat. Waterfowl

surveys are flown monthly during the late fall and winter with indices developed for 5 regions of the state. Additionally, physical data from deer (age, sex, weight, antler development, and/or production) are collected and evaluated to provide a better understanding of the population status and physical condition.

5. Validity, Reliability, and Accuracy: Has the indicator been audited by the Office of the Legislative Auditor? If so, what was the result/finding? If not, how can you assure that the indicator is valid, reliable and accurate?

No. Data are kept on these activities, which are important functions of the biological staff, and reported monthly to quarterly.

6. Data Source, Collection and Reporting: What is the source of data to be reported? What is the frequency and timing of collection and reporting (monthly, quarterly, annual)?

Annual

7. Calculation and Methodology: How is the indicator calculated?

It is the simple proportion of the number of game species in the state with indices developed. There are 14 species of game in Louisiana. (Only 1 species each is associated with ducks, geese, rails, and gallinules even though these groups actually represent more than 1 species. For example, over 15 species of ducks can be found in Louisiana during the course of a year.)

8. Scope: Is the indicator Aggregated or DisAggregated (is it a sum of smaller parts or is it a part of a larger whole)? Example – if the indicator is a statewide figure, can it be broken down by parish or region?

Aggregated.

9. Caveats: Does the indicator have limitations or weaknesses (lack of precision or timeliness, difficult to collect, external factors)?

   The time it takes to develop the different types of indices vary. A commonly used index for many species of resident small game and migratory birds is harvest/day hunted and opening weekend (day) harvest per hunter on WMAs. One is developed through a mail survey that requires a fair amount of time of a few people while the other is a result of bag checks that takes about essentially a day, but with the use of many people.

10. Responsible Person: Who is responsible for data collection, analysis and quality? Provide name, title, and contact information for all persons involved in collection and reporting.

    Mike Olinde, Research Program Manager, 225/765-2350

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **Wildlife**

Objective: **Manage wildlife populations for sustainable harvest and/or other recreational opportunities through survey and research resulting in 215 days of hunting opportunity for game species.**

Indicator Name: **Number of days of hunting offered**

1. Type and Level: What is the type of the indicator (input, output, outcome, efficiency, quality)? What is the level at which the indicator will be reported (key, supporting, general performance information)?

Outcome; General Performance Information

2. Rationale: What is the rationale for the indicator? Why was it selected? How does it help measure achievement of the objective?

It is a measurable activity that is part of stewardship and contributes to the overall goal of maintaining wildlife populations and increasing the opportunities for the public to enjoy their outdoor experiences.

3. Use: How will the indicator be used in management decision-making and other agency processes? Will it be used only for internal management purposes or will it also be used for budgeted purposes?

It provides an index to the degree of public hunting opportunities in the state.

4. Clarity: Does the indicator name clearly identify what is being measured? If the name contains jargon, acronyms, or unclear terms, define or clarify them here.

No.

5. Validity, Reliability, and Accuracy: Has the indicator been audited by the Office of the Legislative Auditor? If so, what was the result/finding? If not, how can you assure that the indicator is valid, reliable and accurate?

No. It is an easily documented value.

6. Data Source, Collection and Reporting: What is the source of data to be reported? What is the frequency and timing of collection and reporting (monthly, quarterly, annual)?

Annual.

7. Calculation and Methodology: How is the indicator calculated?

It is the maximum number of total days of hunting allowed. Overlapping seasons do not count as more than 1 day and the most liberal season in the state is used if more than 1 season for a species is set. For example, the archery season for deer in the state generally starts 1 October and runs 31 January. Concurrently, there are squirrel, duck, etc. seasons also open during much/most of this period. The count would be the total calendar days for this period (123) and the days the duck and squirrel seasons are open during this period are not added to the count nor are the deer gun hunting days that also occur during that period. Similarly, there are 3 wild turkey Areas in the state. The fewest number of days open to turkey hunting within these Areas is 9 and the greatest is 30. Thirty would be added to the days of hunting allowed.

8. Scope: Is the indicator Aggregated or DisAggregated (is it a sum of smaller parts or is it a part of a larger whole)? Example – if the indicator is a statewide figure, can it be broken down by parish or region?

Aggregated.

9. Caveats: Does the indicator have limitations or weaknesses (lack of precision or timeliness, difficult to collect, external factors)?

It will not reflect a change in bag limit (increase or decrease) and some season lengths (migratory birds) are determined by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and not the Department.

10. Responsible Person: Who is responsible for data collection, analysis and quality? Provide name, title, and contact information for all persons involved in collection and reporting.

Mike Olinde, Research Program Manager, 225/765-2350

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **Wildlife**

Objective: **Manage wildlife populations for sustainable harvest and/or other recreational opportunities through survey and research resulting in 215 days of hunting opportunity for game species.**

Indicator Name: **Total number hunter-days annually**

1. Type and Level: What is the type of the indicator (input, output, outcome, efficiency, quality)? What is the level at which the indicator will be reported (key, supporting, general performance information)?

Outcome; Supporting

2. Rationale: What is the rationale for the indicator? Why was it selected? How does it help measure achievement of the objective?

It is a measurable activity that is part of stewardship and contributes to the overall goal of maintaining wildlife populations and increasing the opportunities for the public to enjoy their outdoor experiences.

3. Use: How will the indicator be used in management decision-making and other agency processes? Will it be used only for internal management purposes or will it also be used for budgeted purposes?

It provides an index to the degree of public hunting opportunities in the state.

4. Clarity: Does the indicator name clearly identify what is being measured? If the name contains jargon, acronyms, or unclear terms, define or clarify them here.

No.

5. Validity, Reliability, and Accuracy: Has the indicator been audited by the Office of the Legislative Auditor? If so, what was the result/finding? If not, how can you assure that the indicator is valid, reliable and accurate?

No. It is an easily documented value.

6. Data Source, Collection and Reporting: What is the source of data to be reported? What is the frequency and timing of collection and reporting (monthly, quarterly, annual)?

Annual.

7. Calculation and Methodology: How is the indicator calculated?

It calculated through standard methodology used for a harvest survey.

8. Scope: Is the indicator Aggregated or DisAggregated (is it a sum of smaller parts or is it a part of a larger whole)? Example – if the indicator is a statewide figure, can it be broken down by parish or region?

Aggregated.

9. Caveats: Does the indicator have limitations or weaknesses (lack of precision or timeliness, difficult to collect, external factors)?

It will not reflect a change in bag limit (increase or decrease) and some season lengths (migratory birds) are determined by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and not the Department.

10. Responsible Person: Who is responsible for data collection, analysis and quality? Provide name, title, and contact information for all persons involved in collection and reporting.

Mike Olinde, Research Program Manager, 225/765-2350

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **Wildlife**

Objective: **Manage wildlife populations for sustainable harvest and/or other recreational opportunities through survey and research resulting in 215 days of hunting opportunity for game species.**

Indicator Name: **Number of wood duck boxes monitored**

1. Type and Level: What is the type of the indicator (input, output, outcome, efficiency, quality)? What is the level at which the indicator will be reported (key, supporting, general performance information)?

Output; Supporting.

2. Rationale: What is the rationale for the indicator? Why was it selected? How does it help measure achievement of the objective?

Long-term game species indices provide important data for assessment of the status of game populations and can be used in the regulation setting process.

3. Use: How will the indicator be used in management decision-making and other agency processes? Will it be used only for internal management purposes or will it also be used for budgeted purposes?

It provides an index to the effectiveness of the wood duck nest box program. It also is an index to the workload of the Wildlife Division's biological staff. A limit to the extent of monitoring can be implemented when necessary because of staff or budgetary restrictions.

4. Clarity: Does the indicator name clearly identify what is being measured? If the name contains jargon, acronyms, or unclear terms, define or clarify them here.

   Yes;
   Monitoring: Monitoring refers to the collection of biological data from the wood duck boxes throughout the nesting season, such as # of eggs and # of eggs hatched.

5. Validity, Reliability, and Accuracy: Has the indicator been audited by the Office of the Legislative Auditor? If so, what was the result/finding? If not, how can you assure that the indicator is valid, reliable and accurate?

No. Data are kept on these activities, which are important functions of the biological staff, and reported annually.

6. Data Source, Collection and Reporting: What is the source of data to be reported? What is the frequency and timing of collection and reporting (monthly, quarterly, annual)?

Annual.

7. Calculation and Methodology: How is the indicator calculated?

It is a simple count of the number of wood duck boxes monitored by Wildlife Division personnel. This value includes boxes located on and off of the non-coastal WMAs.

8. Scope: Is the indicator Aggregated or DisAggregated (is it a sum of smaller parts or is it a part of a larger whole)? Example – if the indicator is a statewide figure, can it be broken down by parish or region?

Aggregated.

9. Caveats: Does the indicator have limitations or weaknesses (lack of precision or timeliness, difficult to collect, external factors)?

No.

10. Responsible Person: Who is responsible for data collection, analysis and quality? Provide name, title, and contact information for all persons involved in collection and reporting.

Steve Hebert, Regional Supervisor, 318/371-3050

Jerald Owens, Regional Supervisor, 318/343-4044
Czerny Newland, Regional Supervisor, 318/487-5887
Reggie Wycoff, Regional Supervisor, 318/757-4571
John Robinette, Regional Supervisor, 337/491-2575
Kerney Sonnier, Regional Supervisor, 337/948-0255
John Mullins, Regional Supervisor, 225/765-2361
Robert Helm, Waterfowl Program Manager, 225/765-2350

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **Wildlife**

Objective: **Manage wildlife populations for sustainable harvest and/or other recreational opportunities through survey and research resulting in 215 days of hunting opportunity for game species.**

Indicator Name: **Number of wood ducks banded**

11. Type and Level: What is the type of the indicator (input, output, outcome, efficiency, quality)? What is the level at which the indicator will be reported (key, supporting, general performance information)?

Output; Supporting.

12. Rationale: What is the rationale for the indicator? Why was it selected? How does it help measure achievement of the objective?

Long-term game species indices provide important data for assessment of the status of game populations and can be used in the regulation setting process. This banding program is part of an effort to get more liberal federal hunting regulations for this species.

13. Use: How will the indicator be used in management decision-making and other agency processes? Will it be used only for internal management purposes or will it also be used for budgeted purposes?

It provides an index to the effectiveness of the wood duck nest box program. It also is an index to the workload of the Wildlife Division's biological staff. A limit to the extent of monitoring can be implemented when necessary because of staff or budgetary restrictions.

14. Clarity: Does the indicator name clearly identify what is being measured? If the name contains jargon, acronyms, or unclear terms, define or clarify them here.

No.

15. Validity, Reliability, and Accuracy: Has the indicator been audited by the Office of the Legislative Auditor? If so, what was the result/finding? If not, how can you assure that the indicator is valid, reliable and accurate?

No. Data are kept on these activities, which are important functions of the biological staff, and reported annually.

16. Data Source, Collection and Reporting: What is the source of data to be reported? What is the frequency and timing of collection and reporting (monthly, quarterly, annual)?

Annual.

17. Calculation and Methodology: How is the indicator calculated?

It is a simple count of the number of wood duck banded by Wildlife Division personnel. This value includes those banded on and off of the non-coastal WMAs.

18. Scope: Is the indicator Aggregated or DisAggregated (is it a sum of smaller parts or is it a part of a larger whole)? Example – if the indicator is a statewide figure, can it be broken down by parish or region?

Aggregated.

19. Caveats: Does the indicator have limitations or weaknesses (lack of precision or timeliness, difficult to collect, external factors)?

No.

20. Responsible Person: Who is responsible for data collection, analysis and quality? Provide name, title, and contact information for all persons involved in collection and reporting.

Steve Hebert, Regional Supervisor, 318/371-3050

Jerald Owens, Regional Supervisor, 318/343-4044
Czerny Newland, Regional Supervisor, 318/487-5887
Reggie Wycoff, Regional Supervisor, 318/757-4571
John Robinette, Regional Supervisor, 337/491-2575
Kerney Sonnier, Regional Supervisor, 337/948-0255
John Mullins, Regional Supervisor, 225/765-2361
Robert Helm, Waterfowl Program Manager, 225/765-2350

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **Wildlife**

Objective: **Manage wildlife populations for sustainable harvest and/or other recreational opportunities through survey and research resulting in 215 days of hunting opportunity for game species.**

Indicator Name: **Deer Harvested**

1. Type and Level: What is the type of the indicator (input, output, outcome, efficiency, quality)? What is the level at which the indicator will be reported (key, supporting, general performance information)?

Outcome; General Performance Information

2. Rationale: What is the rationale for the indicator? Why was it selected? How does it help measure achievement of the objective?

It is a measurable value that should be obtained as part of good stewardship.

3. Use: How will the indicator be used in management decision-making and other agency processes? Will it be used only for internal management purposes or will it also be used for budgeted purposes?

It provides an index to the deer population in the state.

4. Clarity: Does the indicator name clearly identify what is being measured? If the name contains jargon, acronyms, or unclear terms, define or clarify them here.

No.

5. Validity, Reliability, and Accuracy: Has the indicator been audited by the Office of the Legislative Auditor? If so, what was the result/finding? If not, how can you assure that the indicator is valid, reliable and accurate?

No. The value is developed through a mailed survey.

6. Data Source, Collection and Reporting: What is the source of data to be reported? What is the frequency and timing of collection and reporting (monthly, quarterly, annual)?

Annual.

7. Calculation and Methodology: How is the indicator calculated?

It calculated through standard methodology used for a harvest survey.

8. Scope: Is the indicator Aggregated or DisAggregated (is it a sum of smaller parts or is it a part of a larger whole)? Example – if the indicator is a statewide figure, can it be broken down by parish or region?

Disaggregated.

9. Caveats: Does the indicator have limitations or weaknesses (lack of precision or timeliness, difficult to collect, external factors)?

Weather, season length, bag, the number of hunters and days hunted can also influence the harvest value.

10. Responsible Person: Who is responsible for data collection, analysis and quality? Provide name, title, and contact information for all persons involved in collection and reporting.

Mike Olinde, Research Program Manager, 225/765-2350

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **Wildlife**

Objective: **Manage wildlife populations for sustainable harvest and/or other recreational opportunities through survey and research resulting in 215 days of hunting opportunity for game species.**

Indicator Name: **Turkey Harvested**

1. Type and Level: What is the type of the indicator (input, output, outcome, efficiency, quality)? What is the level at which the indicator will be reported (key, supporting, general performance information)?

Outcome; General Performance Information

2. Rationale: What is the rationale for the indicator? Why was it selected? How does it help measure achievement of the objective?

It is a measurable value that should be obtained as part of good stewardship.

3. Use: How will the indicator be used in management decision-making and other agency processes? Will it be used only for internal management purposes or will it also be used for budgeted purposes?

It provides an index to the turkey population in the state.

4. Clarity: Does the indicator name clearly identify what is being measured? If the name contains jargon, acronyms, or unclear terms, define or clarify them here.

No.

5. Validity, Reliability, and Accuracy: Has the indicator been audited by the Office of the Legislative Auditor? If so, what was the result/finding? If not, how can you assure that the indicator is valid, reliable and accurate?

No. The value is developed through a mailed survey.

6. Data Source, Collection and Reporting: What is the source of data to be reported? What is the frequency and timing of collection and reporting (monthly, quarterly, annual)?

Annual.

7. Calculation and Methodology: How is the indicator calculated?

It calculated through standard methodology used for a harvest survey.

8. Scope: Is the indicator Aggregated or DisAggregated (is it a sum of smaller parts or is it a part of a larger whole)? Example – if the indicator is a statewide figure, can it be broken down by parish or region?

Disaggregated.

9. Caveats: Does the indicator have limitations or weaknesses (lack of precision or timeliness, difficult to collect, external factors)?

Weather, season length, bag, number of hunters, and days hunted can also influence the harvest value.

10. Responsible Person: Who is responsible for data collection, analysis and quality? Provide name, title, and contact information for all persons involved in collection and reporting.

Mike Olinde, Research Program Manager, 225/765-2350

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **Wildlife**

Objective: **Manage wildlife populations for sustainable harvest and/or other recreational opportunities through survey and research resulting in 215 days of hunting opportunity for game species.**

Indicator Name: **Duck harvest per hunter season**

1. Type and Level: What is the type of the indicator (input, output, outcome, efficiency, quality)? What is the level at which the indicator will be reported (key, supporting, general performance information)?

Outcome; General Performance Information

2. Rationale: What is the rationale for the indicator? Why was it selected? How does it help measure achievement of the objective?

It is a measurable value that should be obtained as part of good stewardship.

3. Use: How will the indicator be used in management decision-making and other agency processes? Will it be used only for internal management purposes or will it also be used for budgeted purposes?

It provides an index to the duck population.

4. Clarity: Does the indicator name clearly identify what is being measured? If the name contains jargon, acronyms, or unclear terms, define or clarify them here.

Yes, harvest values are per hunter that harvested at least 1 animal.

5. Validity, Reliability, and Accuracy: Has the indicator been audited by the Office of the Legislative Auditor? If so, what was the result/finding? If not, how can you assure that the indicator is valid, reliable and accurate?

No. The value is developed through a mailed survey.

6. Data Source, Collection and Reporting: What is the source of data to be reported? What is the frequency and timing of collection and reporting (monthly, quarterly, annual)?

Annual.

7. Calculation and Methodology: How is the indicator calculated?

It calculated through standard methodology used for a harvest survey.

8. Scope: Is the indicator Aggregated or DisAggregated (is it a sum of smaller parts or is it a part of a larger whole)? Example – if the indicator is a statewide figure, can it be broken down by parish or region?

Disaggregated.

9. Caveats: Does the indicator have limitations or weaknesses (lack of precision or timeliness, difficult to collect, external factors)?

Weather, season length, bag, and days hunted can also influence the harvest value.

10. Responsible Person: Who is responsible for data collection, analysis and quality? Provide name, title, and contact information for all persons involved in collection and reporting.

Mike Olinde, Research Program Manager, 225/765-2350

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **Wildlife**

Objective: **Manage wildlife populations for sustainable harvest and/or other recreational opportunities through survey and research resulting in 215 days of hunting opportunity for game species.**

Indicator Name: **Rabbit harvest per hunter season**

1. Type and Level: What is the type of the indicator (input, output, outcome, efficiency, quality)? What is the level at which the indicator will be reported (key, supporting, general performance information)?

Outcome; General Performance Information

2. Rationale: What is the rationale for the indicator? Why was it selected? How does it help measure achievement of the objective?

It is a measurable value that should be obtained as part of good stewardship.

3. Use: How will the indicator be used in management decision-making and other agency processes? Will it be used only for internal management purposes or will it also be used for budgeted purposes?

It provides an index to the rabbit population.

4. Clarity: Does the indicator name clearly identify what is being measured? If the name contains jargon, acronyms, or unclear terms, define or clarify them here.

Yes, harvest values are per hunter that harvested at least 1 animal.

5. Validity, Reliability, and Accuracy: Has the indicator been audited by the Office of the Legislative Auditor? If so, what was the result/finding? If not, how can you assure that the indicator is valid, reliable and accurate?

No. The value is developed through a mailed survey.

6. Data Source, Collection and Reporting: What is the source of data to be reported? What is the frequency and timing of collection and reporting (monthly, quarterly, annual)?

Annual.

7. Calculation and Methodology: How is the indicator calculated?

It calculated through standard methodology used for a harvest survey.

8. Scope: Is the indicator Aggregated or DisAggregated (is it a sum of smaller parts or is it a part of a larger whole)? Example – if the indicator is a statewide figure, can it be broken down by parish or region?

Disaggregated.

9. Caveats: Does the indicator have limitations or weaknesses (lack of precision or timeliness, difficult to collect, external factors)?

Weather, season length, bag, and days hunted can also influence the harvest value.

10. Responsible Person: Who is responsible for data collection, analysis and quality? Provide name, title, and contact information for all persons involved in collection and reporting.

    Mike Olinde, Research Program Manager, 225/765-2350

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **Wildlife**

Objective: **Manage wildlife populations for sustainable harvest and/or other recreational opportunities through survey and research resulting in 215 days of hunting opportunity for game species.**

Indicator Name: **Quail harvest per hunter season**

1. Type and Level: What is the type of the indicator (input, output, outcome, efficiency, quality)? What is the level at which the indicator will be reported (key, supporting, general performance information)?

Outcome; General Performance Information

2. Rationale: What is the rationale for the indicator? Why was it selected? How does it help measure achievement of the objective?

It is a measurable value that should be obtained as part of good stewardship.

3. Use: How will the indicator be used in management decision-making and other agency processes? Will it be used only for internal management purposes or will it also be used for budgeted purposes?

It provides an index to the quail population.

4. Clarity: Does the indicator name clearly identify what is being measured? If the name contains jargon, acronyms, or unclear terms, define or clarify them here.

Yes, harvest values are per hunter that harvested at least 1 animal.

5. Validity, Reliability, and Accuracy: Has the indicator been audited by the Office of the Legislative Auditor? If so, what was the result/finding? If not, how can you assure that the indicator is valid, reliable and accurate?

No. The value is developed through a mailed survey.

6. Data Source, Collection and Reporting: What is the source of data to be reported? What is the frequency and timing of collection and reporting (monthly, quarterly, annual)?

Annual.

7. Calculation and Methodology: How is the indicator calculated?

It calculated through standard methodology used for a harvest survey.

8. Scope: Is the indicator Aggregated or DisAggregated (is it a sum of smaller parts or is it a part of a larger whole)? Example – if the indicator is a statewide figure, can it be broken down by parish or region?

Disaggregated.

9. Caveats: Does the indicator have limitations or weaknesses (lack of precision or timeliness, difficult to collect, external factors)?

Weather, season length, bag, and days hunted can also influence the harvest value.

10. Responsible Person: Who is responsible for data collection, analysis and quality? Provide name, title, and contact information for all persons involved in collection and reporting.

Mike Olinde, Research Program Manager, 225/765-2350

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **Wildlife**

Objective: **Manage wildlife populations for sustainable harvest and/or other recreational opportunities through survey and research resulting in 215 days of hunting opportunity for game species.**

Indicator Name: **Woodcock harvest per hunter season**

1. Type and Level: What is the type of the indicator (input, output, outcome, efficiency, quality)? What is the level at which the indicator will be reported (key, supporting, general performance information)?

Outcome; General Performance Information

2. Rationale: What is the rationale for the indicator? Why was it selected? How does it help measure achievement of the objective?

It is a measurable value that should be obtained as part of good stewardship.

3. Use: How will the indicator be used in management decision-making and other agency processes? Will it be used only for internal management purposes or will it also be used for budgeted purposes?

It provides an index to the woodcock population.

4. Clarity: Does the indicator name clearly identify what is being measured? If the name contains jargon, acronyms, or unclear terms, define or clarify them here.

Yes, harvest values are per hunter that harvested at least 1 animal.

5. Validity, Reliability, and Accuracy: Has the indicator been audited by the Office of the Legislative Auditor? If so, what was the result/finding? If not, how can you assure that the indicator is valid, reliable and accurate?

No. The value is developed through a mailed survey.

6. Data Source, Collection and Reporting: What is the source of data to be reported? What is the frequency and timing of collection and reporting (monthly, quarterly, annual)?

Annual.

7. Calculation and Methodology: How is the indicator calculated?

It calculated through standard methodology used for a harvest survey.

8. Scope: Is the indicator Aggregated or DisAggregated (is it a sum of smaller parts or is it a part of a larger whole)? Example – if the indicator is a statewide figure, can it be broken down by parish or region?

Disaggregated.

9. Caveats: Does the indicator have limitations or weaknesses (lack of precision or timeliness, difficult to collect, external factors)?

Weather, season length, bag, and days hunted can also influence the harvest value.

10. Responsible Person: Who is responsible for data collection, analysis and quality? Provide name, title, and contact information for all persons involved in collection and reporting.

Mike Olinde, Research Program Manager, 225/765-2350

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **Wildlife**

Objective: **Manage wildlife populations for sustainable harvest and/or other recreational opportunities through survey and research resulting in 215 days of hunting opportunity for game species.**

Indicator Name: **Dove harvest per hunter season**

1. Type and Level: What is the type of the indicator (input, output, outcome, efficiency, quality)? What is the level at which the indicator will be reported (key, supporting, general performance information)?

Outcome; General Performance Information

2. Rationale: What is the rationale for the indicator? Why was it selected? How does it help measure achievement of the objective?

It is a measurable value that should be obtained as part of good stewardship.

3. Use: How will the indicator be used in management decision-making and other agency processes? Will it be used only for internal management purposes or will it also be used for budgeted purposes?

It provides an index to the dove population.

4. Clarity: Does the indicator name clearly identify what is being measured? If the name contains jargon, acronyms, or unclear terms, define or clarify them here.

Yes, harvest values are per hunter that harvested at least 1 animal.

5. Validity, Reliability, and Accuracy: Has the indicator been audited by the Office of the Legislative Auditor? If so, what was the result/finding? If not, how can you assure that the indicator is valid, reliable and accurate?

No. The value is developed through a mailed survey.

6. Data Source, Collection and Reporting: What is the source of data to be reported? What is the frequency and timing of collection and reporting (monthly, quarterly, annual)?

Annual.

7. Calculation and Methodology: How is the indicator calculated?

It calculated through standard methodology used for a harvest survey.

8. Scope: Is the indicator Aggregated or DisAggregated (is it a sum of smaller parts or is it a part of a larger whole)? Example – if the indicator is a statewide figure, can it be broken down by parish or region?

Disaggregated.

9. Caveats: Does the indicator have limitations or weaknesses (lack of precision or timeliness, difficult to collect, external factors)?

Weather, season length, bag, and days hunted can also influence the harvest value.

10. Responsible Person: Who is responsible for data collection, analysis and quality? Provide name, title, and contact information for all persons involved in collection and reporting.

Mike Olinde, Research Program Manager, 225/765-2350

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **Wildlife**

Objective: **Manage wildlife populations for sustainable harvest and/or other recreational opportunities through survey and research resulting in 215 days of hunting opportunity for game species.**

Indicator Name: **Percentage of all basic licensed hunters who deer hunt**

1. Type and Level: What is the type of the indicator (input, output, outcome, efficiency, quality)? What is the level at which the indicator will be reported (key, supporting, general performance information)?

Outcome; General Performance Information

2. Rationale: What is the rationale for the indicator? Why was it selected? How does it help measure achievement of the objective?

It provides insight into the hunting clientele that the Division serves as well as indices to the population.

3. Use: How will the indicator be used in management decision-making and other agency processes? Will it be used only for internal management purposes or will it also be used for budgeted purposes?

It provides indices to the deer hunter importance and population status and insight into prioritization of management activities.

4. Clarity: Does the indicator name clearly identify what is being measured? If the name contains jargon, acronyms, or unclear terms, define or clarify them here.

Yes, harvest values are per hunter that harvested at least 1 animal.

5. Validity, Reliability, and Accuracy: Has the indicator been audited by the Office of the Legislative Auditor? If so, what was the result/finding? If not, how can you assure that the indicator is valid, reliable and accurate?

No. The value is developed through a mailed survey.

6. Data Source, Collection and Reporting: What is the source of data to be reported? What is the frequency and timing of collection and reporting (monthly, quarterly, annual)?

Annual.

7. Calculation and Methodology: How is the indicator calculated?

Hunter numbers are calculated through standard methodology used for a harvest survey. The proportion is then determined based on the hunter number and resident basic license sales (and other license that include this license).

8. Scope: Is the indicator Aggregated or DisAggregated (is it a sum of smaller parts or is it a part of a larger whole)? Example – if the indicator is a statewide figure, can it be broken down by parish or region?

Disaggregated.

9. Caveats: Does the indicator have limitations or weaknesses (lack of precision or timeliness, difficult to collect, external factors)?

As performance table eliminates old data, significance of proportions can be misinterpreted.

10. Responsible Person: Who is responsible for data collection, analysis and quality? Provide name, title, and contact information for all persons involved in collection and reporting.

Mike Olinde, Research Program Manager, 225/765-2350

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **Wildlife**

Objective: **Manage wildlife populations for sustainable harvest and/or other recreational opportunities through survey and research resulting in 215 days of hunting opportunity for game species.**

Indicator Name: **Percentage of all basic licensed hunters who duck hunt**

1. Type and Level: What is the type of the indicator (input, output, outcome, efficiency, quality)? What is the level at which the indicator will be reported (key, supporting, general performance information)?

Outcome; General Performance Information

2. Rationale: What is the rationale for the indicator? Why was it selected? How does it help measure achievement of the objective?

It provides insight into the hunting clientele that the Division serves as well as indices to the population.

3. Use: How will the indicator be used in management decision-making and other agency processes? Will it be used only for internal management purposes or will it also be used for budgeted purposes?

It provides indices to the duck hunter importance and population status and insight into prioritization of management activities.

4. Clarity: Does the indicator name clearly identify what is being measured? If the name contains jargon, acronyms, or unclear terms, define or clarify them here.

Yes, harvest values are per hunter that harvested at least 1 animal.

5. Validity, Reliability, and Accuracy: Has the indicator been audited by the Office of the Legislative Auditor? If so, what was the result/finding? If not, how can you assure that the indicator is valid, reliable and accurate?

No. The value is developed through a mailed survey.

6. Data Source, Collection and Reporting: What is the source of data to be reported? What is the frequency and timing of collection and reporting (monthly, quarterly, annual)?

Annual.

7. Calculation and Methodology: How is the indicator calculated?

Hunter numbers are calculated through standard methodology used for a harvest survey. The proportion is then determined based on the hunter number and resident basic license sales (and other license that include this license).

8. Scope: Is the indicator Aggregated or DisAggregated (is it a sum of smaller parts or is it a part of a larger whole)? Example – if the indicator is a statewide figure, can it be broken down by parish or region?

Disaggregated.

9. Caveats: Does the indicator have limitations or weaknesses (lack of precision or timeliness, difficult to collect, external factors)?

As performance table eliminates old data, significance of proportions can be misinterpreted.

10. Responsible Person: Who is responsible for data collection, analysis and quality? Provide name, title, and contact information for all persons involved in collection and reporting.

Mike Olinde, Research Program Manager, 225/765-2350

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **Wildlife**

Objective: **Manage wildlife populations for sustainable harvest and/or other recreational opportunities through survey and research resulting in 215 days of hunting opportunity for game species.**

Indicator Name: **Percentage of all basic licensed hunters who rabbit hunt**

1. Type and Level: What is the type of the indicator (input, output, outcome, efficiency, quality)? What is the level at which the indicator will be reported (key, supporting, general performance information)?

Outcome; General Performance Information

2. Rationale: What is the rationale for the indicator? Why was it selected? How does it help measure achievement of the objective?

It provides insight into the hunting clientele that the Division serves as well as indices to the population.

3. Use: How will the indicator be used in management decision-making and other agency processes? Will it be used only for internal management purposes or will it also be used for budgeted purposes?

It provides indices to the rabbit hunter importance and population status and insight into prioritization of management activities.

4. Clarity: Does the indicator name clearly identify what is being measured? If the name contains jargon, acronyms, or unclear terms, define or clarify them here.

Yes, harvest values are per hunter that harvested at least 1 animal.

5. Validity, Reliability, and Accuracy: Has the indicator been audited by the Office of the Legislative Auditor? If so, what was the result/finding? If not, how can you assure that the indicator is valid, reliable and accurate?

No. The value is developed through a mailed survey.

6. Data Source, Collection and Reporting: What is the source of data to be reported? What is the frequency and timing of collection and reporting (monthly, quarterly, annual)?

Annual.

7. Calculation and Methodology: How is the indicator calculated?

Hunter numbers are calculated through standard methodology used for a harvest survey. The proportion is then determined based on the hunter number and resident basic license sales (and other license that include this license).

8. Scope: Is the indicator Aggregated or DisAggregated (is it a sum of smaller parts or is it a part of a larger whole)? Example – if the indicator is a statewide figure, can it be broken down by parish or region?

Disaggregated.

9. Caveats: Does the indicator have limitations or weaknesses (lack of precision or timeliness, difficult to collect, external factors)?

As performance table eliminates old data, significance of proportions can be misinterpreted.

10. Responsible Person: Who is responsible for data collection, analysis and quality? Provide name, title, and contact information for all persons involved in collection and reporting.

Mike Olinde, Research Program Manager, 225/765-2350

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **Wildlife**

Objective: **Manage wildlife populations for sustainable harvest and/or other recreational opportunities through survey and research resulting in 215 days of hunting opportunity for game species.**

Indicator Name: **Percentage of all basic licensed hunters who squirrel hunt**

1. Type and Level: What is the type of the indicator (input, output, outcome, efficiency, quality)? What is the level at which the indicator will be reported (key, supporting, general performance information)?

Outcome; General Performance Information

2. Rationale: What is the rationale for the indicator? Why was it selected? How does it help measure achievement of the objective?

It provides insight into the hunting clientele that the Division serves as well as indices to the population.

3. Use: How will the indicator be used in management decision-making and other agency processes? Will it be used only for internal management purposes or will it also be used for budgeted purposes?

It provides indices to the squirrel hunter importance and population status and insight into prioritization of management activities.

4. Clarity: Does the indicator name clearly identify what is being measured? If the name contains jargon, acronyms, or unclear terms, define or clarify them here.

Yes, harvest values are per hunter that harvested at least 1 animal.

5. Validity, Reliability, and Accuracy: Has the indicator been audited by the Office of the Legislative Auditor? If so, what was the result/finding? If not, how can you assure that the indicator is valid, reliable and accurate?

No. The value is developed through a mailed survey.

6. Data Source, Collection and Reporting: What is the source of data to be reported? What is the frequency and timing of collection and reporting (monthly, quarterly, annual)?

Annual.

7. Calculation and Methodology: How is the indicator calculated?

Hunter numbers are calculated through standard methodology used for a harvest survey. The proportion is then determined based on the hunter number and resident basic license sales (and other license that include this license).

8. Scope: Is the indicator Aggregated or DisAggregated (is it a sum of smaller parts or is it a part of a larger whole)? Example – if the indicator is a statewide figure, can it be broken down by parish or region?

Disaggregated.

9. Caveats: Does the indicator have limitations or weaknesses (lack of precision or timeliness, difficult to collect, external factors)?

As performance table eliminates old data, significance of proportions can be misinterpreted.

10. Responsible Person: Who is responsible for data collection, analysis and quality? Provide name, title, and contact information for all persons involved in collection and reporting.

Mike Olinde, Research Program Manager, 225/765-2350

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **Wildlife**

Objective: **Manage wildlife populations for sustainable harvest and/or other recreational opportunities through survey and research resulting in 215 days of hunting opportunity for game species.**

Indicator Name: **Percentage of all basic licensed hunters who quail hunt**

1. Type and Level: What is the type of the indicator (input, output, outcome, efficiency, quality)? What is the level at which the indicator will be reported (key, supporting, general performance information)?

Outcome; General Performance Information

2. Rationale: What is the rationale for the indicator? Why was it selected? How does it help measure achievement of the objective?

It provides insight into the hunting clientele that the Division serves as well as indices to the population.

3. Use: How will the indicator be used in management decision-making and other agency processes? Will it be used only for internal management purposes or will it also be used for budgeted purposes?

It provides indices to the quail hunter importance and population status and insight into prioritization of management activities.

4. Clarity: Does the indicator name clearly identify what is being measured? If the name contains jargon, acronyms, or unclear terms, define or clarify them here.

Yes, harvest values are per hunter that harvested at least 1 animal.

5. Validity, Reliability, and Accuracy: Has the indicator been audited by the Office of the Legislative Auditor? If so, what was the result/finding? If not, how can you assure that the indicator is valid, reliable and accurate?

No. The value is developed through a mailed survey.

6. Data Source, Collection and Reporting: What is the source of data to be reported? What is the frequency and timing of collection and reporting (monthly, quarterly, annual)?

Annual.

7. Calculation and Methodology: How is the indicator calculated?

Hunter numbers are calculated through standard methodology used for a harvest survey. The proportion is then determined based on the hunter number and resident basic license sales (and other license that include this license).

8. Scope: Is the indicator Aggregated or DisAggregated (is it a sum of smaller parts or is it a part of a larger whole)? Example – if the indicator is a statewide figure, can it be broken down by parish or region?

Disaggregated.

9. Caveats: Does the indicator have limitations or weaknesses (lack of precision or timeliness, difficult to collect, external factors)?

As performance table eliminates old data, significance of proportions can be misinterpreted.

10. Responsible Person: Who is responsible for data collection, analysis and quality? Provide name, title, and contact information for all persons involved in collection and reporting.

Mike Olinde, Research Program Manager, 225/765-2350

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **Wildlife**

Objective: **Manage wildlife populations for sustainable harvest and/or other recreational opportunities through survey and research resulting in 215 days of hunting opportunity for game species.**

Indicator Name: **Percentage of all basic licensed hunters who dove hunt**

1. Type and Level: What is the type of the indicator (input, output, outcome, efficiency, quality)? What is the level at which the indicator will be reported (key, supporting, general performance information)?

Outcome; General Performance Information

2. Rationale: What is the rationale for the indicator? Why was it selected? How does it help measure achievement of the objective?

It provides insight into the hunting clientele that the Division serves as well as indices to the population.

3. Use: How will the indicator be used in management decision-making and other agency processes? Will it be used only for internal management purposes or will it also be used for budgeted purposes?

It provides indices to the dove hunter importance and population status and insight into prioritization of management activities.

4. Clarity: Does the indicator name clearly identify what is being measured? If the name contains jargon, acronyms, or unclear terms, define or clarify them here.

Yes, harvest values are per hunter that harvested at least 1 animal.

5. Validity, Reliability, and Accuracy: Has the indicator been audited by the Office of the Legislative Auditor? If so, what was the result/finding? If not, how can you assure that the indicator is valid, reliable and accurate?

No. The value is developed through a mailed survey.

6. Data Source, Collection and Reporting: What is the source of data to be reported? What is the frequency and timing of collection and reporting (monthly, quarterly, annual)?

Annual.

7. Calculation and Methodology: How is the indicator calculated?

Hunter numbers are calculated through standard methodology used for a harvest survey. The proportion is then determined based on the hunter number and resident basic license sales (and other license that include this license).

8. Scope: Is the indicator Aggregated or DisAggregated (is it a sum of smaller parts or is it a part of a larger whole)? Example – if the indicator is a statewide figure, can it be broken down by parish or region?

Disaggregated.

9. Caveats: Does the indicator have limitations or weaknesses (lack of precision or timeliness, difficult to collect, external factors)?

As performance table eliminates old data, significance of proportions can be misinterpreted.

10. Responsible Person: Who is responsible for data collection, analysis and quality? Provide name, title, and contact information for all persons involved in collection and reporting.

Mike Olinde, Research Program Manager, 225/765-2350

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **Wildlife**

Objective: Conduct educational programs to reach 45,000 participants and respond to 80,000 general information questions from the public annually.

Indicator Name: **Number of hunter education participants**

1. Type and Level: What is the type of the indicator (input, output, outcome, efficiency, quality)? What is the level at which the indicator will be reported (key, supporting, general performance information)?

   Output; Key

2. Rationale: What is the rationale for the indicator? Why was it selected? How does it help measure achievement of the objective?

   State law requires hunter education because these courses have shown a reduction in hunting accidents nationally. It represents about 45 percent of the participants in the educational programs.

3. Use: How will the indicator be used in management decision-making and other agency processes? Will it be used only for internal management purposes or will it also be used for budgeted purposes?

   It is an index to hunter recruitment. A dramatic decline in hunter education participants will indicate that the department needs to develop/modify outreach to maintain our hunting heritage.

4. Clarity: Does the indicator name clearly identify what is being measured? If the name contains jargon, acronyms, or unclear terms, define or clarify them here.

   Yes;
   Hunter education: Hunter education refers to the basic student hunter education course that state law requires of hunters to complete prior to purchasing a hunting license. It does not include the bow hunter education participants.

5. Validity, Reliability, and Accuracy: Has the indicator been audited by the Office of the Legislative Auditor? If so, what was the result/finding? If not, how can you assure that the indicator is valid, reliable and accurate?

Yes and it was valid.

6. Data Source, Collection and Reporting: What is the source of data to be reported? What is the frequency and timing of collection and reporting (monthly, quarterly, annual)?

Monthly; Quarterly

7. Calculation and Methodology: How is the indicator calculated?

It is a simple count of the participants who successfully completely a hunter education course.

8. Scope: Is the indicator Aggregated or DisAggregated (is it a sum of smaller parts or is it a part of a larger whole)? Example – if the indicator is a statewide figure, can it be broken down by parish or region?

Aggregated.

9. Caveats: Does the indicator have limitations or weaknesses (lack of precision or timeliness, difficult to collect, external factors)?

The Wildlife Division does not control how many people choose to hunt.

10. Responsible Person: Who is responsible for data collection, analysis and quality? Provide name, title, and contact information for all persons involved in collection and reporting.

John Sturgis, State Education Coordinator, 225/763-5448

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **Wildlife**

Objective: Conduct educational programs to reach 45,000 participants and respond to 80,000 general information questions from the public annually.

Indicator Name: **Number of hunter education courses offered**

1. Type and Level: What is the type of the indicator (input, output, outcome, efficiency, quality)? What is the level at which the indicator will be reported (key, supporting, general performance information)?

Input; Key

2. Rationale: What is the rationale for the indicator? Why was it selected? How does it help measure achievement of the objective?

   State law requires hunter education because these courses have shown a reduction in hunting accidents nationally. It represents about 45 percent of the participants in the educational programs.

3. Use: How will the indicator be used in management decision-making and other agency processes? Will it be used only for internal management purposes or will it also be used for budgeted purposes?

   Hunter education courses are correlated to number of hunter education participants and therefore is an index to hunter recruitment. A dramatic decline in hunter education participants will indicate that the department needs to develop/modify outreach to maintain our hunting heritage.

4. Clarity: Does the indicator name clearly identify what is being measured? If the name contains jargon, acronyms, or unclear terms, define or clarify them here.

   Yes;
   Hunter Education: Hunter education refers to the basic student hunter education course that state law requires of hunters to complete prior to purchasing a hunting license. It does not include the bow hunter education participants.

5. Validity, Reliability, and Accuracy: Has the indicator been audited by the Office of the Legislative Auditor? If so, what was the result/finding? If not, how can you assure that the indicator is valid, reliable and accurate?

Yes and it was valid.

6. Data Source, Collection and Reporting: What is the source of data to be reported? What is the frequency and timing of collection and reporting (monthly, quarterly, annual)?

Monthly; Quarterly

7. Calculation and Methodology: How is the indicator calculated?

It is a simple count of the number of hunter education courses taught.

8. Scope: Is the indicator Aggregated or DisAggregated (is it a sum of smaller parts or is it a part of a larger whole)? Example – if the indicator is a statewide figure, can it be broken down by parish or region?

Aggregated.

9. Caveats: Does the indicator have limitations or weaknesses (lack of precision or timeliness, difficult to collect, external factors)?

The Wildlife Division does not control how many people choose to hunt.

10. Responsible Person: Who is responsible for data collection, analysis and quality? Provide name, title, and contact information for all persons involved in collection and reporting.

John Sturgis, State Education Coordinator, 225/763-5448

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **Wildlife**

Objective: **Conduct educational programs to reach 45,000 participants and respond to 80,000 general information questions from the public annually.**

Indicator Name: **Number of active hunter education volunteer instructors**

1. Type and Level: What is the type of the indicator (input, output, outcome, efficiency, quality)? What is the level at which the indicator will be reported (key, supporting, general performance information)?

   Output; Supporting

2. Rationale: What is the rationale for the indicator? Why was it selected? How does it help measure achievement of the objective?

   State law requires hunter education because these courses have shown a reduction in hunting accidents nationally. It represents about 45 percent of the participants in the educational programs. Volunteer instructors are essential to accomplish this task.

3. Use: How will the indicator be used in management decision-making and other agency processes? Will it be used only for internal management purposes or will it also be used for budgeted purposes?

   It is an index to hunter recruitment. A dramatic decline in hunter education participants will indicate that the department needs to develop/modify outreach to maintain our hunting heritage.

4. Clarity: Does the indicator name clearly identify what is being measured? If the name contains jargon, acronyms, or unclear terms, define or clarify them here.

   Yes;
   Active Hunter Education Volunteer Instructor: Active hunter education volunteer instructor refers to a volunteer who teaches at least 1 course every 2 years. New volunteers and existing instructors attend in-service training annually. Volunteer instructors who teach less than 1 course every 2 years are listed as inactive and are not counted. Also, it does not include the bowhunter education instructive.

5. Validity, Reliability, and Accuracy: Has the indicator been audited by the Office of the Legislative Auditor? If so, what was the result/finding? If not, how can you assure that the indicator is valid, reliable and accurate?

No. It is a simple count of those instructors who are considered active.

6. Data Source, Collection and Reporting: What is the source of data to be reported? What is the frequency and timing of collection and reporting (monthly, quarterly, annual)?

Annual.

7. Calculation and Methodology: How is the indicator calculated?

It is a simple count of active hunter education volunteer instructors.

8. Scope: Is the indicator Aggregated or DisAggregated (is it a sum of smaller parts or is it a part of a larger whole)? Example – if the indicator is a statewide figure, can it be broken down by parish or region?

Aggregated.

9. Caveats: Does the indicator have limitations or weaknesses (lack of precision or timeliness, difficult to collect, external factors)?

The Wildlife Division does not control how many people choose to hunt or volunteer to teach courses.

10. Responsible Person: Who is responsible for data collection, analysis and quality? Provide name, title, and contact information for all persons involved in collection and reporting.

John Sturgis, State Education Coordinator, 225/763-5448

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **Wildlife**

Objective: **Conduct educational programs to reach 45,000 participants and respond to 80,000 general information questions from the public annually.**

Indicator Name: **Number of bowhunter education participants**

1. Type and Level: What is the type of the indicator (input, output, outcome, efficiency, quality)? What is the level at which the indicator will be reported (key, supporting, general performance information)?

Output; Supported

2. Rationale: What is the rationale for the indicator? Why was it selected? How does it help measure achievement of the objective?

   While mandatory by state law, bowhunter education is required on federal refuges administered by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and it is also require in some other states.

3. Use: How will the indicator be used in management decision-making and other agency processes? Will it be used only for internal management purposes or will it also be used for budgeted purposes?

   It is an index to bowhunter recruitment. A dramatic decline in bowhunter education participants will indicate that the department needs to develop/modify outreach to maintain our bowhunting heritage.

4. Clarity: Does the indicator name clearly identify what is being measured? If the name contains jargon, acronyms, or unclear terms, define or clarify them here.

   Yes;
   Bowhunter Education: Bow hunter education refers to the special bowhunting course that is offered. It does not include the basic student hunter education course that state law requires of hunters to complete prior to purchasing a hunting license.

5. Validity, Reliability, and Accuracy: Has the indicator been audited by the Office of the Legislative Auditor? If so, what was the result/finding? If not, how can you assure that the indicator is valid, reliable and accurate?

No. It is a simple count of the bowhunter education courses taught. Data are compiled similar to the hunter education participants.

6. Data Source, Collection and Reporting: What is the source of data to be reported? What is the frequency and timing of collection and reporting (monthly, quarterly, annual)?

Monthly; Quarterly

7. Calculation and Methodology: How is the indicator calculated?

It is a simple count of the number of participants who successfully completed the bowhunter education course.

8. Scope: Is the indicator Aggregated or DisAggregated (is it a sum of smaller parts or is it a part of a larger whole)? Example – if the indicator is a statewide figure, can it be broken down by parish or region?

Aggregated.

9. Caveats: Does the indicator have limitations or weaknesses (lack of precision or timeliness, difficult to collect, external factors)?

The Wildlife Division does not control how many people choose to hunt.

10. Responsible Person: Who is responsible for data collection, analysis and quality? Provide name, title, and contact information for all persons involved in collection and reporting.

John Sturgis, State Education Coordinator, 225/763-5448

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **Wildlife**

Objective: **Conduct educational programs to reach 45,000 participants and respond to 80,000 general information questions from the public annually.**

Indicator Name: **Number of bowhunter education courses offered**

1. Type and Level: What is the type of the indicator (input, output, outcome, efficiency, quality)? What is the level at which the indicator will be reported (key, supporting, general performance information)?

Input; Supporting

2. Rationale: What is the rationale for the indicator? Why was it selected? How does it help measure achievement of the objective?

   While mandatory by state law, bowhunter education is required on federal refuges administered by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and it is also require in some other states.

3. Use: How will the indicator be used in management decision-making and other agency processes? Will it be used only for internal management purposes or will it also be used for budgeted purposes?

   Bowhunter education courses are correlated to number of bowhunter education participants and therefore is an index to bowhunter recruitment. A dramatic decline in hunter education participants will indicate that the department needs to develop/modify outreach to maintain our bowhunting heritage.

4. Clarity: Does the indicator name clearly identify what is being measured? If the name contains jargon, acronyms, or unclear terms, define or clarify them here.

   Yes;
   Hunter Education: Hunter education refers to the basic student hunter education course that state law requires of hunters to complete prior to purchasing a hunting license. It does not include the bow hunter education participants.

5. Validity, Reliability, and Accuracy: Has the indicator been audited by the Office of the Legislative Auditor? If so, what was the result/finding? If not, how can you assure that the indicator is valid, reliable and accurate?

Yes and it was valid.

6. Data Source, Collection and Reporting: What is the source of data to be reported? What is the frequency and timing of collection and reporting (monthly, quarterly, annual)?

Monthly; Quarterly

7. Calculation and Methodology: How is the indicator calculated?

It is a simple count of the number of hunter education courses taught.

8. Scope: Is the indicator Aggregated or DisAggregated (is it a sum of smaller parts or is it a part of a larger whole)? Example – if the indicator is a statewide figure, can it be broken down by parish or region?

Aggregated.

9. Caveats: Does the indicator have limitations or weaknesses (lack of precision or timeliness, difficult to collect, external factors)?

The Wildlife Division does not control how many people choose to hunt.

10. Responsible Person: Who is responsible for data collection, analysis and quality? Provide name, title, and contact information for all persons involved in collection and reporting.

John Sturgis, State Education Coordinator, 225/763-5448

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **Wildlife**

Objective: Conduct educational programs to reach 45,000 participants and respond to 80,000 general information questions from the public annually.

Indicator Name: **Number of aquatic education courses offered**

1. Type and Level: What is the type of the indicator (input, output, outcome, efficiency, quality)? What is the level at which the indicator will be reported (key, supporting, general performance information)?

Input; Supporting

2. Rationale: What is the rationale for the indicator? Why was it selected? How does it help measure achievement of the objective?

   It is a index to the Wildlife Division's efforts to educate the public on aquatic issues.

3. Use: How will the indicator be used in management decision-making and other agency processes? Will it be used only for internal management purposes or will it also be used for budgeted purposes?

   Aquatic education courses are correlated to number of aquatic education participants. A dramatic decline in aquatic education courses will indicate that the department needs to develop/modify outreach to maintain our fishing heritage.

4. Clarity: Does the indicator name clearly identify what is being measured? If the name contains jargon, acronyms, or unclear terms, define or clarify them here.

   Yes;
   Aquatic Education: Aquatic education has 2 main components. One is programs offered to the general public that is taught by Wildlife Division staff. The other is programs offered through Louisiana's school system. These course are taught by school teachers who were trained by Wildlife Division staff.

5. Validity, Reliability, and Accuracy: Has the indicator been audited by the Office of the Legislative Auditor? If so, what was the result/finding? If not, how can you assure that the indicator is valid, reliable and accurate?

No. It is a simple count of the number of aquatic education course taught. Data have been used to provide supporting documentation for federal grant matches.

6. Data Source, Collection and Reporting: What is the source of data to be reported? What is the frequency and timing of collection and reporting (monthly, quarterly, annual)?

Monthly; Quarterly

7. Calculation and Methodology: How is the indicator calculated?

It is a simple count of the number of aquatic education courses taught.

8. Scope: Is the indicator Aggregated or DisAggregated (is it a sum of smaller parts or is it a part of a larger whole)? Example – if the indicator is a statewide figure, can it be broken down by parish or region?

Aggregated.

9. Caveats: Does the indicator have limitations or weaknesses (lack of precision or timeliness, difficult to collect, external factors)?

The Wildlife Division does not control how many people choose to participate in the course or the number of school teachers who utilize the program.

10. Responsible Person: Who is responsible for data collection, analysis and quality? Provide name, title, and contact information for all persons involved in collection and reporting.

John Sturgis, State Education Coordinator, 225/763-5448

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **Wildlife**

Objective: Conduct educational programs to reach 45,000 participants and respond to 80,000 general information questions from the public annually.

Indicator Name: **Number of participants in BOW and other camps**

1. Type and Level: What is the type of the indicator (input, output, outcome, efficiency, quality)? What is the level at which the indicator will be reported (key, supporting, general performance information)?

Output; Supporting

2. Rationale: What is the rationale for the indicator? Why was it selected? How does it help measure achievement of the objective?

   BOW is a priority program within the department because it is geared towards introducing women into outdoor recreational activities.

3. Use: How will the indicator be used in management decision-making and other agency processes? Will it be used only for internal management purposes or will it also be used for budgeted purposes?

   It is a index of staff workload. Staff or budgetary constraints can result in a reduction of camps offered.

4. Clarity: Does the indicator name clearly identify what is being measured? If the name contains jargon, acronyms, or unclear terms, define or clarify them here.

   Yes;
   BOW: Becoming an Outdoor Women. See Question 2.

5. Validity, Reliability, and Accuracy: Has the indicator been audited by the Office of the Legislative Auditor? If so, what was the result/finding? If not, how can you assure that the indicator is valid, reliable and accurate?

No. It is a simple count of participants in BOW and other camps.

6. Data Source, Collection and Reporting: What is the source of data to be reported? What is the frequency and timing of collection and reporting (monthly, quarterly, annual)?

Annual.

7. Calculation and Methodology: How is the indicator calculated?

It is a simple count of the participants in BOW and other camps.

8. Scope: Is the indicator Aggregated or DisAggregated (is it a sum of smaller parts or is it a part of a larger whole)? Example – if the indicator is a statewide figure, can it be broken down by parish or region?

Aggregated.

9. Caveats: Does the indicator have limitations or weaknesses (lack of precision or timeliness, difficult to collect, external factors)?

The Wildlife Division does not control how many people choose to participate. But, currently the demand exceeds staffing capability.

10. Responsible Person: Who is responsible for data collection, analysis and quality? Provide name, title, and contact information for all persons involved in collection and reporting.

John Sturgis, State Education Coordinator, 225/763-5448

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **Wildlife**

Objective: **Conduct educational programs to reach xxxx participants and respond to 80,000 general information questions from the public annually.**

Indicator Name: **Number of requests for general information answered**

1. Type and Level: What is the type of the indicator (input, output, outcome, efficiency, quality)? What is the level at which the indicator will be reported (key, supporting, general performance information)?

Output; Key

2. Rationale: What is the rationale for the indicator? Why was it selected? How does it help measure achievement of the objective?

The ability to answer requests from the public concerning general hunting, fishing, and other information impacts the public's outdoor experiences as well as their general impression of the department.

3. Use: How will the indicator be used in management decision-making and other agency processes? Will it be used only for internal management purposes or will it also be used for budgeted purposes?

It provides an index to public interest in the department's programs and to the workload of the full-time staff. A limit to the number or extent of public contact can be implemented when necessary because of staff or budgetary restrictions.

4. Clarity: Does the indicator name clearly identify what is being measured? If the name contains jargon, acronyms, or unclear terms, define or clarify them here.

5. Validity, Reliability, and Accuracy: Has the indicator been audited by the Office of the Legislative Auditor? If so, what was the result/finding? If not, how can you assure that the indicator is valid, reliable and accurate?

No. It is a simple count of the requests from the public answered by the Wildlife Division staff, excluding hunter safety and aquatic education personnel.

6. Data Source, Collection and Reporting: What is the source of data to be reported? What is the frequency and timing of collection and reporting (monthly, quarterly, annual)?

Monthly; Quarterly

7. Calculation and Methodology: How is the indicator calculated?

It is a simple count of the requests from the public answered by the Wildlife Division staff, excluding hunter safety and aquatic education personnel.

8. Scope: Is the indicator Aggregated or DisAggregated (is it a sum of smaller parts or is it a part of a larger whole)? Example – if the indicator is a statewide figure, can it be broken down by parish or region?

Aggregated.

9. Caveats: Does the indicator have limitations or weaknesses (lack of precision or timeliness, difficult to collect, external factors)?

The Wildlife Division has no control over the number of requests for information. Different types of requests also may take considerably more time to answer than other types.

10. Responsible Person: Who is responsible for data collection, analysis and quality? Provide name, title, and contact information for all persons involved in collection and reporting.

Steve Hebert, Regional Supervisor, 318/371-3050

Jerald Owens, Regional Supervisor, 318/343-4044
Czerny Newland, Regional Supervisor, 318/487-5887
Reggie Wycoff, Regional Supervisor, 318/757-4571
John Robinette, Regional Supervisor, 337/491-2575
Kerney Sonnier, Regional Supervisor, 337/948-0255
John Mullins, Regional Supervisor, 225/765-2361
Kenny Ribbeck, Forestry Supervisor, 225/765-2350
David Moreland, Deer Program Manager, 225/765-2350
Robert Helm, Waterfowl Program Manager, 225/765-2350
Fred Kimmel, Upland Program Manager, 225/765-2350
Mike Olinde, Research Program Manager, 225/765-2350

Jimmy Anthony, Federal Aid Coordinator, 225/765-2350
Randy Myers, Land Acquisition Coordinator, 225/765-2350

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **Wildlife**

Objective: **Conduct educational programs to reach 45,000 participants and respond to 80,000 general information requests from the public annually.**

Indicator Name: **Number of requests for general information answered per full-time staff**

1. Type and Level: What is the type of the indicator (input, output, outcome, efficiency, quality)? What is the level at which the indicator will be reported (key, supporting, general performance information)?

   Efficiency; Supporting

2. Rationale: What is the rationale for the indicator? Why was it selected? How does it help measure achievement of the objective?

The ability of the Wildlife Division to answer requests from the public concerning general hunting, fishing, and other information impacts the public's outdoor experiences as well as their general impression of the department.

3. Use: How will the indicator be used in management decision-making and other agency processes? Will it be used only for internal management purposes or will it also be used for budgeted purposes?

It provides an index to the workload of the full-time staff. A limit to the number or extent of public contact can be implemented when necessary because of staff or budgetary restrictions.

4. Clarity: Does the indicator name clearly identify what is being measured? If the name contains jargon, acronyms, or unclear terms, define or clarify them here.

The value excludes those answered by hunter safety and aquatic education staff.

5. Validity, Reliability, and Accuracy: Has the indicator been audited by the Office of the Legislative Auditor? If so, what was the result/finding? If not, how can you assure that the indicator is valid, reliable and accurate?

No. It is the simple count of the number of requests answered divided by the average number of filled full-time staff positions for the year.

6. Data Source, Collection and Reporting: What is the source of data to be reported? What is the frequency and timing of collection and reporting (monthly, quarterly, annual)?

Annual.

7. Calculation and Methodology: How is the indicator calculated?

It is the simple count of the number of requests answered divided by the average number of filled full-time staff positions for the year.

8. Scope: Is the indicator Aggregated or DisAggregated (is it a sum of smaller parts or is it a part of a larger whole)? Example – if the indicator is a statewide figure, can it be broken down by parish or region?

Aggregated.

9. Caveats: Does the indicator have limitations or weaknesses (lack of precision or timeliness, difficult to collect, external factors)?

Wildlife Division has no control over the number of requests for information. Different types of requests also may take considerable more time than other types.

10. Responsible Person: Who is responsible for data collection, analysis and quality? Provide name, title, and contact information for all persons involved in collection and reporting.

Steve Hebert, Regional Supervisor, 318/371-3050

Jerald Owens, Regional Supervisor, 318/343-4044
Czerny Newland, Regional Supervisor, 318/487-5887
Reggie Wycoff, Regional Supervisor, 318/757-4571
John Robinette, Regional Supervisor, 337/491-2575
Kerney Sonnier, Regional Supervisor, 337/948-0255
John Mullins, Regional Supervisor, 225/765-2361
Kenny Ribbeck, Forestry Supervisor, 225/765-2350
David Moreland, Deer Program Manager, 225/765-2350
Robert Helm, Waterfowl Program Manager, 225/765-2350
Fred Kimmel, Upland Program Manager, 225/765-2350
Mike Olinde, Research Program Manager, 225/765-2350
Scott Longman, Federal Aid Coordinator, 225/765-2350
Randy Myers, Land Acquisition Coordinator, 225/765-2350
Jimmy Anthony, Asst. Wildlife Administrator, 225/765-2346

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST

Program: Wildlife

Objective: To manage the 0.9 million acres in the non-coastal wildlife management area system through maintenance and habitat management activities.

Strategy: Annually assess and implement management plans developed for each non-coastal wildlife management area.

Yes	No	
		Analysis:
	x	Cost/benefit analysis conducted
	x	Financial or performance audit used
	x	Benchmarking for best management practices used
	x	Act 160 Reports used
x		Other analysis or evaluation tools used
x		Impact on other strategies considered
x		Stakeholders identified and involved
		Authorization:
x		Authorization exists
	x	Authorization needed
		Organization Capacity:
x		Needed structural or procedural changes identified
x		Resource needs identified
x		Strategies developed to implement needed changes
x		Responsibility assigned
		Time Frame:
x		Already ongoing
	x	Lifetime of strategy identified
		Fiscal Impact:

x	Impact on operating budget
x	Impact on capital outlay budget
x	Means of Finance identified
x	Return on investment determined to be favorable

Program: **Wildlife**

Objective: To manage the 0.9 million acres in the non-coastal wildlife management area system through maintenance and habitat management activities.

Strategy: Develop and maintain partnerships with various state and federal agencies as well as conservation organizations, private businesses, and individuals to facilitate management programs.

Yes	No	
		Analysis:
	x	Cost/benefit analysis conducted
	x	Financial or performance audit used
	x	Benchmarking for best management practices used
	x	Act 160 Reports used
x		Other analysis or evaluation tools used
x		Impact on other strategies considered
x		Stakeholders identified and involved
		Authorization:
x		Authorization exists
	x	Authorization needed
		Organization Capacity:
x		Needed structural or procedural changes identified
x		Resource needs identified
x		Strategies developed to implement needed changes
x		Responsibility assigned
		Time Frame:
x		Already ongoing
	x	Lifetime of strategy identified
		Fiscal Impact:

	x	Impact on operating budget
	x	Impact on capital outlay budget
	x	Means of Finance identified
	x	Return on investment determined to be favorable

Program: Wildlife

Objective: Enhance wildlife habitat on private lands and non-Department public lands by providing 15,000 wildlife management technical assistance responses to the public and other agencies/NGOs.

Strategy: Maintain a well-trained biological staff.

Yes	No	
		Analysis:
	x	Cost/benefit analysis conducted
	x	Financial or performance audit used
	x	Benchmarking for best management practices used
	x	Act 160 Reports used
x		Other analysis or evaluation tools used
x		Impact on other strategies considered
x		Stakeholders identified and involved
		Authorization:
x		Authorization exists
	x	Authorization needed
		Organization Capacity:
x		Needed structural or procedural changes identified
x		Resource needs identified
x		Strategies developed to implement needed changes
x		Responsibility assigned
		Time Frame:
x		Already ongoing
	x	Lifetime of strategy identified

		Fiscal Impact:
	x	Impact on operating budget
	x	Impact on capital outlay budget
	x	Means of Finance identified
	x	Return on investment determined to be favorable

Program: Wildlife

Objective: Enhance wildlife habitat on private lands and non-Department public lands by providing 15,000 wildlife management technical assistance responses to the public and other agencies/NGOs.

Strategy: Serve on technical advisory committees of state and federal agencies as well as NGOs that influence land management practices.

Yes	No	
		Analysis:
	x	Cost/benefit analysis conducted
	x	Financial or performance audit used
	x	Benchmarking for best management practices used
	x	Act 160 Reports used
x		Other analysis or evaluation tools used
x		Impact on other strategies considered
x		Stakeholders identified and involved
		Authorization:
x		Authorization exists
	x	Authorization needed
		Organization Capacity:
x		Needed structural or procedural changes identified
x		Resource needs identified
x		Strategies developed to implement needed changes
x		Responsibility assigned

		Time Frame:
x		Already ongoing
	x	Lifetime of strategy identified
		Fiscal Impact:
	x	Impact on operating budget
	x	Impact on capital outlay budget
	x	Means of Finance identified
	x	Return on investment determined to be favorable

Program: Wildlife

Objective: Manage wildlife populations for sustainable harvest and/or other recreational opportunities through survey and research resulting in 238 days of hunting opportunity for game species.

Strategy: Develop and maintain a tracking system of survey/research projects on WMAs and off WMAs when through Division cooperative/collaborative endeavors.

Yes	No	
		Analysis:
	x	Cost/benefit analysis conducted
	x	Financial or performance audit used
	x	Benchmarking for best management practices used
	x	Act 160 Reports used
x		Other analysis or evaluation tools used
x		Impact on other strategies considered
x		Stakeholders identified and involved
		Authorization:
x		Authorization exists
	x	Authorization needed
		Organization Capacity:

x		Needed structural or procedural changes identified
x		Resource needs identified
x		Strategies developed to implement needed changes
x		Responsibility assigned

Time Frame:

x		Already ongoing
	x	Lifetime of strategy identified

Fiscal Impact:

	x	Impact on operating budget
	x	Impact on capital outlay budget
	x	Means of Finance identified
	x	Return on investment determined to be favorable

Program: Wildlife

Objective: Manage wildlife populations for sustainable harvest and/or other recreational opportunities through survey and research resulting in 238 days of hunting opportunity for game species.

Strategy: Annually develop hunting seasons, bag limits, and regulations that provide optimal opportunity and sustainable game populations.

Yes	No	

Analysis:

	x	Cost/benefit analysis conducted
	x	Financial or performance audit used
	x	Benchmarking for best management practices used
	x	Act 160 Reports used
x		Other analysis or evaluation tools used
x		Impact on other strategies considered
x		Stakeholders identified and involved

Authorization:

x		Authorization exists
	x	Authorization needed

Organization Capacity:

x		Needed structural or procedural changes identified
x		Resource needs identified
x		Strategies developed to implement needed changes
x		Responsibility assigned

Time Frame:

x		Already ongoing
	x	Lifetime of strategy identified

Fiscal Impact:

	x	Impact on operating budget
	x	Impact on capital outlay budget
	x	Means of Finance identified
	x	Return on investment determined to be favorable

Program: Wildlife

Objective: Conduct educational programs to reach 45,000 participants and respond to 80,000 general information questions from the public annually.

Strategy: Maintained a well-trained full-time education staff.

Yes	No	

Analysis:

	x	Cost/benefit analysis conducted
	x	Financial or performance audit used
	x	Benchmarking for best management practices used
	x	Act 160 Reports used
x		Other analysis or evaluation tools used
x		Impact on other strategies considered
x		Stakeholders identified and involved

		Authorization:
x		Authorization exists
	x	Authorization needed
		Organization Capacity:
x		Needed structural or procedural changes identified
x		Resource needs identified
x		Strategies developed to implement needed changes
x		Responsibility assigned
		Time Frame:
x		Already ongoing
	x	Lifetime of strategy identified
		Fiscal Impact:
	x	Impact on operating budget
	x	Impact on capital outlay budget
	x	Means of Finance identified
	x	Return on investment determined to be favorable

Program: Wildlife

Objective: Conduct educational programs to reach 45,000 participants and respond to 80,000 general information questions from the public annually.

Strategy: Maintain well-trained volunteer hunter and aquatic instructors.

Yes	No	
		Analysis:
	x	Cost/benefit analysis conducted
	x	Financial or performance audit used
	x	Benchmarking for best management practices used

	x	Act 160 Reports used
x		Other analysis or evaluation tools used
x		Impact on other strategies considered
x		Stakeholders identified and involved

Authorization:

x		Authorization exists
	x	Authorization needed

Organization Capacity:

x		Needed structural or procedural changes identified
x		Resource needs identified
x		Strategies developed to implement needed changes
x		Responsibility assigned

Time Frame:

x		Already ongoing
	x	Lifetime of strategy identified

Fiscal Impact:

	x	Impact on operating budget
	x	Impact on capital outlay budget
	x	Means of Finance identified
	x	Return on investment determined to be favorable

Program: Wildlife

Objective: Conduct educational programs to reach 45,000 participants and respond to 80,000 general information questions from the public annually.

Strategy: Develop new and/or update existing educational programs to increase the public's awareness and knowledge of the state's diverse natural resources.

Yes	No

Analysis:

	x	Cost/benefit analysis conducted
	x	Financial or performance audit used
	x	Benchmarking for best management practices used
	x	Act 160 Reports used
x		Other analysis or evaluation tools used
x		Impact on other strategies considered
x		Stakeholders identified and involved

Authorization:

x		Authorization exists
	x	Authorization needed

Organization Capacity:

x		Needed structural or procedural changes identified
x		Resource needs identified
x		Strategies developed to implement needed changes
x		Responsibility assigned

Time Frame:

x		Already ongoing
	x	Lifetime of strategy identified

Fiscal Impact:

	x	Impact on operating budget
	x	Impact on capital outlay budget
	x	Means of Finance identified
	x	Return on investment determined to be favorable

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: Wildlife

Objective: To manage the alligator resource of the state to provide species protection and to authorize the sustainable harvest of wild alligators.

Indicator Name: Number of wild alligators harvested

31. Type and Level: What is the type of the indicator (input, output, outcome, efficiency, quality)? What is the level at which the indicator will be reported (key, supporting, general performance information)?

    Outcome; Key.

32. Rationale: What is the rationale for the indicator? Why was it selected? How does it help measure achievement of the objective?

    It is a measure of the sustained harvest of alligators and is a critical outcome of this objective.

33. Use: How will the indicator be used in management decision-making and other agency processes? Will it be used only for internal management purposes or will it also be used for budgeted purposes?

    It provides an index to the abundance of alligators in the state and it will be used for internal management purposes as well as budget purposes.

34. Clarity: Does the indicator name clearly identify what is being measured? If the name contains jargon, acronyms, or unclear terms, define or clarify them here.

    Yes, the indicator name clearly identifies what is being measured.

35. Validity, Reliability, and Accuracy: Has the indicator been audited by the Office of the Legislative Auditor? If so, what was the result/finding? If not, how can you assure that the indicator is valid, reliable and accurate?

    No, the indicator has not been audited. Serially numbered harvest tags are issued to licensed hunters and their disposition is tracked and monitored.

36. Data Source, Collection and Reporting: What is the source of data to be reported? What is the frequency and timing of collection and reporting (monthly, quarterly, annual)?

    Wild alligators are harvested in September, however harvest data is collected as skins are inspected prior to export, in-state tanning or taxidermy. Updated reports can be run upon request.

37. Calculation and Methodology: How is the indicator calculated?

    Serially numbered tags are issued to hunters and their disposition is tracked and monitored. Hunters are required to turn in any unused tags.

38. Scope: Is the indicator aggregated or disaggregated (is it a sum of smaller parts or is it a part of a larger whole)? Example – if the indicator is a statewide figure, can it be broken down by parish or region?

    Aggregated. The number of alligators harvested can be broken down to the regional office that initially issued the harvest tags.

39. Caveats: Does the indicator have limitations or weaknesses (lack of precision or timeliness, difficult to collect, external factors)?

    Yes. The Department annually establishes harvest quotas which determine the maximum number of alligators that can be taken in each year. Approximately 95% of all allocated tags are used each year; however, alligator skin value does influence the final number harvested in any given year.

40. Responsible Person: Who is responsible for data collection, analysis and quality? Provide name, title, and contact information for all persons involved in collection and reporting.

    Leisa Nunez, Wildlife Technician Supervisor, 337/538-2276
    Noel Kinler, Alligator Program Manager, 337/373-0032

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: Wildlife

Objective: To manage the alligator resource of the state to provide species protection and to authorize the sustainable harvest of wild alligators.

Indicator Name: Number of acres surveyed during coast wide nest survey

1. Type and Level: What is the type of the indicator (input, output, outcome, efficiency, quality)? What is the level at which the indicator will be reported (key, supporting, general performance information)?

   Output; Supporting.

2. Rationale: What is the rationale for the indicator? Why was it selected? How does it help measure achievement of the objective?

   It measures the amount of area surveyed to estimate abundance and distribution of alligator nests in coastal Louisiana.

3. Use: How will the indicator be used in management decision-making and other agency processes? Will it be used only for internal management purposes or will it also be used for budgeted purposes?

   It provides an index to the abundance and distribution of alligators in coastal Louisiana and it will be used for internal management and budget purposes.

4. Clarity: Does the indicator name clearly identify what is being measured? If the name contains jargon, acronyms, or unclear terms, define or clarify them here.

   Yes, the indicator name clearly identifies what is being measured.

5. Validity, Reliability, and Accuracy: Has the indicator been audited by the Office of the Legislative Auditor? If so, what was the result/finding? If not, how can you assure that the indicator is valid, reliable and accurate?

   No, the indicator has not been audited. Survey lines are computer generated and measured.

6. Data Source, Collection and Reporting: What is the source of data to be reported? What is the frequency and timing of collection and reporting (monthly, quarterly, annual)?

   Annual.

7. Calculation and Methodology: How is the indicator calculated?

   It is a computer generated estimate of acres surveyed, reduced by acres flown over open water.

8. Scope: Is the indicator aggregated or disaggregated (is it a sum of smaller parts or is it a part of a larger whole)? Example – if the indicator is a statewide figure, can it be broken down by parish or region?

   Aggregated. The number of acres surveyed can be broken by habitat type within each parish and by private and public ownership.

9. Caveats: Does the indicator have limitations or weaknesses (lack of precision or timeliness, difficult to collect, external factors)?

   Yes. Continued funding of the annual nest count survey is necessary to maintain this indicator at a consistent level.

10. Responsible Person: Who is responsible for data collection, analysis and quality? Provide name, title, and contact information for all persons involved in collection and reporting.

    Lance Campbell, Biologist Supervisor, 337/373-0032
    Noel Kinler, Alligator Program Manager, 337/373-0032

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: Wildlife

Objective: To manage the alligator resource of the state to provide species protection and to authorize the sustainable harvest of wild alligators.

Indicator Name: Number of licensed alligator hunters

1. Type and Level: What is the type of the indicator (input, output, outcome, efficiency, quality)? What is the level at which the indicator will be reported (key, supporting, general performance information)?

   Output; Key.

2. Rationale: What is the rationale for the indicator? Why was it selected? How does it help measure achievement of the objective?

   It measures the number of hunters participating in the wild alligator harvest program.

3. Use: How will the indicator be used in management decision-making and other agency processes? Will it be used only for internal management purposes or will it also be used for budgeted purposes?

   It provides a measure of the number of individuals hunting alligators each year and will be used for internal management purposes.

4. Clarity: Does the indicator name clearly identify what is being measured? If the name contains jargon, acronyms, or unclear terms, define or clarify them here.

   Yes, the indicator name clearly identifies what is being measured.

5. Validity, Reliability, and Accuracy: Has the indicator been audited by the Office of the Legislative Auditor? If so, what was the result/finding? If not, how can you assure that the indicator is valid, reliable and accurate?

No, the indicator has not been audited. Hunters are issued serially numbered licenses and all pertinent information regarding the license holder is recorded and entered.

6. Data Source, Collection and Reporting: What is the source of data to be reported? What is the frequency and timing of collection and reporting (monthly, quarterly, annual)?

   Annual.

7. Calculation and Methodology: How is the indicator calculated?

   It is a count of the number of alligator hunting licenses issued each year.

8. Scope: Is the indicator aggregated or disaggregated (is it a sum of smaller parts or is it a part of a larger whole)? Example – if the indicator is a statewide figure, can it be broken down by parish or region?

   Aggregated. The number of licenses issued can be broken down to the regional office where the license is issued.

9. Caveats: Does the indicator have limitations or weaknesses (lack of precision or timeliness, difficult to collect, external factors)?

   Yes. Value of alligator skins does influence the number of alligator hunting licenses sold in any given year.

10. Responsible Person: Who is responsible for data collection, analysis and quality? Provide name, title, and contact information for all persons involved in collection and reporting.

    Leisa Nunez, Wildlife Technician Supervisor, 337/538-2276
    Noel Kinler, Alligator Program Manager, 337/373-0032

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: Wildlife

Objective: To manage the alligator resource of the state to provide species protection and to authorize the sustainable harvest of wild alligators.

Indicator Name: Number of wild alligators eggs collected by farmers

1. Type and Level: What is the type of the indicator (input, output, outcome, efficiency, quality)? What is the level at which the indicator will be reported (key, supporting, general performance information)?

   Outcome; Key.

2. Rationale: What is the rationale for the indicator? Why was it selected? How does it help measure achievement of the objective?

   It is a measure of the sustained harvest of wild alligator eggs and is a critical outcome of this objective.

3. Use: How will the indicator be used in management decision-making and other agency processes? Will it be used only for internal management purposes or will it also be used for budgeted purposes?

   It provides an index to the annual production of alligators in the state and it will be used for internal management purposes as well as budget purposes.

4. Clarity: Does the indicator name clearly identify what is being measured? If the name contains jargon, acronyms, or unclear terms, define or clarify them here.

   Yes, the indicator name clearly identifies what is being measured.

5. Validity, Reliability, and Accuracy: Has the indicator been audited by the Office of the Legislative Auditor? If so, what was the result/finding? If not, how can you assure that the indicator is valid, reliable and accurate?

   No, the indicator has not been audited. Alligator farmers are required to report the number of eggs collected each year. Annual reports are reviewed for accuracy of information reported.

6. Data Source, Collection and Reporting: What is the source of data to be reported? What is the frequency and timing of collection and reporting (monthly, quarterly, annual)?

   Annual. Farmers collect eggs in the summer and report their collections in their annual report submitted in December of each year.

7. Calculation and Methodology: How is the indicator calculated?

   The farmer's annual report is reviewed and the number of eggs collected under each egg collection permit is totaled.

8. Scope: Is the indicator aggregated or disaggregated (is it a sum of smaller parts or is it a part of a larger whole)? Example – if the indicator is a statewide figure, can it be broken down by parish or region?

   Aggregated. The number of eggs collected by each farmer is totaled to report one summary figure annually.

9. Caveats: Does the indicator have limitations or weaknesses (lack of precision or timeliness, difficult to collect, external factors)?

   Yes. Annual alligator egg production is influenced by environmental factors that the Department has no control over. Additionally, value of farm raised alligator skins may also affect the number of eggs collected in any given year.

10. Responsible Person: Who is responsible for data collection, analysis and quality? Provide name, title, and contact information for all persons involved in collection and reporting.

    Ruth Elsey, Biologist Manager, 337/538-2276
    Leisa Nunez, Wildlife Technician Supervisor, 337/538-2276

Noel Kinler, Alligator Program Manager, 337/373-0032

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: Wildlife

Objective: To manage the alligator resource of the state to provide species protection and to authorize the sustainable harvest of wild alligators.

Indicator Name: Number of tags issued for harvest of farm raised alligators

1. Type and Level: What is the type of the indicator (input, output, outcome, efficiency, quality)? What is the level at which the indicator will be reported (key, supporting, general performance information)?

   Outcome; Key.

2. Rationale: What is the rationale for the indicator? Why was it selected? How does it help measure achievement of the objective?

   It measures the sustained harvest of farm raised alligators and is a critical outcome for this objective.

3. Use: How will the indicator be used in management decision-making and other agency processes? Will it be used only for internal management purposes or will it also be used for budgeted purposes?

   It provides a measure of the size and production level of the farm alligator program and will be used for internal management and budget purposes.

4. Clarity: Does the indicator name clearly identify what is being measured? If the name contains jargon, acronyms, or unclear terms, define or clarify them here.

   Yes, the indicator name clearly identifies what is being measured.

5. Validity, Reliability, and Accuracy: Has the indicator been audited by the Office of the Legislative Auditor? If so, what was the result/finding? If not, how can you assure that the indicator is valid, reliable and accurate?

   No, the indicator has not been audited. Farmers are issued serially numbered tags and are held accountable for the disposition of all harvest tags issued.

6. Data Source, Collection and Reporting: What is the source of data to be reported? What is the frequency and timing of collection and reporting (monthly, quarterly, annual)?

   Tag issuance is recorded and entered as it occurs. Reports on the number of tags issued can be run upon request.

7. Calculation and Methodology: How is the indicator calculated?

   Serially numbered tags are issued to farmers and their disposition is tracked and monitored. Farmers are required to return any unused tags.

8. Scope: Is the indicator aggregated or disaggregated (is it a sum of smaller parts or is it a part of a larger whole)? Example – if the indicator is a statewide figure, can it be broken down by parish or region?

   Aggregated. The number of tags issued to each farmer is totaled to report one summary figure.

9. Caveats: Does the indicator have limitations or weaknesses (lack of precision or timeliness, difficult to collect, external factors)?

   Yes. The actual allocation of harvest tags for farm raised alligators is dependent upon both the annual wild alligator egg production (which is influenced by environmental factors) and the current value of farm raised alligator skins. The Department has no control over either of these things.

10. Responsible Person: Who is responsible for data collection, analysis and quality? Provide name, title, and contact information for all persons involved in collection and reporting.

    Leisa Nunez, Wildlife Technician Supervisor, 337/538-2276
    Noel Kinler, Alligator Program Manager, 337/373-0032

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: Wildlife

Objective: To manage the alligator resource of the state to provide species protection and to authorize the sustainable harvest of wild alligators.

Indicator Name: Number of farm raised alligators released to the wild

1. Type and Level: What is the type of the indicator (input, output, outcome, efficiency, quality)? What is the level at which the indicator will be reported (key, supporting, general performance information)?

   Outcome; Key.

2. Rationale: What is the rationale for the indicator? Why was it selected? How does it help measure achievement of the objective?

   It is a measure of an activity that is crucial to the long term survivability of the wild alligator resource. It is also a measure of a significant workload associated with this objective.

3. Use: How will the indicator be used in management decision-making and other agency processes? Will it be used only for internal management purposes or will it also be used for budgeted purposes?

   It provides a measure of the recruitment being provided to the wild alligator population. Conducting these releases comprises a significant amount of the workload and budget associated with this objective. This performance indicator will be used for internal management and budget purposes.

4. Clarity: Does the indicator name clearly identify what is being measured? If the name contains jargon, acronyms, or unclear terms, define or clarify them here.

   Yes, the indicator name clearly identifies what is being measured.

5. Validity, Reliability, and Accuracy: Has the indicator been audited by the Office of the Legislative Auditor? If so, what was the result/finding? If not, how can you assure that the indicator is valid, reliable and accurate?

   No, the indicator has not been audited. The technical staff records all pertinent data on each farm alligator released to the wild.

6. Data Source, Collection and Reporting: What is the source of data to be reported? What is the frequency and timing of collection and reporting (monthly, quarterly, annual)?

   Monthly. The technical staff travels to the alligator farms to measure, tag, sex, tail notch and record every alligator to be released to the wild. Data is subsequently entered into a farm inventory computer program to ensure that each farmer meets their release requirements.

7. Calculation and Methodology: How is the indicator calculated?

   A computer report tallies the number of farm alligators released to the wild.

8. Scope: Is the indicator aggregated or disaggregated (is it a sum of smaller parts or is it a part of a larger whole)? Example – if the indicator is a statewide figure, can it be broken down by parish or region?

   Aggregated. The number of farm released alligators is totaled from all farmers.

9. Caveats: Does the indicator have limitations or weaknesses (lack of precision or timeliness, difficult to collect, external factors)?

Yes. The actual number of farm alligators released to the wild is dependent upon both the annual wild alligator egg production (which is influenced by environmental factors) and the current value of farm raised alligator skins. These two factors are beyond the control of the Department, but they do ultimately determine the number of eggs collected in any given year, which is directly related to the number of alligators released each year.

10. Responsible Person: Who is responsible for data collection, analysis and quality? Provide name, title, and contact information for all persons involved in collection and reporting.

    Ruth Elsey, Biologist Manager, 337/538-2276
    Leisa Nunez, Wildlife Technician Supervisor, 337/538-2276
    Noel Kinler, Alligator Program Manager, 337/373-0032

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: Wildlife

Objective: To manage the alligator resource of the state to provide species protection and to authorize the sustainable harvest of wild alligators.

Indicator Name: Number of farm alligator releases conducted

1. Type and Level: What is the type of the indicator (input, output, outcome, efficiency, quality)? What is the level at which the indicator will be reported (key, supporting, general performance information)?

   Output; Supporting.

2. Rationale: What is the rationale for the indicator? Why was it selected? How does it help measure achievement of the objective?

It is a measure of a significant workload associated with this objective.

3. Use: How will the indicator be used in management decision-making and other agency processes? Will it be used only for internal management purposes or will it also be used for budgeted purposes?

   Conducting these releases comprises a significant amount of the workload and budget associated with this objective. This performance indicator will be used for internal management and budget purposes.

4. Clarity: Does the indicator name clearly identify what is being measured? If the name contains jargon, acronyms, or unclear terms, define or clarify them here.

   Yes, the indicator name clearly identifies what is being measured.

5. Validity, Reliability, and Accuracy: Has the indicator been audited by the Office of the Legislative Auditor? If so, what was the result/finding? If not, how can you assure that the indicator is valid, reliable and accurate?

   No, the indicator has not been audited. Supervisory personnel will keep track of the number of farm releases conducted.

6. Data Source, Collection and Reporting: What is the source of data to be reported? What is the frequency and timing of collection and reporting (monthly, quarterly, annual)?

   Monthly. The technical staff travels to the alligator farms to measure, tag, sex, tail notch and record every alligator to be released to the wild. The number of actual releases conducted will be tallied and reported.

7. Calculation and Methodology: How is the indicator calculated?

   The indicator will be calculated by a simple counting of all releases conducted.

8. Scope: Is the indicator aggregated or disaggregated (is it a sum of smaller parts or is it a part of a larger whole)? Example – if the indicator is a statewide figure, can it be broken down by parish or region?

   Disaggregated.

9. Caveats: Does the indicator have limitations or weaknesses (lack of precision or timeliness, difficult to collect, external factors)?

   Yes. The actual number of farm releases conducted is dependent upon both the annual wild alligator egg production (which is influenced by environmental factors) and the current value of farm raised alligator skins. These two factors are beyond the control of the Department, but they do ultimately determine the number of eggs collected in any given year.

10. Responsible Person: Who is responsible for data collection, analysis and quality? Provide name, title, and contact information for all persons involved in collection and reporting.

    Ruth Elsey, Biologist Manager, 337/538-2276
    Leisa Nunez, Wildlife Technician Supervisor, 337/538-2276
    Noel Kinler, Alligator Program Manager, 337/373-0032

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: Wildlife

Objective: To manage the alligator resource of the state to provide species protection and to authorize the sustainable harvest of wild alligators.

Indicator Name: Number of alligator hide inspections conducted

1. Type and Level: What is the type of the indicator (input, output, outcome, efficiency, quality)? What is the level at which the indicator will be reported (key, supporting, general performance information)?

   Output; Supporting.

2. Rationale: What is the rationale for the indicator? Why was it selected? How does it help measure achievement of the objective?

   It is a measure of a significant workload associated with this objective and it provides the basis for tracking final disposition of all alligator harvest tags issued.

3. Use: How will the indicator be used in management decision-making and other agency processes? Will it be used only for internal management purposes or will it also be used for budgeted purposes?

   Conducting the hide inspections comprises a significant amount of the workload associated with this objective. During the inspection process we verify the tag numbers of alligators being shipped and collect all required fees. This performance indicator will be used for internal management and budget purposes.

4. Clarity: Does the indicator name clearly identify what is being measured? If the name contains jargon, acronyms, or unclear terms, define or clarify them here.

   Yes, the indicator name clearly identifies what is being measured.

5. Validity, Reliability, and Accuracy: Has the indicator been audited by the Office of the Legislative Auditor? If so, what was the result/finding? If not, how can you assure that the indicator is valid, reliable and accurate?

   No, the indicator has not been audited. Supervisory personnel will keep track of the number of alligator hide inspections conducted.

6. Data Source, Collection and Reporting: What is the source of data to be reported? What is the frequency and timing of collection and reporting (monthly, quarterly, annual)?

   Monthly. The technical staff travels to the alligator dealer's place of business to conduct the alligator hide inspections. The number of actual hide inspections conducted will be tallied and reported.

7. Calculation and Methodology: How is the indicator calculated?

   The indicator will be calculated by a simple counting of all hide inspections conducted.

8. Scope: Is the indicator aggregated or disaggregated (is it a sum of smaller parts or is it a part of a larger whole)? Example – if the indicator is a statewide figure, can it be broken down by parish or region?

   Disaggregated.

9. Caveats: Does the indicator have limitations or weaknesses (lack of precision or timeliness, difficult to collect, external factors)?

   Yes. The number of hide inspections conducted is determined by the number of wild and farm alligators produced in any given year. Overall alligator skin production is determined by the value of skins and by wild alligator egg production.

10. Responsible Person: Who is responsible for data collection, analysis and quality? Provide name, title, and contact information for all persons involved in collection and reporting.

    Leisa Nunez, Wildlife Technician Supervisor, 337/538-2276
    Ruth Elsey, Biologist Manager, 337/538-2276
    Noel Kinler, Alligator Program Manager, 337/373-0032

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: Wildlife

Objective: To manage the alligator resource of the state to provide species protection and to authorize the sustainable harvest of wild alligators.

Indicator Name: Number of tags issued for harvest of nuisance alligators

1. Type and Level: What is the type of the indicator (input, output, outcome, efficiency, quality)? What is the level at which the indicator will be reported (key, supporting, general performance information)?

   Output; Key.

2. Rationale: What is the rationale for the indicator? Why was it selected? How does it help measure achievement of the objective?

   It is an indicator of the number of human/alligator conflicts in the state. It is important that we monitor and investigate nuisance alligator complaints in order to prevent a serious injury from occurring.

3. Use: How will the indicator be used in management decision-making and other agency processes? Will it be used only for internal management purposes or will it also be used for budgeted purposes?

   It provides a measure of the number of nuisance alligators removed as a result of complaints by residents of the state. This indicator will be used for internal management and budget purposes.

4. Clarity: Does the indicator name clearly identify what is being measured? If the name contains jargon, acronyms, or unclear terms, define or clarify them here.

   Yes, the indicator name clearly identifies what is being measured.

5. Validity, Reliability, and Accuracy: Has the indicator been audited by the Office of the Legislative Auditor? If so, what was the result/finding? If not, how can you assure that the indicator is valid, reliable and accurate?

   No, the indicator has not been audited. Nuisance alligator hunters are issued serially numbered tags and are held accountable for the disposition of all harvest tags issued.

6. Data Source, Collection and Reporting: What is the source of data to be reported? What is the frequency and timing of collection and reporting (monthly, quarterly, annual)?

   Tag issuance is recorded and entered as it occurs. Reports on the number of nuisance tags issued can be run upon request.

7. Calculation and Methodology: How is the indicator calculated?

Serially numbered tags are issued to nuisance hunters and their disposition is tracked and monitored. Nuisance hunters are required to return any unused tags.

8. Scope: Is the indicator aggregated or disaggregated (is it a sum of smaller parts or is it a part of a larger whole)? Example – if the indicator is a statewide figure, can it be broken down by parish or region?

   Aggregated. The number of tags issued for the harvest of nuisance alligators is totaled to produce one summary figure.

9. Caveats: Does the indicator have limitations or weaknesses (lack of precision or timeliness, difficult to collect, external factors)?

   Yes. The number of nuisance alligator tags issued is dependent upon the number of complaints received. Various environmental factors, such as excessive drought, localized rainfall, or storm events influence the number of nuisance complaints received in any given year.

10. Responsible Person: Who is responsible for data collection, analysis and quality? Provide name, title, and contact information for all persons involved in collection and reporting.

    Leisa Nunez, Wildlife Technician Supervisor, 337/538-2276
    Noel Kinler, Alligator Program Manager, 337/373-0032

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: Wildlife

Objective: To manage the furbearer resources of the state to provide for species protection, sustainable harvest and through the Coastwide Nutria Control Program provide incentive payments for nutria harvest to reduce the negative impact of this non-native species on coastal wetland habitats.

Indicator Name: Number of participants in the nutria control program

1. Type and Level: What is the type of the indicator (input, output, outcome, efficiency, quality)? What is the level at which the indicator will be reported (key, supporting, general performance information)?

   Output; Key.

2. Rationale: What is the rationale for the indicator? Why was it selected? How does it help measure achievement of the objective?

   It measures the number of licensed trappers enrolled in the nutria control program.

3. Use: How will the indicator be used in management decision-making and other agency processes? Will it be used only for internal management purposes or will it also be used for budgeted purposes?

   It provides a measure of the level of participation in the nutria incentive program. It will be used for internal management and budget purposes.

4. Clarity: Does the indicator name clearly identify what is being measured? If the name contains jargon, acronyms, or unclear terms, define or clarify them here.

   Yes, the indicator name clearly identifies what is being measured.

5. Validity, Reliability, and Accuracy: Has the indicator been audited by the Office of the Legislative Auditor? If so, what was the result/finding? If not, how can you assure that the indicator is valid, reliable and accurate?

   No, the indicator has not been audited. Individuals participating in the nutria control program are registered and issued registration numbers.

6. Data Source, Collection and Reporting: What is the source of data to be reported? What is the frequency and timing of collection and reporting (monthly, quarterly, annual)?

   Annual.

7. Calculation and Methodology: How is the indicator calculated?

   It is a count of the number of registered participants.

8. Scope: Is the indicator aggregated or disaggregated (is it a sum of smaller parts or is it a part of a larger whole)? Example – if the indicator is a statewide figure, can it be broken down by parish or region?

   Disaggregate

9. Caveats: Does the indicator have limitations or weaknesses (lack of precision or timeliness, difficult to collect, external factors)?

   Yes. The Coastwide Nutria Control Program is a CWPPRA project; therefore the continuation of the program is contingent upon continued federal funding.

10. Responsible Person: Who is responsible for data collection, analysis and quality? Provide name, title, and contact information for all persons involved in collection and reporting.

    Janet Scarborough, Biologist 1, 337/373-0032
    Edmond Mouton, Program Manager, 337/373-0032

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: Wildlife

Objective: To manage the furbearer resources of the state to provide for species protection, sustainable harvest and through the Coastwide Nutria Control Program provide incentive payments for nutria harvest to reduce the negative impact of this non-native species on coastal wetland habitats.

Indicator Name: Number of nutria harvested in the nutria control program

1. Type and Level: What is the type of the indicator (input, output, outcome, efficiency, quality)? What is the level at which the indicator will be reported (key, supporting, general performance information)?

   Outcome; Key.

2. Rationale: What is the rationale for the indicator? Why was it selected? How does it help measure achievement of the objective?

   It is a measure of the sustained harvest of nutria and is a critical outcome of this objective.

3. Use: How will the indicator be used in management decision-making and other agency processes? Will it be used only for internal management purposes or will it also be used for budgeted purposes?

   It provides an indication of the abundance of nutria in coastal Louisiana and it will be used for internal management and budget purposes.

4. Clarity: Does the indicator name clearly identify what is being measured? If the name contains jargon, acronyms, or unclear terms, define or clarify them here.

   Yes, the indicator name clearly identifies what is being measured.

5. Validity, Reliability, and Accuracy: Has the indicator been audited by the Office of the Legislative Auditor? If so, what was the result/finding? If not, how can you assure that the indicator is valid, reliable and accurate?

   No, the indicator has not been audited. A detailed accounting procedure has been established to verify the number of nutria harvested and to issue payment to participants.

6. Data Source, Collection and Reporting: What is the source of data to be reported? What is the frequency and timing of collection and reporting (monthly, quarterly, annual)?

   Monthly. Nutria harvested within the scope of the nutria incentive program are reported weekly and combined to provide monthly totals.

7. Calculation and Methodology: How is the indicator calculated?

   A detailed accounting and payment procedure has been developed for tracking the number of nutria harvested within the nutria control program.

8. Scope: Is the indicator aggregated or disaggregated (is it a sum of smaller parts or is it a part of a larger whole)? Example – if the indicator is a statewide figure, can it be broken down by parish or region?

   Disaggregate

9. Caveats: Does the indicator have limitations or weaknesses (lack of precision or timeliness, difficult to collect, external factors)?

   Yes. The Coastwide Nutria Control Program is a CWPPRA project; therefore the continuation of the program is contingent upon continued federal funding.

10. Responsible Person: Who is responsible for data collection, analysis and quality? Provide name, title, and contact information for all persons involved in collection and reporting.

    Janet Scarborough, Biologist 1, 337/373-0032
    Edmond Mouton, Program Manager, 337/373-0032

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: Wildlife

Objective: To manage the furbearer resources of the state to provide for species protection, sustainable harvest and through the Coastwide Nutria Control Program provide incentive payments for nutria harvest to reduce the negative impact of this non-native species on coastal wetland habitats.

Indicator Name: Number of acres of coastal wetlands impacted by nutria herbivory

1. Type and Level: What is the type of the indicator (input, output, outcome, efficiency, quality)? What is the level at which the indicator will be reported (key, supporting, general performance information)?

   Outcome; Key.

2. Rationale: What is the rationale for the indicator? Why was it selected? How does it help measure achievement of the objective?

   It measures the estimated number of acres of coastal wetlands currently being impacted by nutria herbivory. It is a critical outcome of this objective.

3. Use: How will the indicator be used in management decision-making and other agency processes? Will it be used only for internal management purposes or will it also be used for budgeted purposes?

   It provides a measure of the level of impact that nutria herbivory is currently having on coastal habitats. It will be used for internal management and budget purposes.

4. Clarity: Does the indicator name clearly identify what is being measured? If the name contains jargon, acronyms, or unclear terms, define or clarify them here.

   Yes, the indicator name clearly identifies what is being measured.

5. Validity, Reliability, and Accuracy: Has the indicator been audited by the Office of the Legislative Auditor? If so, what was the result/finding? If not, how can you assure that the indicator is valid, reliable and accurate?

No, the indicator has not been audited. An annual survey is conducted to determine the number of acres of coastal habitats impacted by nutria feeding activity.

6. Data Source, Collection and Reporting: What is the source of data to be reported? What is the frequency and timing of collection and reporting (monthly, quarterly, annual)?

   Annual. The number of acres of coastal wetland habitats impacted is estimated by conducting a coastwide survey, searching for areas of damaged wetlands.

7. Calculation and Methodology: How is the indicator calculated?

   For each wetland site impacted by nutria herbivory, an estimate of the severity, age of damage, predicted recovery level, and size of the damage site is recorded. The size of each damage area is estimated by continuous logging of GPS data points around the perimeter of the site and then an acreage figure is calculated using an ARCVIEW script. The size of all damaged sites is summed to obtain this indicator.

8. Scope: Is the indicator aggregated or disaggregated (is it a sum of smaller parts or is it a part of a larger whole)? Example – if the indicator is a statewide figure, can it be broken down by parish or region?

   Aggregate. Acres of damage can be broken down by parish and habitat type.

9. Caveats: Does the indicator have limitations or weaknesses (lack of precision or timeliness, difficult to collect, external factors)?

   Yes. The Coastwide Nutria Control Program is a CWPPRA project; therefore the continuation of the program is contingent upon continued federal funding.

10. Responsible Person: Who is responsible for data collection, analysis and quality? Provide name, title, and contact information for all persons involved in collection and reporting.

    Janet Scarborough, Biologist 1, 337/373-0032
    Edmond Mouton, Program Manager, 337/373-0032

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: Wildlife

Objective: To manage the furbearer resources of the state to provide for species protection, sustainable harvest and through the Coastwide Nutria Control Program provide incentive payments for nutria harvest to reduce the negative impact of this non-native species on coastal wetland habitats.

Indicator Name: Number of acres of coastal wetlands recovered from nutria herbivory

1. Type and Level: What is the type of the indicator (input, output, outcome, efficiency, quality)? What is the level at which the indicator will be reported (key, supporting, general performance information)?

   Outcome; Key.

2. Rationale: What is the rationale for the indicator? Why was it selected? How does it help measure achievement of the objective?

   It measures the estimated number of acres of coastal wetlands currently recovered from the impact of nutria herbivory. It is a critical outcome of this objective.

3. Use: How will the indicator be used in management decision-making and other agency processes? Will it be used only for internal management purposes or will it also be used for budgeted purposes?

   It provides a measure of the potentially positive results of the nutria control program. As a consistent level of nutria harvest is obtained, damage to coastal wetlands should decrease. It will be used for internal management and budget purposes.

4. Clarity: Does the indicator name clearly identify what is being measured? If the name contains jargon, acronyms, or unclear terms, define or clarify them here.

   Yes, the indicator name clearly identifies what is being measured.

5. Validity, Reliability, and Accuracy: Has the indicator been audited by the Office of the Legislative Auditor? If so, what was the result/finding? If not, how can you assure that the indicator is valid, reliable and accurate?

   No, the indicator has not been audited. An annual survey is conducted to determine the number of acres of coastal habitats that have recovered from the impact of nutria feeding activity.

6. Data Source, Collection and Reporting: What is the source of data to be reported? What is the frequency and timing of collection and reporting (monthly, quarterly, annual)?

   Annual. The number of acres of coastal wetland habitats recovering from impact is estimated by conducting a coastwide survey. Sites previously identified as damaged are resurveyed to determine if recovery has occurred.

7. Calculation and Methodology: How is the indicator calculated?

   Annually. Each wetland site previously identified as damaged by nutria herbivory is resurveyed to determine if the site has recovered. The size of all recovered sites is summed to obtain this indicator.

8. Scope: Is the indicator aggregated or disaggregated (is it a sum of smaller parts or is it a part of a larger whole)? Example – if the indicator is a statewide figure, can it be broken down by parish or region?

   Aggregate. Acres of recovered sites can be broken down by parish and habitat type.

9. Caveats: Does the indicator have limitations or weaknesses (lack of precision or timeliness, difficult to collect, external factors)?

   Yes. The Coastwide Nutria Control Program is a CWPPRA project; therefore the continuation of the program is contingent upon continued federal funding.

10. Responsible Person: Who is responsible for data collection, analysis and quality? Provide name, title, and contact information for all persons involved in collection and reporting.

    Janet Scarborough, Biologist 1, 337/373-0032
    Edmond Mouton, Program Manager, 337/373-0032

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: Wildlife

Objective: To manage the furbearer resources of the state to provide for species protection, sustainable harvest and through the Coastwide Nutria Control Program provide incentive payments for nutria harvest to reduce the negative impact of this non-native species on coastal wetland habitats.

Indicator Name: Number of total furbearers harvested

1. Type and Level: What is the type of the indicator (input, output, outcome, efficiency, quality)? What is the level at which the indicator will be reported (key, supporting, general performance information)?

   Outcome; Key.

2. Rationale: What is the rationale for the indicator? Why was it selected? How does it help measure achievement of the objective?

   It is a measure of the sustained harvest of furbearers and is an important outcome of this objective.

3. Use: How will the indicator be used in management decision-making and other agency processes? Will it be used only for internal management purposes or will it also be used for budgeted purposes?

   It provides a measure of the number of harvested by licensed fur trappers in the state's furbearer management program. It will be used for internal management purposes.

4. Clarity: Does the indicator name clearly identify what is being measured? If the name contains jargon, acronyms, or unclear terms, define or clarify them here.

   Yes, the indicator name clearly identifies what is being measured.

5. Validity, Reliability, and Accuracy: Has the indicator been audited by the Office of the Legislative Auditor? If so, what was the result/finding? If not, how can you assure that the indicator is valid, reliable and accurate?

   No, the indicator has not been audited. Furbearer shipping records and the results of the Coastwide Nutria Control Program are reviewed to determine total furbearer harvest.

6. Data Source, Collection and Reporting: What is the source of data to be reported? What is the frequency and timing of collection and reporting (monthly, quarterly, annual)?

   Annual. Fur dealer reports of furbearer pelts exported are audited annually and this data is combined with the results of the Coastwide Nutria Control Program to determine the total furbearers harvested.

7. Calculation and Methodology: How is the indicator calculated?

   Official audits of fur dealers occur annually to ensure that the required severance tax on furbearer pelts is paid. The results of this audit, combined with the number of nutria harvested in the nutria control program are totaled to determine the total furbearers harvested.

8. Scope: Is the indicator aggregated or disaggregated (is it a sum of smaller parts or is it a part of a larger whole)? Example – if the indicator is a statewide figure, can it be broken down by parish or region?

   Disaggregate

9. Caveats: Does the indicator have limitations or weaknesses (lack of precision or timeliness, difficult to collect, external factors)?

   Yes. The Coastwide Nutria Control Program is a CWPPRA project; therefore the continuation of the program is contingent upon continued federal funding. Without this program, nutria harvest would drop dramatically. The value of the furbearers harvested has a direct impact on the number harvested. Higher pelt values will result in increased harvest.

10. Responsible Person: Who is responsible for data collection, analysis and quality? Provide name, title, and contact information for all persons involved in collection and reporting.

    Edmond Mouton, Program Manager, 337/373-0032

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: Wildlife

Objective: To manage the furbearer resources of the state to provide for species protection, sustainable harvest and through the Coastwide Nutria Control Program provide incentive payments for nutria harvest to reduce the negative impact of this non-native species on coastal wetland habitats.

Indicator Name: Number of licensed trappers

1. Type and Level: What is the type of the indicator (input, output, outcome, efficiency, quality)? What is the level at which the indicator will be reported (key, supporting, general performance information)?

   Output; Key.

2. Rationale: What is the rationale for the indicator? Why was it selected? How does it help measure achievement of the objective?

   It measures the statewide number of licensed trappers.

3. Use: How will the indicator be used in management decision-making and other agency processes? Will it be used only for internal management purposes or will it also be used for budgeted purposes?

It provides a measure of the level of participation in the state's furbearer management program. It will be used for internal management purposes.

4. Clarity: Does the indicator name clearly identify what is being measured? If the name contains jargon, acronyms, or unclear terms, define or clarify them here.

   Yes, the indicator name clearly identifies what is being measured.

5. Validity, Reliability, and Accuracy: Has the indicator been audited by the Office of the Legislative Auditor? If so, what was the result/finding? If not, how can you assure that the indicator is valid, reliable and accurate?

   No, the indicator has not been audited. Individuals participating in the state's furbearer program are required to purchase a trapping license.

6. Data Source, Collection and Reporting: What is the source of data to be reported? What is the frequency and timing of collection and reporting (monthly, quarterly, annual)?

   Annual.

7. Calculation and Methodology: How is the indicator calculated?

   It is a count of the number of individuals purchasing a trapping license.

8. Scope: Is the indicator aggregated or disaggregated (is it a sum of smaller parts or is it a part of a larger whole)? Example – if the indicator is a statewide figure, can it be broken down by parish or region?

   Aggregate. The number of licenses can be broken down by parish.

9. Caveats: Does the indicator have limitations or weaknesses (lack of precision or timeliness, difficult to collect, external factors)?

   Yes. As value of fur pelts increase or decrease, so will the number of licensed trappers.

10. Responsible Person: Who is responsible for data collection, analysis and quality? Provide name, title, and contact information for all persons involved in collection and reporting.

    Edmond Mouton, Program Manager, 337/373-0032

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: Wildlife

Objective: To perform habitat management, maintenance, and monitoring activities to conserve 627,279 acres in the coastal Wildlife Management Area (WMA) and Refuge system for fish and wildlife populations and associated recreational and commercial opportunities.

Indicator Name: Number of acres in the coastal WMA and Refuge system

11. Type and Level: What is the type of the indicator (input, output, outcome, efficiency, quality)? What is the level at which the indicator will be reported (key, supporting, general performance information)?

Input; Key.

12. Rationale: What is the rationale for the indicator? Why was it selected? How does it help measure achievement of the objective?

It documents the acres in the coastal WMA and Refuge system. As such, it is a measure of the status of the acreage under conservation management by Fur and Refuge Division.

13. Use: How will the indicator be used in management decision-making and other agency processes? Will it be used only for internal management purposes or will it also be used for budgeted purposes?

Land management and associated costs accounts for the majority of the Division's expenditures. The level of active management is contingent upon continued funding for operation of these areas.

14. Clarity: Does the indicator name clearly identify what is being measured? If the name contains jargon, acronyms, or unclear terms, define or clarify them here.

Yes. **Coastal Wildlife Management Areas and Refuges include:** Rockefeller Wildlife Refuge, State Wildlife Refuge, Marsh Island Wildlife Refuge, Terrebonne Barrier Islands Refuge, Atchafalaya Delta WMA, Point Aux Chenes WMA, Salvador WMA, Pass-a-Loutre WMA, Timkin WMA, Lake Beouf WMA, Wisner WMA, Biloxi WMA and the White Lake Wetlands Conservation Area.

15. Validity, Reliability, and Accuracy: Has the indicator been audited by the Office of the Legislative Auditor? If so, what was the result/finding? If not, how can you assure that the indicator is valid, reliable and accurate?

No, the indicator has not been audited. It is a simple tabulation of the current acres in the coastal WMA and Refuge system.

16. What is the frequency and timing of collection and reporting (monthly, quarterly, annual)?

Annual.

17. Calculation and Methodology: How is the indicator calculated?

The acres reported was calculated in 2003 by United Sates Geological Survey (USGS)

18. Scope: Is the indicator Aggregated or Disaggregated (is it a sum of smaller parts or is it a part of a larger whole)? Example – if the indicator is a statewide figure, can it be broken down by parish or region?

Aggregated. The acres for each individual area will be summed.

19. Caveats: Does the indicator have limitations or weaknesses (lack of precision or timeliness, difficult to collect, external factors)?

No.

20. Responsible Person: Who is responsible for data collection, analysis and quality? Provide name, title, and contact information for all persons involved in collection and reporting.

Lance Campbell, Biologist Supervisor, 337/373-0032
Noel Kinler, Alligator Program Manager, 337/373-0032

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: Wildlife

Objective: To perform habitat management, maintenance, and monitoring activities to conserve 627,279 acres in the coastal Wildlife Management Area (WMA) and Refuge system for fish and wildlife populations and associated recreational and commercial opportunities.

Indicator Name: Number of habitat enhancement projects under development

11. Type and Level: What is the type of the indicator (input, output, outcome, efficiency, quality)? What is the level at which the indicator will be reported (key, supporting, general performance information)?

    Output; Key.

12. Rationale: What is the rationale for the indicator? Why was it selected? How does it help measure achievement of the objective?

    It is a measure of activity that is part of stewardship and contributes to the overall goal of protecting, enhancing and maintaining habitat, associated fish and wildlife populations and increasing the opportunities for the public to enjoy their outdoor experiences.

13. Use: How will the indicator be used in management decision-making and other agency processes? Will it be used only for internal management purposes or will it also be used for budgeted purposes?

    With existing funding, the Department strives to maintain all habitat management projects that are currently in place. Project development and implementation is a major activity and workload for this objective. Additional sources of funding are sought to develop new habitat enhancement projects. The indicator will be used for internal management and budget purposes.

14. Clarity: Does the indicator name clearly identify what is being measured? If the name contains jargon, acronyms, or unclear terms, define or clarify them here.

    Yes; **Habitat enhancement projects include but are not limited to:** water control structures, levee maintenance and construction, shoreline protection, terrace construction, vegetative planting, access improvements, barrier island restorations, breakwater construction, etc.

15. Validity, Reliability, and Accuracy: Has the indicator been audited by the Office of the Legislative Auditor? If so, what was the result/finding? If not, how can you assure that the indicator is valid, reliable and accurate?

    No, the indicator has not been audited. The count will be done by selected staff, with a specific list of projects by area developed to ensure accuracy of the indicator.

16. Data Source, Collection and Reporting: What is the source of data to be reported? What is the frequency and timing of collection and reporting (monthly, quarterly, annual)?

    Quarterly. The list of projects currently being developed will be reviewed quarterly to ensure that all projects are listed.

17. Calculation and Methodology: How is the indicator calculated?

Appropriate staff will be required to review the current list of active projects. New projects will be added and old projects removed as necessary.

18. Scope: Is the indicator Aggregated or Disaggregated (is it a sum of smaller parts or is it a part of a larger whole)? Example – if the indicator is a statewide figure, can it be broken down by parish or region?

    Aggregated. Projects from all coastal WMAs and Refuges will be summed.

19. Caveats: Does the indicator have limitations or weaknesses (lack of precision or timeliness, difficult to collect, external factors)?

    The number of projects under development will be contingent upon available funding.

20. Responsible Person: Who is responsible for data collection, analysis and quality? Provide name, title, and contact information for all persons involved in collection and reporting.

Mike Carloss, Program Manager, 337/373/0032

Tom Hess, Biologist Manager, 337/538-2276
Guthrie Perry, Program Manager, 337/538-2276
Edmond Mouton, Program Manager, 337/373-0032
Mike Windham, Program Manager, 504/568-5888
Noel Kinler, Alligator Program Manager, 337/373-0032
Wayne Sweeney, Manager, 337/479-1894

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: Wildlife

Objective: To perform habitat management, maintenance, and monitoring activities to conserve 627,279 acres in the coastal Wildlife Management Area (WMA) and Refuge system for fish and wildlife populations and associated recreational and commercial opportunities.

Indicator Name: Number of acres impacted by habitat enhancement projects and activities

1. Type and Level: What is the type of the indicator (input, output, outcome, efficiency, quality)? What is the level at which the indicator will be reported (key, supporting, general performance information)?

   Output; Key.

2. Rationale: What is the rationale for the indicator? Why was it selected? How does it help measure achievement of the objective?

It is a measure of activity that is part of stewardship and contributes to the overall goal of protecting, enhancing and maintaining habitat, associated fish and wildlife populations and increasing the opportunities for the public to enjoy their outdoor experiences.

3. Use: How will the indicator be used in management decision-making and other agency processes? Will it be used only for internal management purposes or will it also be used for budgeted purposes?

With existing funding, the Department strives to maintain all acres that are currently enhanced. This indicator is a critical outcome for this objective. Activities that contribute to the number of acres enhanced are a major function of this objective. The indicator will be used for internal management and budget purposes.

4. Clarity: Does the indicator name clearly identify what is being measured? If the name contains jargon, acronyms, or unclear terms, define or clarify them here.

   Yes; **Habitat enhancement projects and activities which result in impacted acres include but are not limited to:** fixed crest weirs, impoundments, variable crest weirs, levee systems, marsh burning, shoreline protection, terrace construction, vegetative planting, channel development, mowing, crevasse development, barrier island restorations, breakwater construction, etc.

5. Validity, Reliability, and Accuracy: Has the indicator been audited by the Office of the Legislative Auditor? If so, what was the result/finding? If not, how can you assure that the indicator is valid, reliable and accurate?

No, the indicator has not been audited. The estimate of acres impacted will be done by selected staff, with a specific list of acres by area developed to ensure accuracy of the indicator.

6. Data Source, Collection and Reporting: What is the source of data to be reported? What is the frequency and timing of collection and reporting (monthly, quarterly, annual)?

Quarterly.

7. Calculation and Methodology: How is the indicator calculated?

Appropriate staff will be required to develop a list of all acres impacted by habitat enhancement projects and activities. As new projects and activities result in additional impacted acres they will be added to the list.

8. Scope: Is the indicator Aggregated or Disaggregated (is it a sum of smaller parts or is it a part of a larger whole)? Example – if the indicator is a statewide figure, can it be broken down by parish or region?

   Aggregated. Acres impacted from all coastal WMAs and Refuges will be summed.

9. Caveats: Does the indicator have limitations or weaknesses (lack of precision or timeliness, difficult to collect, external factors)?

   The number of acres impacted by habitat enhancement projects and activities could be reduced if budgets and personnel are reduced. Due caution will be exercised to ensure that acres impacted are not double counted.

10. Responsible Person: Who is responsible for data collection, analysis and quality? Provide name, title, and contact information for all persons involved in collection and reporting.

Mike Carloss, Program Manager, 337/373/0032

Tom Hess, Biologist Manager, 337/538-2276
Guthrie Perry, Program Manager, 337/538-2276
Edmond Mouton, Program Manager, 337/373-0032
Mike Windham, Program Manager, 504/568-5888
Noel Kinler, Alligator Program Manager, 337/373-0032
Wayne Sweeney, Manager, 337/479-1894

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: Wildlife

Objective: To perform habitat management, maintenance, and monitoring activities to conserve 627,279 acres in the coastal Wildlife Management Area (WMA) and Refuge system for fish and wildlife populations and associated recreational and commercial opportunities.

Indicator Name: Number of visitors to coastal WMAs and Refuges

1. Type and Level: What is the type of the indicator (input, output, outcome, efficiency, quality)? What is the level at which the indicator will be reported (key, supporting, general performance information)?

   Outcome; Key.

2. Rationale: What is the rationale for the indicator? Why was it selected? How does it help measure achievement of the objective?

It is a measurable activity that is part of stewardship and contributes to the overall goal of protecting, enhancing and maintaining habitat, associated fish and wildlife populations and increasing the opportunities for the public to enjoy their outdoor experiences.

3. Use: How will the indicator be used in management decision-making and other agency processes? Will it be used only for internal management purposes or will it also be used for budgeted purposes?

It provides an index to the degree of public use of the coastal WMAs and Refuges. It provides insight into major user groups and the demand for recreational and commercial opportunity on these areas. This is an important indicator for this objective and as such, will be used for internal management and budget purposes.

4. Clarity: Does the indicator name clearly identify what is being measured? If the name contains jargon, acronyms, or unclear terms, define or clarify them here.

   Yes. The areas to be included for this indicator are: Rockefeller Wildlife Refuge, State Wildlife Refuge, Marsh Island Wildlife Refuge, Atchafalaya Delta WMA, Point Aux Chenes WMA, Salvador WMA, Timkin WMA, Pass-a-Loutre WMA and White Lake Wetlands Conservation Area.

5. Validity, Reliability, and Accuracy: Has the indicator been audited by the Office of the Legislative Auditor? If so, what was the result/finding? If not, how can you assure that the indicator is valid, reliable and accurate?

No, the indicator has not been audited. The number of visitors to these areas is estimated by field staff periodically conducting a reconnaissance of the areas and recording the number and activity of visitors to the area. On Rockefeller Refuge car counters (located on the primary access points) are used to extrapolate to the total number of visitors. Because the methodology used to make this estimate is consistent over time we believe the indicator is valid, reliable and accurate within the limitations of the staff available to make the estimate.

6. Data Source, Collection and Reporting: What is the source of data to be reported? What is the frequency and timing of collection and reporting (monthly, quarterly, annual)?

Data collected from the field surveys and from the car counters are reported quarterly.

7. Calculation and Methodology: How is the indicator calculated?

The number of visitors to these areas is estimated by the field staff periodically conducting a reconnaissance of the areas and recording the number and activity of visitors to the area. On Rockefeller Refuge car counters (located on the primary access points) are used to extrapolate to the total number of visitors. Because the methodology used to make this estimate is consistent over time we believe the indicator is valid, reliable and accurate within the limitations of the staff available to make the estimate.

8. Scope: Is the indicator Aggregated or Disaggregated (is it a sum of smaller parts or is it a part of a larger whole)? Example – if the indicator is a statewide figure, can it be broken down by parish or region?

Aggregated. Number of visitors from the specified coastal WMAs and Refuges will be summed.

9. Caveats: Does the indicator have limitations or weaknesses (lack of precision or timeliness, difficult to collect, external factors)?

   Our ability to determine the number of visitors to these areas is contingent upon maintaining current staffing levels. If work priorities change or if staffing levels are decreased, our ability to accurately determine the number of visitors may be jeopardized.

10. Responsible Person: Who is responsible for data collection, analysis and quality? Provide name, title, and contact information for all persons involved in collection and reporting.

Mike Carloss, Program Manager, 337/373/0032

Guthrie Perry, Program Manager, 337/538-2276
Noel Kinler, Alligator Program Manager, 337/373-0032
Wayne Sweeney, Manager, 337/479-1894
George Melancon, Biologist 3, 337/538-2276

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: Wildlife

Objective: To perform habitat management, maintenance, and monitoring activities to conserve 627,279 acres in the coastal Wildlife Management Area (WMA) and Refuge system for fish and wildlife populations and associated recreational and commercial opportunities.

Indicator Name: Number of individuals participating in youth hunting activities

1. Type and Level: What is the type of the indicator (input, output, outcome, efficiency, quality)? What is the level at which the indicator will be reported (key, supporting, general performance information)?

   Outcome; Supporting

2. Rationale: What is the rationale for the indicator? Why was it selected? How does it help measure achievement of the objective?

It is a measurable activity that is part of stewardship and contributes to the overall goal of protecting, enhancing and maintaining habitat, associated fish and wildlife populations and increasing the opportunities for the public to enjoy their outdoor experiences. In particular the Department is interested in providing specific opportunities to youths to develop their interest in a variety of outdoor recreational activities.

3. Use: How will the indicator be used in management decision-making and other agency processes? Will it be used only for internal management purposes or will it also be used for budgeted purposes?

It provides an index to the desire of youths to take advantage of specific recreational hunting opportunities on the coastal WMAs. As these youth programs increase in popularity, planned Department activities may change to provide additional opportunity. This indicator will be used for internal management and budget purposes.

4. Clarity: Does the indicator name clearly identify what is being measured? If the name contains jargon, acronyms, or unclear terms, define or clarify them here.

   Yes, the indicator name clearly identifies what is being measured.

5. Validity, Reliability, and Accuracy: Has the indicator been audited by the Office of the Legislative Auditor? If so, what was the result/finding? If not, how can you assure that the indicator is valid, reliable and accurate?

No, the indicator has not been audited. All youth hunts are conducted under the immediate supervision of field staff.

6. Data Source, Collection and Reporting: What is the source of data to be reported? What is the frequency and timing of collection and reporting (monthly, quarterly, annual)?

Information on participation in the youth hunting activities is reported in monthly activity reports.

7. Calculation and Methodology: How is the indicator calculated?

All youth hunts are administered through a lottery system and the actual hunting activities are conducted under direst supervision of the field staff. The number of hunters participating is recorded each day of each hunt.

8. Scope: Is the indicator Aggregated or Disaggregated (is it a sum of smaller parts or is it a part of a larger whole)? Example – if the indicator is a statewide figure, can it be broken down by parish or region?

Aggregated. The number of participants on each area will be summed.

9. Caveats: Does the indicator have limitations or weaknesses (lack of precision or timeliness, difficult to collect, external factors)?

   Our ability to provide youth hunting opportunities is contingent upon maintaining current staffing and funding levels.

10. Responsible Person: Who is responsible for data collection, analysis and quality? Provide name, title, and contact information for all persons involved in collection and reporting.

Mike Carloss, Program Manager, 337/373/0032

Noel Kinler, Alligator Program Manager, 337/373-0032
Wayne Sweeney, Manager, 337/479-1894

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: Wildlife

Objective: To perform habitat management, maintenance, and monitoring activities to conserve 627,279 acres in the coastal Wildlife Management Area (WMA) and Refuge system for fish and wildlife populations and associated recreational and commercial opportunities.

Indicator Name: Number of mineral projects

1. Type and Level: What is the type of the indicator (input, output, outcome, efficiency, quality)? What is the level at which the indicator will be reported (key, supporting, general performance information)?

   Outcome; Key

2. Rationale: What is the rationale for the indicator? Why was it selected? How does it help measure achievement of the objective?

It is a measurable activity that is part of stewardship and contributes to the overall goal of protecting, enhancing and maintaining habitat, associated fish and wildlife populations and increasing the opportunities for the public to enjoy their outdoor experiences. In particular the Department is interested in ensuring that any mineral activity conducted on the coastal WMAs and Refuges in done in compliance with all state and federal regulations and that any impacts of these activities on the habitat and fish and wildlife resources on these areas is minimized.

3. Use: How will the indicator be used in management decision-making and other agency processes? Will it be used only for internal management purposes or will it also be used for budgeted purposes?

It is important that the Department know of all current and planned mineral activities on these areas. Appropriate planning of mineral activities may result in habitat benefits. This indicator will be used for internal management and budget purposes.

4. Clarity: Does the indicator name clearly identify what is being measured? If the name contains jargon, acronyms, or unclear terms, define or clarify them here.

   Yes. Mineral projects include but are not limited to the following: well locations, pipelines, seismic activities, servitudes, surface leases, assignments, subsurface leases, etc.

5. Validity, Reliability, and Accuracy: Has the indicator been audited by the Office of the Legislative Auditor? If so, what was the result/finding? If not, how can you assure that the indicator is valid, reliable and accurate?

No, the indicator has not been audited. A simple count of the various mineral activities will be conducted.

6. Data Source, Collection and Reporting: What is the source of data to be reported? What is the frequency and timing of collection and reporting (monthly, quarterly, annual)?

Quarterly.

7. Calculation and Methodology: How is the indicator calculated?

A listing of mineral projects for each area will be developed maintained and reported quarterly.

8. Scope: Is the indicator Aggregated or Disaggregated (is it a sum of smaller parts or is it a part of a larger whole)? Example – if the indicator is a statewide figure, can it be broken down by parish or region?

Aggregated. The number of mineral projects on each area will be summed.

9. Caveats: Does the indicator have limitations or weaknesses (lack of precision or timeliness, difficult to collect, external factors)?

   No.

10. Responsible Person: Who is responsible for data collection, analysis and quality? Provide name, title, and contact information for all persons involved in collection and reporting.

Mike Windham, Program Manager, 225/265-2807

Noel Kinler, Alligator Program Manager, 337/373-0032

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST

Program: Wildlife

Objective: To manage the alligator resource of the state to provide species protection and to authorize the sustainable harvest of wild alligators.

Strategy: Conduct population inventory surveys to assess population trends and distribution.

Yes	No	
		Analysis:
	X	Cost/benefit analysis conducted
	X	Financial or performance audit used
	X	Benchmarking for best management practices used
	X	Act 160 Reports used
X		Other analysis or evaluation tools used
X		Impact on other strategies considered
X		Stakeholders identified and involved
		Authorization:
X		Authorization exists
	X	Authorization needed
		Organization Capacity:
X		Needed structural or procedural changes identified
X		Resource needs identified
X		Strategies developed to implement needed changes
X		Responsibility assigned
		Time Frame:
X		Already ongoing
X		Lifetime of strategy identified
		Fiscal Impact:
	X	Impact on operating budget
X		Impact on capital outlay budget
X		Means of Finance identified
X		Return on investment determined to be favorable

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST

Program: Wildlife

Objective: To manage the alligator resource of the state to provide species protection and to authorize the sustainable harvest of wild alligators.

Strategy: Recommend and implement harvest seasons, quotas and regulations to provide for the sustainable harvest of wild alligators and wild alligator eggs.

Yes	No	
		Analysis:
	X	Cost/benefit analysis conducted
	X	Financial or performance audit used
	X	Benchmarking for best management practices used
	X	Act 160 Reports used
X		Other analysis or evaluation tools used
X		Impact on other strategies considered
X		Stakeholders identified and involved
		Authorization:
X		Authorization exists
	X	Authorization needed
		Organization Capacity:
X		Needed structural or procedural changes identified
X		Resource needs identified
X		Strategies developed to implement needed changes
X		Responsibility assigned
		Time Frame:
X		Already ongoing
X		Lifetime of strategy identified
		Fiscal Impact:
	X	Impact on operating budget

X		Impact on capital outlay budget
X		Means of Finance identified
X		Return on investment determined to be favorable

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST

Program: Wildlife

Objective: To manage the alligator resource of the state to provide species protection and to authorize the sustainable harvest of wild alligators.

Strategy: Conduct the necessary activities to manage the farm/ranching program and wild alligator egg collection program to ensure adequate controls to protect the wild alligator resource.

Yes	No	
		Analysis:
	X	Cost/benefit analysis conducted
	X	Financial or performance audit used
	X	Benchmarking for best management practices used
	X	Act 160 Reports used
X		Other analysis or evaluation tools used
X		Impact on other strategies considered
X		Stakeholders identified and involved
		Authorization:
X		Authorization exists
	X	Authorization needed
		Organization Capacity:
X		Needed structural or procedural changes identified
X		Resource needs identified
X		Strategies developed to implement needed changes
X		Responsibility assigned
		Time Frame:
X		Already ongoing
X		Lifetime of strategy identified

		Fiscal Impact:
	X	Impact on operating budget
X		Impact on capital outlay budget
X		Means of Finance identified
X		Return on investment determined to be favorable

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST

Program: Wildlife

Objective: To manage the alligator resource of the state to provide species protection and to authorize the sustainable harvest of wild alligators.

Strategy: Conduct various research and monitoring activities to provide an adequate database of information to manage the wild alligator population.

Yes	No	
		Analysis:
	X	Cost/benefit analysis conducted
	X	Financial or performance audit used
	X	Benchmarking for best management practices used
	X	Act 160 Reports used
X		Other analysis or evaluation tools used
X		Impact on other strategies considered
X		Stakeholders identified and involved
		Authorization:
X		Authorization exists
	X	Authorization needed
		Organization Capacity:
X		Needed structural or procedural changes identified
X		Resource needs identified
X		Strategies developed to implement needed changes
X		Responsibility assigned
		Time Frame:
X		Already ongoing

X		Lifetime of strategy identified
		Fiscal Impact:
	X	Impact on operating budget
X		Impact on capital outlay budget
X		Means of Finance identified
X		Return on investment determined to be favorable

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST

Program: Wildlife

Objective: To manage the furbearer resources of the state to provide for species protection, sustainable harvest and through the Coastwide Nutria Control Program provide incentive payments for nutria harvest to reduce the negative impact of this non-native species on coastal wetland habitats.

Strategy: Recommend and implement harvest seasons and regulations to provide for the harvest of all furbearers.

Yes	No	
		Analysis:
	X	Cost/benefit analysis conducted
	X	Financial or performance audit used
	X	Benchmarking for best management practices used
	X	Act 160 Reports used
X		Other analysis or evaluation tools used
X		Impact on other strategies considered
X		Stakeholders identified and involved
		Authorization:
X		Authorization exists
	X	Authorization needed
		Organization Capacity:
X		Needed structural or procedural changes identified
X		Resource needs identified
X		Strategies developed to implement needed changes

X		Responsibility assigned
		Time Frame:
X		Already ongoing
X		Lifetime of strategy identified
		Fiscal Impact:
	X	Impact on operating budget
X		Impact on capital outlay budget
X		Means of Finance identified
X		Return on investment determined to be favorable

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST

Program: Wildlife

Objective: To manage the furbearer resources of the state to provide for species protection, sustainable harvest and through the Coastwide Nutria Control Program provide incentive payments for nutria harvest to reduce the negative impact of this non-native species on coastal wetland habitats.

Strategy: Conduct the necessary activities to administer the Coastwide Nutria Control Program, meeting all requirements set forth by the CWPPRA Task Force.

Yes	No	
		Analysis:
	X	Cost/benefit analysis conducted
	X	Financial or performance audit used
	X	Benchmarking for best management practices used
	X	Act 160 Reports used
X		Other analysis or evaluation tools used
X		Impact on other strategies considered
X		Stakeholders identified and involved
		Authorization:
X		Authorization exists
	X	Authorization needed
		Organization Capacity:
X		Needed structural or procedural changes identified

X		Resource needs identified
X		Strategies developed to implement needed changes
X		Responsibility assigned
		Time Frame:
X		Already ongoing
X		Lifetime of strategy identified
		Fiscal Impact:
	X	Impact on operating budget
X		Impact on capital outlay budget
X		Means of Finance identified
X		Return on investment determined to be favorable

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST

Program: Wildlife

Objective: To manage the furbearer resources of the state to provide for species protection, sustainable harvest and through the Coastwide Nutria Control Program provide incentive payments for nutria harvest to reduce the negative impact of this non-native species on coastal wetland habitats.

Strategy: Conduct an annual coastwide survey to assess the impact of nutria on coastal wetland habitats.

Yes	No	
		Analysis:
	X	Cost/benefit analysis conducted
	X	Financial or performance audit used
	X	Benchmarking for best management practices used
	X	Act 160 Reports used
X		Other analysis or evaluation tools used
X		Impact on other strategies considered
X		Stakeholders identified and involved
		Authorization:
X		Authorization exists
	X	Authorization needed
		Organization Capacity:

X		Needed structural or procedural changes identified
X		Resource needs identified
X		Strategies developed to implement needed changes
X		Responsibility assigned
		Time Frame:
X		Already ongoing
X		Lifetime of strategy identified
		Fiscal Impact:
	X	Impact on operating budget
X		Impact on capital outlay budget
X		Means of Finance identified
X		Return on investment determined to be favorable

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST

Program: Wildlife

Objective: To perform habitat management, maintenance, and monitoring activities to conserve 627,279 acres in the coastal Wildlife Management Area (WMA) and Refuge system for fish and wildlife populations and associated recreational and commercial opportunities.

Strategy: Assess, conduct, monitor, and implement marsh management activities on the coastal Wildlife Management Areas and Refuges.

Yes	No	
		Analysis:
	X	Cost/benefit analysis conducted
	X	Financial or performance audit used
	X	Benchmarking for best management practices used
	X	Act 160 Reports used
X		Other analysis or evaluation tools used
X		Impact on other strategies considered
X		Stakeholders identified and involved
		Authorization:
X		Authorization exists
	X	Authorization needed

		Organization Capacity:
X		Needed structural or procedural changes identified
X		Resource needs identified
X		Strategies developed to implement needed changes
X		Responsibility assigned
		Time Frame:
X		Already ongoing
X		Lifetime of strategy identified
		Fiscal Impact:
	X	Impact on operating budget
X		Impact on capital outlay budget
X		Means of Finance identified
X		Return on investment determined to be favorable

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST

Program: Wildlife

Objective: To perform habitat management, maintenance, and monitoring activities to conserve 627,279 acres in the coastal Wildlife Management Area (WMA) and Refuge system for fish and wildlife populations and associated recreational and commercial opportunities.

Strategy: Assess, monitor, and implement development activities on the coastal Wildlife Management Areas and Refuges.

Yes	No	
		Analysis:
	X	Cost/benefit analysis conducted
	X	Financial or performance audit used
	X	Benchmarking for best management practices used
	X	Act 160 Reports used
X		Other analysis or evaluation tools used
X		Impact on other strategies considered
X		Stakeholders identified and involved
		Authorization:

X		Authorization exists
	X	Authorization needed
		Organization Capacity:
X		Needed structural or procedural changes identified
X		Resource needs identified
X		Strategies developed to implement needed changes
X		Responsibility assigned
		Time Frame:
X		Already ongoing
X		Lifetime of strategy identified
		Fiscal Impact:
	X	Impact on operating budget
	X	Impact on capital outlay budget
X		Means of Finance identified
X		Return on investment determined to be favorable

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST

Program: Wildlife

Objective: To perform habitat management, maintenance, and monitoring activities to conserve 627,279 acres in the coastal Wildlife Management Area (WMA) and Refuge system for fish and wildlife populations and associated recreational and commercial opportunities.

Strategy: Develop and maintain partnerships with various state and federal agencies as well as conservation groups to facilitate management programs.

Yes	No	
		Analysis:
	X	Cost/benefit analysis conducted
	X	Financial or performance audit used
	X	Benchmarking for best management practices used
	X	Act 160 Reports used
X		Other analysis or evaluation tools used
X		Impact on other strategies considered
X		Stakeholders identified and involved

		Authorization:
X		Authorization exists
	X	Authorization needed
		Organization Capacity:
X		Needed structural or procedural changes identified
X		Resource needs identified
X		Strategies developed to implement needed changes
X		Responsibility assigned
		Time Frame:
X		Already ongoing
X		Lifetime of strategy identified
		Fiscal Impact:
	X	Impact on operating budget
X		Impact on capital outlay budget
X		Means of Finance identified
X		Return on investment determined to be favorable

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST

Program: Wildlife

Objective: To perform habitat management, maintenance, and monitoring activities to conserve 627,279 acres in the coastal Wildlife Management Area (WMA) and Refuge system for fish and wildlife populations and associated recreational and commercial opportunities.

Strategy: Provide recreational and commercial opportunities on coastal Wildlife Management Areas and Refuges.

Yes	No	
		Analysis:
	X	Cost/benefit analysis conducted
	X	Financial or performance audit used
	X	Benchmarking for best management practices used
	X	Act 160 Reports used
X		Other analysis or evaluation tools used
X		Impact on other strategies considered

X		Stakeholders identified and involved
		Authorization:
X		Authorization exists
	X	Authorization needed
		Organization Capacity:
X		Needed structural or procedural changes identified
X		Resource needs identified
X		Strategies developed to implement needed changes
X		Responsibility assigned
		Time Frame:
X		Already ongoing
X		Lifetime of strategy identified
		Fiscal Impact:
	X	Impact on operating budget
X		Impact on capital outlay budget
X		Means of Finance identified
X		Return on investment determined to be favorable

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST

Program: Wildlife

Objective: To perform habitat management, maintenance, and monitoring activities to conserve 627,279 acres in the coastal Wildlife Management Area (WMA) and Refuge system for fish and wildlife populations and associated recreational and commercial opportunities.

Strategy: Conduct necessary preparations to minimize impacts from catastrophic events; assess impacts and implement all necessary recovery activities.

Yes	No	
		Analysis:
	X	Cost/benefit analysis conducted
	X	Financial or performance audit used
	X	Benchmarking for best management practices used
	X	Act 160 Reports used

X		Other analysis or evaluation tools used
X		Impact on other strategies considered
X		Stakeholders identified and involved
		Authorization:
X		Authorization exists
	X	Authorization needed
		Organization Capacity:
X		Needed structural or procedural changes identified
X		Resource needs identified
X		Strategies developed to implement needed changes
X		Responsibility assigned
		Time Frame:
X		Already ongoing
X		Lifetime of strategy identified
		Fiscal Impact:
	X	Impact on operating budget
	X	Impact on capital outlay budget
X		Means of Finance identified
X		Return on investment determined to be favorable

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **Wildlife**

Objective: **To promote the conservation of non-game species through the solicitation and approval of grant-funded projects, by monitoring the relative occurrence of Louisiana's rare threatened and endangered species, by continuously updating the data base with site specific occurrence records of targeted species, and by managing nuisance wildlife control operators and rehabilitators.**

Indicator Name: **Number of new or updated EORs entered into database**

41. Type and Level: What is the type of the indicator (input, output, outcome, efficiency, quality)? What is the level at which the indicator will be reported (key, supporting, general performance information)?

Input. The actual number of input items will be reported.

42. Rationale: What is the rationale for the indicator? Why was it selected? How does it help measure achievement of the objective?

    The indicator reflects the level of new or update data placed into the data base and serves as a good measuring tool. The number of EORs entered is a direct reflection on the amount of effort needed to collect such information.

43. Use: How will the indicator be used in management decision-making and other agency processes? Will it be used only for internal management purposes or will it also be used for budgeted purposes?

    It will used to allocate manpower and budget resources to achieve the objective.

44. Clarity: Does the indicator name clearly identify what is being measured? If the name contains jargon, acronyms, or unclear terms, define or clarify them here.

    An EOR is a single record showing the location and status of one of the species of special concern in Louisiana.

45. Validity, Reliability, and Accuracy: Has the indicator been audited by the Office of the Legislative Auditor? If so, what was the result/finding? If not, how can you assure that the indicator is valid, reliable and accurate?

    The indicator is a direct accounting of the number of records either new or updated.

46. Data Source, Collection and Reporting: What is the source of data to be reported? What is the frequency and timing of collection and reporting (monthly, quarterly, annual)?

    The source of the data is from field collection with data being entered weekly and reported on a quarterly.

47. Calculation and Methodology: How is the indicator calculated?

    Simple addition

48. Scope: Is the indicator aggregated or disaggregated (is it a sum of smaller parts or is it a part of a larger whole)? Example – if the indicator is a statewide figure, can it be broken down by parish or region?

    It is an aggregated.

49. Caveats: Does the indicator have limitations or weaknesses (lack of precision or timeliness, difficult to collect, external factors)?

    It is limited to manpower and financial resources.

50. Responsible Person: Who is responsible for data collection, analysis and quality? Provide name, title, and contact information for all persons involved in collection and reporting.

    Gary Lester, Biologist Manager, (225) 765-2823
    Nicole Lorenz, Biologist 3, (225) 765-2643
    Patty Faulkner, Biologist DCL-A, (225) 765-2975
    Christopher Reid, Biologist DCL-A, (225) 765-2828
    Beau Gregory, Biologist DCL-A, (225) 765-2820
    Carolyn Martin, Biologist 2, (225) 765-2357
    Aran Meyer, Biologist 1, (225) 765-2822

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **Wildlife**

Objective: **To promote the conservation of non-game species through the solicitation and approval of grant-funded projects, by monitoring the relative occurrence of Louisiana's rare threatened and endangered species, by continuously updating the data base with site specific occurrence records of targeted species, and by managing nuisance wildlife control operators and rehabilitators.**

Indicator Name: **Number of nuisance Black Bear problems acted upon**

1. Type and Level: What is the type of the indicator (input, output, outcome, efficiency, quality)? What is the level at which the indicator will be reported (key, supporting, general performance information)?

   Outcome. The actual number of outcome items will be reported.

2. Rationale: What is the rationale for the indicator? Why was it selected? How does it help measure achievement of the objective?

   The indicator reflects the level of action taken on reported nuisance Black Bear problems. The number of problems entered is a direct reflection on the amount of attention needed on this matter.

3. Use: How will the indicator be used in management decision-making and other agency processes? Will it be used only for internal management purposes or will it also be used for budgeted purposes?

   It will used to allocate manpower and budget resources to achieve the objective.

4. Clarity: Does the indicator name clearly identify what is being measured? If the name contains jargon, acronyms, or unclear terms, define or clarify them here.

   Yes

5. Validity, Reliability, and Accuracy: Has the indicator been audited by the Office of the Legislative Auditor? If so, what was the result/finding? If not, how can you assure that the indicator is valid, reliable and accurate?

   The indicator is a direct accounting of the number of records.

6. Data Source, Collection and Reporting: What is the source of data to be reported? What is the frequency and timing of collection and reporting (monthly, quarterly, annual)?

   The source of the data is from field collection with data being on a semi-annually.

7. Calculation and Methodology: How is the indicator calculated?

   Simple addition

8. Scope: Is the indicator aggregated or disaggregated (is it a sum of smaller parts or is it a part of a larger whole)? Example – if the indicator is a statewide figure, can it be broken down by parish or region?

It is an aggregated.

9. Caveats: Does the indicator have limitations or weaknesses (lack of precision or timeliness, difficult to collect, external factors)?

   It is limited to manpower and financial resources.

10. Responsible Person: Who is responsible for data collection, analysis and quality? Provide name, title, and contact information for all persons involved in collection and reporting.

    Maria Davidson, Biologist DCL-B, (225) 765-2385

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **Wildlife**

Objective: **To promote the conservation of non-game species through the solicitation and approval of grant-funded projects, by monitoring the relative occurrence of Louisiana's rare threatened and endangered species, by continuously updating the data**

base with site specific occurrence records of targeted species, and by managing nuisance wildlife control operators and rehabilitators.

Indicator Name: Number of man-days expended on biological surveys on populations of non-game, rare, threatened and endangered species and native plants

1. Type and Level: What is the type of the indicator (input, output, outcome, efficiency, quality)? What is the level at which the indicator will be reported (key, supporting, general performance information)?

   Outcome. The actual number of outcome items will be reported.

2. Rationale: What is the rationale for the indicator? Why was it selected? How does it help measure achievement of the objective?

   The indicator reflects the level of action taken on conducting surveys. The number of man-days entered is a direct reflection on the amount of attention needed on this matter.

3. Use: How will the indicator be used in management decision-making and other agency processes? Will it be used only for internal management purposes or will it also be used for budgeted purposes?

   It will used to allocate manpower and budget resources to achieve the objective.

4. Clarity: Does the indicator name clearly identify what is being measured? If the name contains jargon, acronyms, or unclear terms, define or clarify them here.

   Yes

5. Validity, Reliability, and Accuracy: Has the indicator been audited by the Office of the Legislative Auditor? If so, what was the result/finding? If not, how can you assure that the indicator is valid, reliable and accurate?

   The indicator is a direct accounting of the number of records.

6. Data Source, Collection and Reporting: What is the source of data to be reported? What is the frequency and timing of collection and reporting (monthly, quarterly, annual)?

   The source of the data is from field collection occurring weekly with data being reported semi-annually.

7. Calculation and Methodology: How is the indicator calculated?

   Simple addition

8. Scope: Is the indicator aggregated or disaggregated (is it a sum of smaller parts or is it a part of a larger whole)? Example – if the indicator is a statewide figure, can it be broken down by parish or region?

   It is an aggregated.

9. Caveats: Does the indicator have limitations or weaknesses (lack of precision or timeliness, difficult to collect, external factors)?

   It is limited to manpower and financial resources.

10. Responsible Person: Who is responsible for data collection, analysis and quality? Provide name, title, and contact information for all persons involved in collection and reporting.

    Maria Davidson, Biologist DCL-B, (225) 765-2385
    Gary Lester, Biologist Manager, (225) 765-2823
    Nicole Lorenz, Biologist 3, (225) 765-2643
    Patty Faulkner, Biologist DCL-A, (225) 765-2975
    Christopher Reid, Biologist DCL-A, (225) 765-2828
    Beau Gregory, Biologist DCL-A, (225) 765-2820
    Aran Meyer, Biologist 1, (225) 765-2822
    Eric Baka, Biologist Manager, (225) 765-2359
    Kathryn Heyden, Biologist 1, (318) 487-5885
    Carrie Salyers, Biologist DCL-A, (225) 763-3557
    Michael Seymour, Biologist DCL-A, (225) 763-3554
    Andrew Ardoin, Biologist DCL-A, (225) 765-0239
    Jeff Boundy, Biologist DCL-A, (225) 765-2815

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **Wildlife**

Objective: **To promote the conservation of non-game species through the solicitation and approval of grant-funded projects, by monitoring the relative occurrence of Louisiana's rare threatened and endangered species, by continuously updating the data base with site specific occurrence records of targeted species, and by managing nuisance wildlife control operators and rehabilitators.**

Indicator Name: **Number of Nuisance Animal Control Operators and Nuisance Animal Control Permits Issued**

1. Type and Level: What is the type of the indicator (input, output, outcome, efficiency, quality)? What is the level at which the indicator will be reported (key, supporting, general performance information)?

   Outcome. The actual number of outcome items will be reported.

2. Rationale: What is the rationale for the indicator? Why was it selected? How does it help measure achievement of the objective?

   The indicator reflects the level of action taken on issuing permits. The number of permits entered is a direct reflection on the amount of requests for this clearance.

3. Use: How will the indicator be used in management decision-making and other agency processes? Will it be used only for internal management purposes or will it also be used for budgeted purposes?

   It will used to allocate manpower and budget resources to achieve the objective.

4. Clarity: Does the indicator name clearly identify what is being measured? If the name contains jargon, acronyms, or unclear terms, define or clarify them here.

   Yes

5. Validity, Reliability, and Accuracy: Has the indicator been audited by the Office of the Legislative Auditor? If so, what was the result/finding? If not, how can you assure that the indicator is valid, reliable and accurate?

   The indicator is a direct accounting of the number of records.

6. Data Source, Collection and Reporting: What is the source of data to be reported? What is the frequency and timing of collection and reporting (monthly, quarterly, annual)?

The source of the data is from field collection occurring weekly with data being reported semi-annually.

7. Calculation and Methodology: How is the indicator calculated?

   Simple addition

8. Scope: Is the indicator aggregated or disaggregated (is it a sum of smaller parts or is it a part of a larger whole)? Example – if the indicator is a statewide figure, can it be broken down by parish or region?

   It is an aggregated.

9. Caveats: Does the indicator have limitations or weaknesses (lack of precision or timeliness, difficult to collect, external factors)?

   It is limited to the number of request coming to the agency.

10. Responsible Person: Who is responsible for data collection, analysis and quality? Provide name, title, and contact information for all persons involved in collection and reporting.

    Carrie Salyers, Biologist DCL-A, (225) 763-3557

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **Wildlife**

Objective: **To promote the conservation of non-game species through the solicitation and approval of grant-funded projects, by monitoring the relative occurrence of Louisiana's rare threatened and endangered species, by continuously updating the data base with site specific occurrence records of targeted species, and by managing nuisance wildlife control operators and rehabilitators.**

Indicator Name: **Number of Wildlife Rehabilitator Permits issued**

1. Type and Level: What is the type of the indicator (input, output, outcome, efficiency, quality)? What is the level at which the indicator will be reported (key, supporting, general performance information)?

   Outcome. The actual number of outcome items will be reported.

2. Rationale: What is the rationale for the indicator? Why was it selected? How does it help measure achievement of the objective?

   The indicator reflects the level of action taken on issuing permits. The number of permits entered is a direct reflection on the amount of requests for this clearance.

3. Use: How will the indicator be used in management decision-making and other agency processes? Will it be used only for internal management purposes or will it also be used for budgeted purposes?

   It will used to allocate manpower and budget resources to achieve the objective.

4. Clarity: Does the indicator name clearly identify what is being measured? If the name contains jargon, acronyms, or unclear terms, define or clarify them here.

   Yes

5. Validity, Reliability, and Accuracy: Has the indicator been audited by the Office of the Legislative Auditor? If so, what was the result/finding? If not, how can you assure that the indicator is valid, reliable and accurate?

   The indicator is a direct accounting of the number of records.

6. Data Source, Collection and Reporting: What is the source of data to be reported? What is the frequency and timing of collection and reporting (monthly, quarterly, annual)?

   The source of the data is from field collection occurring weekly with data being reported semi-annually.

7. Calculation and Methodology: How is the indicator calculated?

   Simple addition

8. Scope: Is the indicator aggregated or disaggregated (is it a sum of smaller parts or is it a part of a larger whole)? Example – if the indicator is a statewide figure, can it be broken down by parish or region?

   It is an aggregated.

9. Caveats: Does the indicator have limitations or weaknesses (lack of precision or timeliness, difficult to collect, external factors)?

   It is limited to the number of request coming to the agency.

10. Responsible Person: Who is responsible for data collection, analysis and quality? Provide name, title, and contact information for all persons involved in collection and reporting.

    Carrie Salyers, Biologist DCL-A, (225) 763-3557

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **Wildlife**

Objective: **To promote the conservation of non-game species through the solicitation and approval of grant-funded projects, by monitoring the relative occurrence of Louisiana's rare threatened and endangered species, by continuously updating the data base with site specific occurrence records of targeted species, and by managing nuisance wildlife control operators and rehabilitators.**

Indicator Name: **Number of Scientific Collecting Permits issued**

1. Type and Level: What is the type of the indicator (input, output, outcome, efficiency, quality)? What is the level at which the indicator will be reported (key, supporting, general performance information)?

   Outcome. The actual number of outcome items will be reported.

2. Rationale: What is the rationale for the indicator? Why was it selected? How does it help measure achievement of the objective?

   The indicator reflects the level of action taken on issuing permits. The number of permits entered is a direct reflection on the amount of requests for this clearance.

3. Use: How will the indicator be used in management decision-making and other agency processes? Will it be used only for internal management purposes or will it also be used for budgeted purposes?

   It will used to allocate manpower and budget resources to achieve the objective.

4. Clarity: Does the indicator name clearly identify what is being measured? If the name contains jargon, acronyms, or unclear terms, define or clarify them here.

   Yes

5. Validity, Reliability, and Accuracy: Has the indicator been audited by the Office of the Legislative Auditor? If so, what was the result/finding? If not, how can you assure that the indicator is valid, reliable and accurate?

   The indicator is a direct accounting of the number of records.

6. Data Source, Collection and Reporting: What is the source of data to be reported? What is the frequency and timing of collection and reporting (monthly, quarterly, annual)?

   The source of the data is from field collection occurring weekly with data being reported semi-annually.

7. Calculation and Methodology: How is the indicator calculated?

   Simple addition

8. Scope: Is the indicator aggregated or disaggregated (is it a sum of smaller parts or is it a part of a larger whole)? Example – if the indicator is a statewide figure, can it be broken down by parish or region?

   It is an aggregated.

9. Caveats: Does the indicator have limitations or weaknesses (lack of precision or timeliness, difficult to collect, external factors)?

   It is limited to the number of request coming to the agency.

10. Responsible Person: Who is responsible for data collection, analysis and quality? Provide name, title, and contact information for all persons involved in collection and reporting.

    Michael Seymour, Biologist DCL-A, (225) 763-3554

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **Wildlife**

Objective: **To promote the conservation of non-game species through the solicitation and approval of grant-funded projects, by monitoring the relative occurrence of Louisiana's rare threatened and endangered species, by continuously updating the data base with site specific occurrence records of targeted species, and by managing nuisance wildlife control operators and rehabilitators.**

Indicator Name: **Number of active grant-funded projects managed**

1. Type and Level: What is the type of the indicator (input, output, outcome, efficiency, quality)? What is the level at which the indicator will be reported (key, supporting, general performance information)?

   Outcome. The actual number of outcome items will be reported.

2. Rationale: What is the rationale for the indicator? Why was it selected? How does it help measure achievement of the objective?

   The indicator reflects the level of action taken to request, review, select, award, and process grant-funded projects. The number of active grant-funded projects is a direct reflection on the Agency's effort to promote the conservation of non-game species to preclude the need for listing under the Endangered Species Act.

3. Use: How will the indicator be used in management decision-making and other agency processes? Will it be used only for internal management purposes or will it also be used for budgeted purposes?

   It will used to allocate manpower and budget resources to achieve the objective.

4. Clarity: Does the indicator name clearly identify what is being measured? If the name contains jargon, acronyms, or unclear terms, define or clarify them here.

   Yes

5. Validity, Reliability, and Accuracy: Has the indicator been audited by the Office of the Legislative Auditor? If so, what was the result/finding? If not, how can you assure that the indicator is valid, reliable and accurate?

   The indicator is a direct accounting of active grant-funded projects managed.

6. Data Source, Collection and Reporting: What is the source of data to be reported? What is the frequency and timing of collection and reporting (monthly, quarterly, annual)?

   The source of the data is from records maintained by the Wildlife Action Plan Coordinator and is reported quarterly.

7. Calculation and Methodology: How is the indicator calculated?

   Simple addition

8. Scope: Is the indicator aggregated or disaggregated (is it a sum of smaller parts or is it a part of a larger whole)? Example – if the indicator is a statewide figure, can it be broken down by parish or region?

   It is an aggregated.

9. Caveats: Does the indicator have limitations or weaknesses (lack of precision or timeliness, difficult to collect, external factors)?

   It is limited to the amount of federal funding appropriated annually by Congress for State Wildlife Grants and the number of research proposals received, reviewed, selected, awarded, and processed by this Agency for grant funding.

10. Responsible Person: Who is responsible for data collection, analysis and quality? Provide name, title, and contact information for all persons involved in collection and reporting.

    Andrew Ardoin, Biologist DCL-A, (225) 765-0239

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **Wildlife**

Objective: **To avoid, minimize and/or mitigate adverse environmental impacts to fish and wildlife habitat from/by statewide development projects by reviewing and providing technical comments and recommendations on 100 percent of the public notices and permit applications received and by issuing Scenic River Permits as required by statute.**

Indicator Name: **Number of public notices and permit applications received, logged, and reviewed**

1. Type and Level: What is the type of the indicator (input, output, outcome, efficiency, quality)? What is the level at which the indicator will be reported (key, supporting, general performance information)?

   Input Indicator, General performance information

2. Rationale: What is the rationale for the indicator? Why was it selected? How does it help measure achievement of the objective?

   The indicator reflects the level of action taken on commenting on permit applications. The number of permit applications entered is a direct reflection on the amount of requests for comments from this agency.

3. Use: How will the indicator be used in management decision-making and other agency processes? Will it be used only for internal management purposes or will it also be used for budgeted purposes?

   It will used to allocate manpower and budget resources to achieve the objective.

4. Clarity: Does the indicator name clearly identify what is being measured? If the name contains jargon, acronyms, or unclear terms, define or clarify them here.

   Yes

5. Validity, Reliability, and Accuracy: Has the indicator been audited by the Office of the Legislative Auditor? If so, what was the result/finding? If not, how can you assure that the indicator is valid, reliable and accurate?

   The indicator is a direct accounting of the number of records.

6. Data Source, Collection and Reporting: What is the source of data to be reported? What is the frequency and timing of collection and reporting (monthly, quarterly, annual)?

   The source of the data is from field collection occurring weekly with data being reported semi-annually.

7. Calculation and Methodology: How is the indicator calculated?

   Simple addition

8. Scope: Is the indicator aggregated or disaggregated (is it a sum of smaller parts or is it a part of a larger whole)? Example – if the indicator is a statewide figure, can it be broken down by parish or region?

   It is an aggregated.

9. Caveats: Does the indicator have limitations or weaknesses (lack of precision or timeliness, difficult to collect, external factors)?

   It is limited to the number of request coming to the agency.

10. Responsible Person: Who is responsible for data collection, analysis and quality? Provide name, title, and contact information for all persons involved in collection and reporting.

    Kyle Balkum, Biologist Program Manager, (225) 765-2819
    Keith Cascio, Biologist DCL-A, (318) 343-4045

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **Wildlife**

Objective: **To avoid, minimize and/or mitigate adverse environmental impacts to fish and wildlife habitat from/by statewide development projects by reviewing and providing technical comments and recommendations on 100 percent of the public notices and permit applications received and by issuing Scenic River Permits as required by statute.**

Indicator Name: **Number of technical comments and mitigation recommendations provided in response to public notices and permit applications received**

1. Type and Level: What is the type of the indicator (input, output, outcome, efficiency, quality)? What is the level at which the indicator will be reported (key, supporting, general performance information)?

   Outcome. The actual number of outcome items will be reported.

2. Rationale: What is the rationale for the indicator? Why was it selected? How does it help measure achievement of the objective?

The indicator reflects the level of action taken on commenting on the need for mitigation. The number of request for mitigation reflects to national and state goal of no net loss of wetland habitat.

3. Use: How will the indicator be used in management decision-making and other agency processes? Will it be used only for internal management purposes or will it also be used for budgeted purposes?

   It will used to allocate manpower and budget resources to achieve the objective.

4. Clarity: Does the indicator name clearly identify what is being measured? If the name contains jargon, acronyms, or unclear terms, define or clarify them here.

   Yes

5. Validity, Reliability, and Accuracy: Has the indicator been audited by the Office of the Legislative Auditor? If so, what was the result/finding? If not, how can you assure that the indicator is valid, reliable and accurate?

   The indicator is a direct accounting of the number of records.

6. Data Source, Collection and Reporting: What is the source of data to be reported? What is the frequency and timing of collection and reporting (monthly, quarterly, annual)?

   The source of the data is from field collection occurring weekly with data being reported semi-annually.

7. Calculation and Methodology: How is the indicator calculated?

   Simple addition

8. Scope: Is the indicator aggregated or disaggregated (is it a sum of smaller parts or is it a part of a larger whole)? Example – if the indicator is a statewide figure, can it be broken down by parish or region?

   It is an aggregated.

9. Caveats: Does the indicator have limitations or weaknesses (lack of precision or timeliness, difficult to collect, external factors)?

   It is limited to the number of projects having significant adverse impact to fish and wildlife resources.

10. Responsible Person: Who is responsible for data collection, analysis and quality? Provide name, title, and contact information for all persons involved in collection and reporting.

    Kyle Balkum, Biologist Program Manager, (225) 765-2819
    Keith Cascio, Biologist DCL-A, (318) 343-4045

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **Wildlife**

Objective: **To avoid, minimize and/or mitigate adverse environmental impacts to fish and wildlife habitat from/by statewide development projects by reviewing and providing technical comments and recommendations on 100 percent of the public notices and permit applications received and by issuing Scenic River Permits as required by statute.**

Indicator Name: **Number of Scenic River Permit Applications received and processed**

1. Type and Level: What is the type of the indicator (input, output, outcome, efficiency, quality)? What is the level at which the indicator will be reported (key, supporting, general performance information)?

   Input. The actual number of input items will be reported.

2. Rationale: What is the rationale for the indicator? Why was it selected? How does it help measure achievement of the objective?

   The indicator reflects the level of action taken on request for a scenic river permit. The number of requests for a permit is dependant on development projects planned to occur on the Scenic River System.

3. Use: How will the indicator be used in management decision-making and other agency processes? Will it be used only for internal management purposes or will it also be used for budgeted purposes?

   It will used to allocate manpower and budget resources to achieve the objective.

4. Clarity: Does the indicator name clearly identify what is being measured? If the name contains jargon, acronyms, or unclear terms, define or clarify them here.

   Yes

5. Validity, Reliability, and Accuracy: Has the indicator been audited by the Office of the Legislative Auditor? If so, what was the result/finding? If not, how can you assure that the indicator is valid, reliable and accurate?

   The indicator is a direct accounting of the number of records.

6. Data Source, Collection and Reporting: What is the source of data to be reported? What is the frequency and timing of collection and reporting (monthly, quarterly, annual)?

   The source of the data is from field collection occurring weekly with data being reported quarterly.

7. Calculation and Methodology: How is the indicator calculated?

   Simple addition

8. Scope: Is the indicator aggregated or disaggregated (is it a sum of smaller parts or is it a part of a larger whole)? Example – if the indicator is a statewide figure, can it be broken down by parish or region?

   It is an aggregated.

9. Caveats: Does the indicator have limitations or weaknesses (lack of precision or timeliness, difficult to collect, external factors)?

It is limited to the number of projects having significant impacts to the Scenic River System.

10. Responsible Person: Who is responsible for data collection, analysis and quality? Provide name, title, and contact information for all persons involved in collection and reporting.

    Keith Cascio, Biologist DCL-A, (318) 343-4045

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **Wildlife**

Objective: **To avoid, minimize and/or mitigate adverse environmental impacts to fish and wildlife habitat from/by statewide development projects by reviewing and providing technical comments and recommendations on 100 percent of the public notices and permit applications received and by issuing Scenic River Permits as required by statute.**

Indicator Name: **Number of Scenic River Permits issued with mitigation requirements**

1. Type and Level: What is the type of the indicator (input, output, outcome, efficiency, quality)? What is the level at which the indicator will be reported (key, supporting, general performance information)?

   Outcome. The actual number of outcome items will be reported.

2. Rationale: What is the rationale for the indicator? Why was it selected? How does it help measure achievement of the objective?

   The indicator reflects the level of action taken to issue, with mitigation requirements, scenic river permits. The number of requests for a permit is dependant on development projects planned to occur on the Scenic River System.

3. Use: How will the indicator be used in management decision-making and other agency processes? Will it be used only for internal management purposes or will it also be used for budgeted purposes?

   It will used to allocate manpower and budget resources to achieve the objective.

4. Clarity: Does the indicator name clearly identify what is being measured? If the name contains jargon, acronyms, or unclear terms, define or clarify them here.

   Yes

5. Validity, Reliability, and Accuracy: Has the indicator been audited by the Office of the Legislative Auditor? If so, what was the result/finding? If not, how can you assure that the indicator is valid, reliable and accurate?

   The indicator is a direct accounting of the number of records.

6. Data Source, Collection and Reporting: What is the source of data to be reported? What is the frequency and timing of collection and reporting (monthly, quarterly, annual)?

   The source of the data is from field collection occurring weekly with data being reported quarterly.

7. Calculation and Methodology: How is the indicator calculated?

   Simple addition

8. Scope: Is the indicator aggregated or disaggregated (is it a sum of smaller parts or is it a part of a larger whole)? Example – if the indicator is a statewide figure, can it be broken down by parish or region?

It is an aggregated.

9. Caveats: Does the indicator have limitations or weaknesses (lack of precision or timeliness, difficult to collect, external factors)?

   It is limited to the number of projects having significant impacts to the Scenic River System.

10. Responsible Person: Who is responsible for data collection, analysis and quality? Provide name, title, and contact information for all persons involved in collection and reporting.

    Keith Cascio, Biologist DCL-A, (318) 343-4045

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST

Program: **Wildlife**

Objective: **To promote the conservation of non-game species through the solicitation and approval of grant-funded projects, by monitoring the relative occurrence of Louisiana's rare threatened and endangered species, by continuously updating the data base with site specific occurrence records of targeted species, and by managing nuisance wildlife control operators and rehabilitators.**

Strategy: **To annually enter new or updated Element Occurrence Records (EORs) in our non-game, rare, threatened and endangered species data base. An EOR is a single record showing the location and status of one of the species of concern in Louisiana.**

Yes	No	
		Analysis:
	X	Cost/benefit analysis conducted
X		Financial or performance audit used
X		Benchmarking for best management practices used
X		Act 160 Reports used
X		Other analysis or evaluation tools used
X		Impact on other strategies considered
X		Stakeholders identified and involved
		Authorization:
X		Authorization exists
	X	Authorization needed
		Organization Capacity:
	X	Needed structural or procedural changes identified
X		Resource needs identified
	X	Strategies developed to implement needed changes
X		Responsibility assigned
		Time Frame:
X		Already ongoing
	X	Lifetime of strategy identified
		Fiscal Impact:

	X	Impact on operating budget
	X	Impact on capital outlay budget
	X	Means of Finance identified
	X	Return on investment determined to be favorable

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST

Program: **Wildlife**

Objective: **To promote the conservation of non-game species through the solicitation and approval of grant-funded projects, by monitoring the relative occurrence of Louisiana's rare threatened and endangered species, by continuously updating the data base with site specific occurrence records of targeted species, and by managing nuisance wildlife control operators and rehabilitators.**

Strategy: **Manage and issue permits for nuisance wildlife control operators and wildlife rehabilitators.**

Yes	No	
		Analysis:
	X	Cost/benefit analysis conducted
X		Financial or performance audit used
X		Benchmarking for best management practices used
X		Act 160 Reports used
X		Other analysis or evaluation tools used
X		Impact on other strategies considered
X		Stakeholders identified and involved
		Authorization:
X		Authorization exists
	X	Authorization needed
		Organization Capacity:
	X	Needed structural or procedural changes identified
X		Resource needs identified
X		Strategies developed to implement needed changes
X		Responsibility assigned
		Time Frame:
X		Already ongoing
	X	Lifetime of strategy identified

		Fiscal Impact:
	X	Impact on operating budget
	X	Impact on capital outlay budget
	X	Means of Finance identified
	X	Return on investment determined to be favorable

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST

Program: Wildlife

Objective: To promote the conservation of non-game species through the solicitation and approval of grant-funded projects, by monitoring the relative occurrence of Louisiana's rare threatened and endangered species, by continuously updating the data base with site specific occurrence records of targeted species, and by managing nuisance wildlife control operators and rehabilitators.

Strategy: Respond and provide technical assistance to the public concerning nuisance and injured wildlife

Yes	No	
		Analysis:
	X	Cost/benefit analysis conducted
X		Financial or performance audit used
X		Benchmarking for best management practices used
X		Act 160 Reports used
X		Other analysis or evaluation tools used
X		Impact on other strategies considered
X		Stakeholders identified and involved
		Authorization:
X		Authorization exists
	X	Authorization needed
		Organization Capacity:
	X	Needed structural or procedural changes identified
X		Resource needs identified
X		Strategies developed to implement needed changes
X		Responsibility assigned

		Time Frame:
X		Already ongoing
	X	Lifetime of strategy identified
		Fiscal Impact:
	X	Impact on operating budget
	X	Impact on capital outlay budget
	X	Means of Finance identified
	X	Return on investment determined to be favorable

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST

Program: Wildlife

Objective: To promote the conservation of non-game species through the solicitation and approval of grant-funded projects, by monitoring the relative occurrence of Louisiana's rare threatened and endangered species, by continuously updating the data base with site specific occurrence records of targeted species, and by managing nuisance wildlife control operators and rehabilitators.

Strategy: Issue Scientific Collecting permits for wildlife species.

Yes	No	
		Analysis:
	X	Cost/benefit analysis conducted
X		Financial or performance audit used
X		Benchmarking for best management practices used
X		Act 160 Reports used
X		Other analysis or evaluation tools used
X		Impact on other strategies considered
X		Stakeholders identified and involved
		Authorization:
X		Authorization exists
	X	Authorization needed
		Organization Capacity:
	X	Needed structural or procedural changes identified
X		Resource needs identified

X		Strategies developed to implement needed changes
X		Responsibility assigned
		Time Frame:
X		Already ongoing
	X	Lifetime of strategy identified
		Fiscal Impact:
	X	Impact on operating budget
	X	Impact on capital outlay budget
	X	Means of Finance identified
	X	Return on investment determined to be favorable

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST

Program: Wildlife

Objective: To promote the conservation of non-game species through the solicitation and approval of grant-funded projects, by monitoring the relative occurrence of Louisiana's rare threatened and endangered species, by continuously updating the data base with site specific occurrence records of targeted species, and by managing nuisance wildlife control operators and rehabilitators.

Strategy: Promote the conservation of non-game species to preclude the need for listing under the Endangered Species Act.

Yes	No	
		Analysis:
	X	Cost/benefit analysis conducted
X		Financial or performance audit used
X		Benchmarking for best management practices used
X		Act 160 Reports used
X		Other analysis or evaluation tools used
X		Impact on other strategies considered
X		Stakeholders identified and involved
		Authorization:
X		Authorization exists

	X	Authorization needed
		Organization Capacity:
	X	Needed structural or procedural changes identified
X		Resource needs identified
X		Strategies developed to implement needed changes
X		Responsibility assigned
		Time Frame:
X		Already ongoing
	X	Lifetime of strategy identified
		Fiscal Impact:
	X	Impact on operating budget
	X	Impact on capital outlay budget
	X	Means of Finance identified
	X	Return on investment determined to be favorable

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST

Program: Wildlife

Objective: To avoid, minimize and/or mitigate adverse environmental impacts to fish and wildlife habitat from/by statewide development projects by reviewing and providing technical comments and recommendations on 100 percent of the public notices and permit applications received and by issuing Scenic River Permits as required by statute.

Strategy: Receive, log in, review and comment on all public notices and permit applications from wetland regulatory agencies, and make recommendations for mitigation actions designed to avoid, minimize, or compensate for damages to fish and wildlife resources and habitat

Yes	No	
		Analysis:
	X	Cost/benefit analysis conducted
X		Financial or performance audit used
X		Benchmarking for best management practices used
X		Act 160 Reports used
X		Other analysis or evaluation tools used
X		Impact on other strategies considered

X		Stakeholders identified and involved
		Authorization:
X		Authorization exists
	X	Authorization needed
		Organization Capacity:
	X	Needed structural or procedural changes identified
X		Resource needs identified
X		Strategies developed to implement needed changes
X		Responsibility assigned
		Time Frame:
X		Already ongoing
	X	Lifetime of strategy identified
		Fiscal Impact:
	X	Impact on operating budget
	X	Impact on capital outlay budget
	X	Means of Finance identified
	X	Return on investment determined to be favorable

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST

Program: Wildlife

Objective: To avoid, minimize and/or mitigate adverse environmental impacts to fish and wildlife habitat from/by statewide development projects by reviewing and providing technical comments and recommendations on 100 percent of the public notices and permit applications received and by issuing Scenic River Permits as required by statute.

Strategy: Work with federal and state regulatory agencies on major projects, which impact fish and wildlife resources and habitat by conducting joint habitat evaluations with those agencies, and formulating mitigation recommendations, which will be mandatory

Yes	No	
		Analysis:
	X	Cost/benefit analysis conducted
X		Financial or performance audit used
X		Benchmarking for best management practices used

X		Act 160 Reports used
X		Other analysis or evaluation tools used
X		Impact on other strategies considered
X		Stakeholders identified and involved
		Authorization:
X		Authorization exists
	X	Authorization needed
		Organization Capacity:
	X	Needed structural or procedural changes identified
X		Resource needs identified
X		Strategies developed to implement needed changes
X		Responsibility assigned
		Time Frame:
X		Already ongoing
	X	Lifetime of strategy identified
		Fiscal Impact:
	X	Impact on operating budget
	X	Impact on capital outlay budget
	X	Means of Finance identified
	X	Return on investment determined to be favorable

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST

Program: Wildlife

Objective: To avoid, minimize and/or mitigate adverse environmental impacts to fish and wildlife habitat from/by statewide development projects by reviewing and providing technical comments and recommendations on 100 percent of the public notices and permit applications received and by issuing Scenic River Permits as required by statute.

Strategy: Assist in the development and operation of mitigation banks

Yes	No	
		Analysis:
	X	Cost/benefit analysis conducted

X		Financial or performance audit used
X		Benchmarking for best management practices used
X		Act 160 Reports used
X		Other analysis or evaluation tools used
X		Impact on other strategies considered
X		Stakeholders identified and involved
		Authorization:
X		Authorization exists
	X	Authorization needed
		Organization Capacity:
	X	Needed structural or procedural changes identified
X		Resource needs identified
X		Strategies developed to implement needed changes
X		Responsibility assigned
		Time Frame:
X		Already ongoing
	X	Lifetime of strategy identified
		Fiscal Impact:
	X	Impact on operating budget
	X	Impact on capital outlay budget
	X	Means of Finance identified
	X	Return on investment determined to be favorable

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST

Program: Wildlife

Objective: To avoid, minimize and/or mitigate adverse environmental impacts to fish and wildlife habitat from/by statewide development projects by reviewing and providing technical comments and recommendations on 100 percent of the public notices and permit applications received and by issuing Scenic River Permits as required by statute.

Strategy: Monitor the State's Natural and Scenic River System to prevent unauthorized uses, initiate enforcement and corrective action against unauthorized

activities, and to control impacts to the streams through the established permitting system, which includes mitigation requirements

Yes	No	
		Analysis:
	X	Cost/benefit analysis conducted
X		Financial or performance audit used
X		Benchmarking for best management practices used
X		Act 160 Reports used
X		Other analysis or evaluation tools used
X		Impact on other strategies considered
X		Stakeholders identified and involved
		Authorization:
X		Authorization exists
	X	Authorization needed
		Organization Capacity:
	X	Needed structural or procedural changes identified
X		Resource needs identified
X		Strategies developed to implement needed changes
X		Responsibility assigned
		Time Frame:
X		Already ongoing
	X	Lifetime of strategy identified
		Fiscal Impact:
	X	Impact on operating budget
	X	Impact on capital outlay budget
	X	Means of Finance identified
	X	Return on investment determined to be favorable

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **Fisheries**

Objective: **Ensure that Louisiana's major marine fish stocks are not overfished**

Indicator Name: **Number of Louisiana's major coastal bay systems with sampling teams collecting fisheries data.**

51. Type and Level: What is the type of the indicator (input, output, outcome, efficiency, quality)? What is the level at which the indicator will be reported (key, supporting, general performance information)?

    This input indicator provides supporting performance information.

52. Rationale: What is the rationale for the indicator? Why was it selected? How does it help measure achievement of the objective?

    It measures personnel resource allocation for gathering data.

53. Use: How will the indicator be used in management decision-making and other agency processes? Will it be used only for internal management purposes or will it also be used for budgeted purposes?

    It allows the Division to target specific bay systems and species for data collection and fisheries management measures. The primary use is internal, but budgetary factors affect resource allocation.

54. Clarity: Does the indicator name clearly identify what is being measured? If the name contains jargon, acronyms, or unclear terms, define or clarify them here.

    N/A

55. Validity, Reliability, and Accuracy: Has the indicator been audited by the Office of the Legislative Auditor? If so, what was the result/finding? If not, how can you assure that the indicator is valid, reliable and accurate?

    It has not been audited. Agency management for marine fisheries is based on coastal bay systems.

56. Data Source, Collection and Reporting: What is the source of data to be reported? What is the frequency and timing of collection and reporting (monthly, quarterly, annual)?

The data source is Marine Fisheries Division operations and the Division fisheries information database. Data are collected and reported continuously.

57. Calculation and Methodology: How is the indicator calculated?

    The total number of sampling teams collecting data from coastal bay systems.

58. Scope: Is the indicator aggregated or disaggregated (is it a sum of smaller parts or is it a part of a larger whole)? Example – if the indicator is a statewide figure, can it be broken down by parish or region?

    It is aggregated and can be broken down by coastal study area.

59. Caveats: Does the indicator have limitations or weaknesses (lack of precision or timeliness, difficult to collect, external factors)?

    N/A

60. Responsible Person: Who is responsible for data collection, analysis and quality? Provide name, title, and contact information for all persons involved in collection and reporting.

    It is compiled and reported by the Assistant Administrator, Marine Fisheries Division: Jim Hanifen, jhanifen@wlf.louisiana.gov.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **Fisheries**

Objective: **Ensure that Louisiana's major marine fish stocks are not overfished**

Indicator Name: **Number of fishery-independent data collection stations sampled**

1. Type and Level: What is the type of the indicator (input, output, outcome, efficiency, quality)? What is the level at which the indicator will be reported (key, supporting, general performance information)?

   This input indicator provides supporting performance information.

2. Rationale: What is the rationale for the indicator? Why was it selected? How does it help measure achievement of the objective?

   It measures fisheries data collection effort and is an index to the service provided.

3. Use: How will the indicator be used in management decision-making and other agency processes? Will it be used only for internal management purposes or will it also be used for budgeted purposes?

   It allows the Division to target specific data needs for collection and fisheries management. The primary use is internal, but budgetary factors affect allocation of effort.

4. Clarity: Does the indicator name clearly identify what is being measured? If the name contains jargon, acronyms, or unclear terms, define or clarify them here.

   Fishery-independent data are collected from sources other than fishery participants, and provide baseline information on the status of fish communities in coastal bay systems.

5. Validity, Reliability, and Accuracy: Has the indicator been audited by the Office of the Legislative Auditor? If so, what was the result/finding? If not, how can you assure that the indicator is valid, reliable and accurate?

   It has not been audited. It is sum total number of biological and environmental sample stations where fisheries data are collected.

6. Data Source, Collection and Reporting: What is the source of data to be reported? What is the frequency and timing of collection and reporting (monthly, quarterly, annual)?

The data source is Marine Fisheries Division operations and the Division fisheries information database. Data are collected and reported continuously.

7. Calculation and Methodology: How is the indicator calculated?

   It is sum total number of biological and environmental sample stations where fisheries data are collected.

8. Scope: Is the indicator aggregated or disaggregated (is it a sum of smaller parts or is it a part of a larger whole)? Example – if the indicator is a statewide figure, can it be broken down by parish or region?

   It is aggregated and can be broken down by coastal study area or other biological or environmental parameter.

9. Caveats: Does the indicator have limitations or weaknesses (lack of precision or timeliness, difficult to collect, external factors)?

   N/A

10. Responsible Person: Who is responsible for data collection, analysis and quality? Provide name, title, and contact information for all persons involved in collection and reporting.

    It is compiled and reported by the Data Management Program Manager, Marine Fisheries Division: Joe Shepard, jshepard@wlf.louisiana.gov.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **Fisheries**

Objective: **Ensure that Louisiana's major marine fish stocks are not overfished**

Indicator Name: **Number of saltwater recreational creel interviews/samples taken**

1. Type and Level: What is the type of the indicator (input, output, outcome, efficiency, quality)? What is the level at which the indicator will be reported (key, supporting, general performance information)?

   This input indicator provides supporting performance information.

2. Rationale: What is the rationale for the indicator? Why was it selected? How does it help measure achievement of the objective?

   It measures fisheries data collection effort and is an index to the service provided.

3. Use: How will the indicator be used in management decision-making and other agency processes? Will it be used only for internal management purposes or will it also be used for budgeted purposes?

   It allows the Division to target specific data needs for collection and fisheries management. The primary use is internal, but budgetary factors affect allocation of effort.

4. Clarity: Does the indicator name clearly identify what is being measured? If the name contains jargon, acronyms, or unclear terms, define or clarify them here.

   Fishery-dependent data is information gathered from recreational or commercial fishers.

5. Validity, Reliability, and Accuracy: Has the indicator been audited by the Office of the Legislative Auditor? If so, what was the result/finding? If not, how can you assure that the indicator is valid, reliable and accurate?

   This indicator has not been audited. It is sum total number of recreational creel interviews conducted.

6. Data Source, Collection and Reporting: What is the source of data to be reported? What is the frequency and timing of collection and reporting (monthly, quarterly, annual)?

The data source is Marine Fisheries Division operations and the Division fisheries information database. Data are collected and reported continuously.

7. Calculation and Methodology: How is the indicator calculated?

   It is sum total number of recreational creel interviews conducted.

8. Scope: Is the indicator aggregated or disaggregated (is it a sum of smaller parts or is it a part of a larger whole)? Example – if the indicator is a statewide figure, can it be broken down by parish or region?

   It is aggregated by state.

9. Caveats: Does the indicator have limitations or weaknesses (lack of precision or timeliness, difficult to collect, external factors)?

   N/A

10. Responsible Person: Who is responsible for data collection, analysis and quality? Provide name, title, and contact information for all persons involved in collection and reporting.

    It is compiled and reported by the Data Management Program Manager, Marine Fisheries Division: Joe Shepard, jshepard@wlf.louisiana.gov.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **Fisheries**

Objective: **Ensure that Louisiana's major marine fish stocks are not overfished**

Indicator Name: **Number of management plans written/updated**

1. Type and Level: What is the type of the indicator (input, output, outcome, efficiency, quality)? What is the level at which the indicator will be reported (key, supporting, general performance information)?

   This output indicator provides supporting performance information.

2. Rationale: What is the rationale for the indicator? Why was it selected? How does it help measure achievement of the objective?

   It is an index to the service provided. Management plans provide a framework for protection of marine fish stocks.

3. Use: How will the indicator be used in management decision-making and other agency processes? Will it be used only for internal management purposes or will it also be used for budgeted purposes?

   Management plans allow the Department to target specific data needs for collection and fisheries management. The primary use is internal; budgetary factors affect allocation of effort.

4. Clarity: Does the indicator name clearly identify what is being measured? If the name contains jargon, acronyms, or unclear terms, define or clarify them here.

   N/A

5. Validity, Reliability, and Accuracy: Has the indicator been audited by the Office of the Legislative Auditor? If so, what was the result/finding? If not, how can you assure that the indicator is valid, reliable and accurate?

   It has not been audited. The sum total of management plans written/updated.

6. Data Source, Collection and Reporting: What is the source of data to be reported? What is the frequency and timing of collection and reporting (monthly, quarterly, annual)?

The data source is Marine Fisheries Division operations and the Division fisheries information database. Data are collected and reported annually.

7. Calculation and Methodology: How is the indicator calculated?

   The sum total of management plans written/updated.

8. Scope: Is the indicator aggregated or disaggregated (is it a sum of smaller parts or is it a part of a larger whole)? Example – if the indicator is a statewide figure, can it be broken down by parish or region?

   It is disaggregated – species specific.

9. Caveats: Does the indicator have limitations or weaknesses (lack of precision or timeliness, difficult to collect, external factors)?

   N/A

10. Responsible Person: Who is responsible for data collection, analysis and quality? Provide name, title, and contact information for all persons involved in collection and reporting.

    It is compiled and reported by the Data Management Program Manager, Marine Fisheries Division: Joe Shepard, jshepard@wlf.louisiana.gov.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **Fisheries**

Objective: **Ensure that Louisiana's major marine fish stocks are not overfished**

Indicator Name: **Number of commercial fishing trips**

1. Type and Level: What is the type of the indicator (input, output, outcome, efficiency, quality)? What is the level at which the indicator will be reported (key, supporting, general performance information)?

   This output indicator provides general performance information.

2. Rationale: What is the rationale for the indicator? Why was it selected? How does it help measure achievement of the objective?

   It measures fisheries data collection effort and is an index to the service provided.

3. Use: How will the indicator be used in management decision-making and other agency processes? Will it be used only for internal management purposes or will it also be used for budgeted purposes?

   It allows the Division to target specific data needs for collection and fisheries management. The primary use is internal, but budgetary factors affect allocation of effort.

4. Clarity: Does the indicator name clearly identify what is being measured? If the name contains jargon, acronyms, or unclear terms, define or clarify them here.

   N/A

5. Validity, Reliability, and Accuracy: Has the indicator been audited by the Office of the Legislative Auditor? If so, what was the result/finding? If not, how can you assure that the indicator is valid, reliable and accurate?

   It has not been audited. Quality control standards for trip ticket data are applicable.

6. Data Source, Collection and Reporting: What is the source of data to be reported? What is the frequency and timing of collection and reporting (monthly, quarterly, annual)?

   The data source is Marine Fisheries Division operations and the Division trip ticket database. Data are collected and reported continuously.

7. Calculation and Methodology: How is the indicator calculated?

   Number of trips is calculated from the trip ticket data base.

8. Scope: Is the indicator aggregated or disaggregated (is it a sum of smaller parts or is it a part of a larger whole)? Example – if the indicator is a statewide figure, can it be broken down by parish or region?

   It is aggregated and can be broken down by region.

9. Caveats: Does the indicator have limitations or weaknesses (lack of precision or timeliness, difficult to collect, external factors)?

   N/A

10. Responsible Person: Who is responsible for data collection, analysis and quality? Provide name, title, and contact information for all persons involved in collection and reporting.

    It is compiled and reported by the Data Management Program Manager, Marine Fisheries Division: Joe Shepard, jshepard@wlf.louisiana.gov.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **Fisheries**

Objective: **Ensure that Louisiana's major marine fish stocks are not overfished**

Indicator Name: **Percent of major fish stocks not overfished**

1. Type and Level: What is the type of the indicator (input, output, outcome, efficiency, quality)? What is the level at which the indicator will be reported (key, supporting, general performance information)?

   This outcome indicator provides key performance information.

2. Rationale: What is the rationale for the indicator? Why was it selected? How does it help measure achievement of the objective?

   It measures effectiveness of fisheries management efforts and is an index to the service provided

3. Use: How will the indicator be used in management decision-making and other agency processes? Will it be used only for internal management purposes or will it also be used for budgeted purposes?

   It allows the Division to target specific data needs for collection and fisheries management. The primary use is internal, but budgetary factors affect allocation of effort.

4. Clarity: Does the indicator name clearly identify what is being measured? If the name contains jargon, acronyms, or unclear terms, define or clarify them here.

   N/A

5. Validity, Reliability, and Accuracy: Has the indicator been audited by the Office of the Legislative Auditor? If so, what was the result/finding? If not, how can you assure that the indicator is valid, reliable and accurate?

   It has not been audited. It is calculated based on status of fish stocks from stock assessments.

6. Data Source, Collection and Reporting: What is the source of data to be reported? What is the frequency and timing of collection and reporting (monthly, quarterly, annual)?

The data source is Marine Fisheries Division operations. Data are collected continuously and reported annually.

7. Calculation and Methodology: How is the indicator calculated?

   It is calculated based on status of fish stocks from stock assessments.

8. Scope: Is the indicator aggregated or disaggregated (is it a sum of smaller parts or is it a part of a larger whole)? Example – if the indicator is a statewide figure, can it be broken down by parish or region?

   It is aggregated and, on a species-specific basis, can be broken down based on the parameter of interest.

9. Caveats: Does the indicator have limitations or weaknesses (lack of precision or timeliness, difficult to collect, external factors)?

   It is affected by the quality and quantity of available data.

10. Responsible Person: Who is responsible for data collection, analysis and quality? Provide name, title, and contact information for all persons involved in collection and reporting.

    It is compiled and reported by the Data Management Program Manager, Marine Fisheries Division: Joe Shepard, jshepard@wlf.louisiana.gov.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **Fisheries**

Objective: **Ensure that Louisiana's major marine fish stocks are not overfished**

Indicator Name: **National ranking in recreational marine finfishing (# days fished)**

1. Type and Level: What is the type of the indicator (input, output, outcome, efficiency, quality)? What is the level at which the indicator will be reported (key, supporting, general performance information)?

   This outcome indicator provides general performance information.

2. Rationale: What is the rationale for the indicator? Why was it selected? How does it help measure achievement of the objective?

   It is an index to the effectiveness of fisheries management efforts and the service provided.

3. Use: How will the indicator be used in management decision-making and other agency processes? Will it be used only for internal management purposes or will it also be used for budgeted purposes?

   It allows the Division to target specific data needs for collection and fisheries management. The primary use is internal, but budgetary factors affect allocation of effort.

4. Clarity: Does the indicator name clearly identify what is being measured? If the name contains jargon, acronyms, or unclear terms, define or clarify them here.

   N/A

5. Validity, Reliability, and Accuracy: Has the indicator been audited by the Office of the Legislative Auditor? If so, what was the result/finding? If not, how can you assure that the indicator is valid, reliable and accurate?

   It has not been audited. It is a ranking of national landings data, by state.

6. Data Source, Collection and Reporting: What is the source of data to be reported? What is the frequency and timing of collection and reporting (monthly, quarterly, annual)?

National Marine Fisheries Service compiled landings data for the most recent year available. Data collection is continuous, reporting is annual.

7. Calculation and Methodology: How is the indicator calculated?

   It is a national ranking of marine recreational finfishing trips by state.

8. Scope: Is the indicator aggregated or disaggregated (is it a sum of smaller parts or is it a part of a larger whole)? Example – if the indicator is a statewide figure, can it be broken down by parish or region?

   It is aggregated by state.

9. Caveats: Does the indicator have limitations or weaknesses (lack of precision or timeliness, difficult to collect, external factors)?

   N/A

10. Responsible Person: Who is responsible for data collection, analysis and quality? Provide name, title, and contact information for all persons involved in collection and reporting.

    It is compiled and reported by the Data Management Program Manager, Marine Fisheries Division: Joe Shepard, jshepard@wlf.louisiana.gov.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **Fisheries**

Objective: **Ensure that Louisiana's major marine fish stocks are not overfished**

Indicator Name: **National ranking in commercial marine shellfish landings**

1. Type and Level: What is the type of the indicator (input, output, outcome, efficiency, quality)? What is the level at which the indicator will be reported (key, supporting, general performance information)?

   This outcome indicator provides general performance information.

2. Rationale: What is the rationale for the indicator? Why was it selected? How does it help measure achievement of the objective?

   It is an index to the effectiveness of fisheries management efforts and the service provided.

3. Use: How will the indicator be used in management decision-making and other agency processes? Will it be used only for internal management purposes or will it also be used for budgeted purposes?

   It allows the Division to target specific data needs for collection and fisheries management. The primary use is internal, but budgetary factors affect allocation of effort.

4. Clarity: Does the indicator name clearly identify what is being measured? If the name contains jargon, acronyms, or unclear terms, define or clarify them here.

   N/A

5. Validity, Reliability, and Accuracy: Has the indicator been audited by the Office of the Legislative Auditor? If so, what was the result/finding? If not, how can you assure that the indicator is valid, reliable and accurate?

   It has not been audited. It is a ranking of national landings data, by state.

6. Data Source, Collection and Reporting: What is the source of data to be reported? What is the frequency and timing of collection and reporting (monthly, quarterly, annual)?

National Marine Fisheries Service compiled landings data for the most recent year available. Data collection is continuous, reporting is annual.

7. Calculation and Methodology: How is the indicator calculated?

   It is a national ranking of marine shellfish landings data, by state.

8. Scope: Is the indicator aggregated or disaggregated (is it a sum of smaller parts or is it a part of a larger whole)? Example – if the indicator is a statewide figure, can it be broken down by parish or region?

   It is aggregated and can be broken down by region.

9. Caveats: Does the indicator have limitations or weaknesses (lack of precision or timeliness, difficult to collect, external factors)?

   N/A

10. Responsible Person: Who is responsible for data collection, analysis and quality? Provide name, title, and contact information for all persons involved in collection and reporting.

    It is compiled and reported by the Data Management Program Manager, Marine Fisheries Division: Joe Shepard, jshepard@wlf.louisiana.gov.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **Fisheries**

Objective: **Ensure that Louisiana's major marine fish stocks are not overfished**

Indicator Name: **National ranking in commercial marine finfish landings**

1. Type and Level: What is the type of the indicator (input, output, outcome, efficiency, quality)? What is the level at which the indicator will be reported (key, supporting, general performance information)?

   This outcome indicator provides general performance information.

2. Rationale: What is the rationale for the indicator? Why was it selected? How does it help measure achievement of the objective?

   It is an index to the effectiveness of fisheries management efforts and the service provided.

3. Use: How will the indicator be used in management decision-making and other agency processes? Will it be used only for internal management purposes or will it also be used for budgeted purposes?

   It allows the Division to target specific data needs for collection and fisheries management. The primary use is internal, but budgetary factors affect allocation of effort.

4. Clarity: Does the indicator name clearly identify what is being measured? If the name contains jargon, acronyms, or unclear terms, define or clarify them here.

   N/A

5. Validity, Reliability, and Accuracy: Has the indicator been audited by the Office of the Legislative Auditor? If so, what was the result/finding? If not, how can you assure that the indicator is valid, reliable and accurate?

   It has not been audited. It is a ranking of national landings data, by state.

6. Data Source, Collection and Reporting: What is the source of data to be reported? What is the frequency and timing of collection and reporting (monthly, quarterly, annual)?

National Marine Fisheries Service compiled landings data for the most recent year available. Data collection is continuous, reporting is annual.

7. Calculation and Methodology: How is the indicator calculated?

   It is a national ranking of marine finfish landings data, by state.

8. Scope: Is the indicator aggregated or disaggregated (is it a sum of smaller parts or is it a part of a larger whole)? Example – if the indicator is a statewide figure, can it be broken down by parish or region?

   It is aggregated and can be broken down by region.

9. Caveats: Does the indicator have limitations or weaknesses (lack of precision or timeliness, difficult to collect, external factors)?

   N/A

10. Responsible Person: Who is responsible for data collection, analysis and quality? Provide name, title, and contact information for all persons involved in collection and reporting.

    It is compiled and reported by the Data Management Program Manager, Marine Fisheries Division: Joe Shepard, jshepard@wlf.louisiana.gov.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **Fisheries**

Objective: **Ensure that Louisiana's major marine fish stocks are not overfished**

Indicator Name: **Number of licensed commercial fishers**

1. Type and Level: What is the type of the indicator (input, output, outcome, efficiency, quality)? What is the level at which the indicator will be reported (key, supporting, general performance information)?

   This outcome indicator provides general performance information.

2. Rationale: What is the rationale for the indicator? Why was it selected? How does it help measure achievement of the objective?

   It is an index to the effectiveness of fisheries management efforts and the service provided.

3. Use: How will the indicator be used in management decision-making and other agency processes? Will it be used only for internal management purposes or will it also be used for budgeted purposes?

   It allows the Division to target specific data needs for collection and fisheries management. The primary use is internal, but budgetary factors affect allocation of effort.

4. Clarity: Does the indicator name clearly identify what is being measured? If the name contains jargon, acronyms, or unclear terms, define or clarify them here.

   N/A

5. Validity, Reliability, and Accuracy: Has the indicator been audited by the Office of the Legislative Auditor? If so, what was the result/finding? If not, how can you assure that the indicator is valid, reliable and accurate?

   It has not been audited. It is the number of commercial fishers from DWF license sales.

6. Data Source, Collection and Reporting: What is the source of data to be reported? What is the frequency and timing of collection and reporting (monthly, quarterly, annual)?

   The data are collected continually and should be reported annually.

7. Calculation and Methodology: How is the indicator calculated?

   It is the number of commercial fishers based on DWF license sales.

8. Scope: Is the indicator aggregated or disaggregated (is it a sum of smaller parts or is it a part of a larger whole)? Example – if the indicator is a statewide figure, can it be broken down by parish or region?

   It is aggregated and can be broken down by region.

9. Caveats: Does the indicator have limitations or weaknesses (lack of precision or timeliness, difficult to collect, external factors)?

   The numbers of licensed fishers is affected by economic conditions not under the control of the Department. The number of licenses does not reflect the number of participants in the commercial fishery.

10. Responsible Person: Who is responsible for data collection, analysis and quality? Provide name, title, and contact information for all persons involved in collection and reporting.

    It is compiled and reported by the Data Management Program Manager, Marine Fisheries Division: Joe Shepard, jshepard@wlf.louisiana.gov.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **Fisheries**

Objective: **Ensure that Louisiana's major marine fish stocks are not overfished**

Indicator Name: **Number of licensed saltwater recreational fishers**

1. Type and Level: What is the type of the indicator (input, output, outcome, efficiency, quality)? What is the level at which the indicator will be reported (key, supporting, general performance information)?

   This outcome indicator provides general performance information.

2. Rationale: What is the rationale for the indicator? Why was it selected? How does it help measure achievement of the objective?

   It is an index to the effectiveness of fisheries management efforts and the service provided.

3. Use: How will the indicator be used in management decision-making and other agency processes? Will it be used only for internal management purposes or will it also be used for budgeted purposes?

   It allows the Division to target specific data needs for collection and fisheries management. The primary use is internal, but budgetary factors affect allocation of effort.

4. Clarity: Does the indicator name clearly identify what is being measured? If the name contains jargon, acronyms, or unclear terms, define or clarify them here.

   N/A

5. Validity, Reliability, and Accuracy: Has the indicator been audited by the Office of the Legislative Auditor? If so, what was the result/finding? If not, how can you assure that the indicator is valid, reliable and accurate?

   It has not been audited. It is the number of licensed recreational fishers, including holders of lifetime licenses.

6. Data Source, Collection and Reporting: What is the source of data to be reported? What is the frequency and timing of collection and reporting (monthly, quarterly, annual)?

DWF recreational license sales records are collected continually and should be reported annually.

7. Calculation and Methodology: How is the indicator calculated?

   It is the number of licensed recreational fishers, including holders of lifetime licenses.

8. Scope: Is the indicator aggregated or disaggregated (is it a sum of smaller parts or is it a part of a larger whole)? Example – if the indicator is a statewide figure, can it be broken down by parish or region?

   It is aggregated and can be broken down by region.

9. Caveats: Does the indicator have limitations or weaknesses (lack of precision or timeliness, difficult to collect, external factors)?

   The numbers of licensed fishers is affected by economic conditions not under the control of the Department.

10. Responsible Person: Who is responsible for data collection, analysis and quality? Provide name, title, and contact information for all persons involved in collection and reporting.

    It is compiled and reported by the Data Management Program Manager, Marine Fisheries Division: Joe Shepard, jshepard@wlf.louisiana.gov.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **Fisheries**

Objective: **Administer a leasing system for oyster waterbottoms such that 99% of all leases result in no legal challenges related to the leasing system and manage public reefs to fulfill 100% of the industry's seed oyster demand and make at least one area available for sack oyster harvest on the public seed grounds.**

Indicator Name: **Number of oyster lease applications received**

1. Type and Level: What is the type of the indicator (input, output, outcome, efficiency, quality)? What is the level at which the indicator will be reported (key, supporting, general performance information)?

   This input indicator provides supporting performance information.

2. Rationale: What is the rationale for the indicator? Why was it selected? How does it help measure achievement of the objective?

   It is a measure of the need for the service.

3. Use: How will the indicator be used in management decision-making and other agency processes? Will it be used only for internal management purposes or will it also be used for budgeted purposes?

   It allows the Division to target specific data needs for collection and fisheries management. The primary use is internal, but budgetary factors affect allocation of effort.

4. Clarity: Does the indicator name clearly identify what is being measured? If the name contains jargon, acronyms, or unclear terms, define or clarify them here.

   N/A

5. Validity, Reliability, and Accuracy: Has the indicator been audited by the Office of the Legislative Auditor? If so, what was the result/finding? If not, how can you assure that the indicator is valid, reliable and accurate?

   It has not been audited. It is the total number of lease applications received.

6. Data Source, Collection and Reporting: What is the source of data to be reported? What is the frequency and timing of collection and reporting (monthly, quarterly, annual)?

Oyster Lease Survey Section lease application records are collected continuously, reporting is semiannual.

7. Calculation and Methodology: How is the indicator calculated?

   It is the total number of lease applications received.

8. Scope: Is the indicator aggregated or disaggregated (is it a sum of smaller parts or is it a part of a larger whole)? Example – if the indicator is a statewide figure, can it be broken down by parish or region?

   It is aggregated and can be broken down by region.

9. Caveats: Does the indicator have limitations or weaknesses (lack of precision or timeliness, difficult to collect, external factors)?

   A moratorium on issuance of new oyster leases was declared by the Wildlife and Fisheries Commission on 2/7/02; only renewal leases will be surveyed during the moratorium.

10. Responsible Person: Who is responsible for data collection, analysis and quality? Provide name, title, and contact information for all persons involved in collection and reporting.

    It is compiled and reported by the Oyster Leasing Supervisor, Marine Fisheries Division: Raymond Impastato, rimpastato@wlf.louisiana.gov.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **Fisheries**

Objective: **Administer a leasing system for oyster waterbottoms such that 99% of all leases result in no legal challenges related to the leasing system and manage public reefs to fulfill 100% of the industry's seed oyster demand and make at least one area available for sack oyster harvest on the public seed grounds.**

Indicator Name: **Number of barrels of seed oysters available on the public grounds**

1. Type and Level: What is the type of the indicator (input, output, outcome, efficiency, quality)? What is the level at which the indicator will be reported (key, supporting, general performance information)?

   This output indicator provides supporting performance information.

2. Rationale: What is the rationale for the indicator? Why was it selected? How does it help measure achievement of the objective?

   It is a measure of progress in attaining the objective.

3. Use: How will the indicator be used in management decision-making and other agency processes? Will it be used only for internal management purposes or will it also be used for budgeted purposes?

   It allows the Division to target specific data needs for collection and fisheries management. The primary use is internal, but budgetary factors affect allocation of effort.

4. Clarity: Does the indicator name clearly identify what is being measured? If the name contains jargon, acronyms, or unclear terms, define or clarify them here.

   Seed oysters are juvenile oysters that are harvested from the public reefs by oyster fishers to transport to leases to be grown to a marketable size.

5. Validity, Reliability, and Accuracy: Has the indicator been audited by the Office of the Legislative Auditor? If so, what was the result/finding? If not, how can you assure that the indicator is valid, reliable and accurate?

   It has not been audited. It is the total number of barrels of seed oysters available from public reefs.

6. Data Source, Collection and Reporting: What is the source of data to be reported? What is the frequency and timing of collection and reporting (monthly, quarterly, annual)?

   The data source is Marine Fisheries Division operations. Data are collected and should be reported annually.

7. Calculation and Methodology: How is the indicator calculated?

   It is the total number of barrels of seed oysters available from public reefs.

8. Scope: Is the indicator aggregated or disaggregated (is it a sum of smaller parts or is it a part of a larger whole)? Example – if the indicator is a statewide figure, can it be broken down by parish or region?

   It is aggregated and can be broken down by public seed ground.

9. Caveats: Does the indicator have limitations or weaknesses (lack of precision or timeliness, difficult to collect, external factors)?

   N/A

10. Responsible Person: Who is responsible for data collection, analysis and quality? Provide name, title, and contact information for all persons involved in collection and reporting.

    It is compiled and reported by the Oyster Program Manager, Marine Fisheries Division (currently vacant).

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **Fisheries**

Objective: **Administer a leasing system for oyster waterbottoms such that 99% of all leases result in no legal challenges related to the leasing system and manage public reefs to fulfill 100% of the industry's seed oyster demand and make at least one area available for sack oyster harvest on the public seed grounds.**

Indicator Name: **Number of areas available for harvest of sack oysters on public seed grounds**

1. Type and Level: What is the type of the indicator (input, output, outcome, efficiency, quality)? What is the level at which the indicator will be reported (key, supporting, general performance information)?

   This output indicator provides key performance information.

2. Rationale: What is the rationale for the indicator? Why was it selected? How does it help measure achievement of the objective?

   It is an index to oyster availability on the public grounds.

3. Use: How will the indicator be used in management decision-making and other agency processes? Will it be used only for internal management purposes or will it also be used for budgeted purposes?

   To determine the need for sack oysters and allow for more effective planning of future management activities on the public reefs. The primary use is internal, but budgetary factors affect allocation of effort.

4. Clarity: Does the indicator name clearly identify what is being measured? If the name contains jargon, acronyms, or unclear terms, define or clarify them here.

   Sack oysters are marketable oysters of legal size for harvest and sale.

5. Validity, Reliability, and Accuracy: Has the indicator been audited by the Office of the Legislative Auditor? If so, what was the result/finding? If not, how can you assure that the indicator is valid, reliable and accurate?

   It has not been audited. It is the number of areas open to sack oyster harvest on public reefs.

6. Data Source, Collection and Reporting: What is the source of data to be reported? What is the frequency and timing of collection and reporting (monthly, quarterly, annual)?

   The data source is Marine Fisheries Division operations. Data are collected and should be reported annually.

7. Calculation and Methodology: How is the indicator calculated?

   It is the number of areas open to sack oyster harvest on public reefs.

8. Scope: Is the indicator aggregated or disaggregated (is it a sum of smaller parts or is it a part of a larger whole)? Example – if the indicator is a statewide figure, can it be broken down by parish or region?

   It is aggregated and can be broken down by individual public seed ground.

9. Caveats: Does the indicator have limitations or weaknesses (lack of precision or timeliness, difficult to collect, external factors)?

   Environmental and other external factors affect suitability of areas for sack oyster harvest.

10. Responsible Person: Who is responsible for data collection, analysis and quality? Provide name, title, and contact information for all persons involved in collection and reporting.

    It is compiled and reported by the Oyster Program Manager, Marine Fisheries Division (currently vacant).

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **Fisheries**

Objective: **Administer a leasing system for oyster waterbottoms such that 99% of all leases result in no legal challenges related to the leasing system and manage public reefs to fulfill 100% of the industry's seed oyster demand and make at least one area available for sack oyster harvest on the public seed grounds.**

Indicator Name: **Number of oyster lease surveys conducted**

1. Type and Level: What is the type of the indicator (input, output, outcome, efficiency, quality)? What is the level at which the indicator will be reported (key, supporting, general performance information)?

   This input indicator provides supporting performance information.

2. Rationale: What is the rationale for the indicator? Why was it selected? How does it help measure achievement of the objective?

   It is a measure of the service provided.

3. Use: How will the indicator be used in management decision-making and other agency processes? Will it be used only for internal management purposes or will it also be used for budgeted purposes?

   It will be used to allocate resources for issuing leases. The primary use is internal, but budgetary factors affect allocation of effort.

4. Clarity: Does the indicator name clearly identify what is being measured? If the name contains jargon, acronyms, or unclear terms, define or clarify them here.

   N/A

5. Validity, Reliability, and Accuracy: Has the indicator been audited by the Office of the Legislative Auditor? If so, what was the result/finding? If not, how can you assure that the indicator is valid, reliable and accurate?

   It has not been audited. It is the total number of leases surveyed by survey crews.

6. Data Source, Collection and Reporting: What is the source of data to be reported? What is the frequency and timing of collection and reporting (monthly, quarterly, annual)?

Oyster Lease Survey Section operations. Data are collected continually and should be reported semiannually.

7. Calculation and Methodology: How is the indicator calculated?

   It is the total number of leases surveyed by survey crews.

8. Scope: Is the indicator aggregated or disaggregated (is it a sum of smaller parts or is it a part of a larger whole)? Example – if the indicator is a statewide figure, can it be broken down by parish or region?

   It is aggregated and can be broken down by region.

9. Caveats: Does the indicator have limitations or weaknesses (lack of precision or timeliness, difficult to collect, external factors)?

   A moratorium on issuance of new oyster leases was declared by the Wildlife and Fisheries Commission on 2/7/02; only renewal leases will be surveyed during the moratorium.

10. Responsible Person: Who is responsible for data collection, analysis and quality? Provide name, title, and contact information for all persons involved in collection and reporting.

    It is compiled and reported by the Oyster Leasing Supervisor, Marine Fisheries Division: Raymond Impastato, rimpastato@wlf.louisiana.gov.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **Fisheries**

Objective: **Administer a leasing system for oyster waterbottoms such that 99% of all leases result in no legal challenges related to the leasing system and manage public reefs to fulfill 100% of the industry's seed oyster demand and make at least one area available for sack oyster harvest on the public seed grounds.**

Indicator Name: **Number of barrels of seed oysters harvested by oyster fishers from the public grounds**

1. Type and Level: What is the type of the indicator (input, output, outcome, efficiency, quality)? What is the level at which the indicator will be reported (key, supporting, general performance information)?

   This outcome indicator provides supporting performance information.

2. Rationale: What is the rationale for the indicator? Why was it selected? How does it help measure achievement of the objective?

   It is a measure of progress in attaining the objective.

3. Use: How will the indicator be used in management decision-making and other agency processes? Will it be used only for internal management purposes or will it also be used for budgeted purposes?

   To determine the need for seed oysters to allow for more effective planning of future management activities on the public reefs. The primary use is internal, but budgetary factors affect allocation of effort.

4. Clarity: Does the indicator name clearly identify what is being measured? If the name contains jargon, acronyms, or unclear terms, define or clarify them here.

   1 barrel = 2 sacks

5. Validity, Reliability, and Accuracy: Has the indicator been audited by the Office of the Legislative Auditor? If so, what was the result/finding? If not, how can you assure that the indicator is valid, reliable and accurate?

   It has not been audited. It is the number of barrels of seed oysters harvested from public reefs.

6. Data Source, Collection and Reporting: What is the source of data to be reported? What is the frequency and timing of collection and reporting (monthly, quarterly, annual)?

   The data source is Marine Fisheries Division operations. Data are collected and should be reported annually.

7. Calculation and Methodology: How is the indicator calculated?

   It is the number of barrels of seed oysters harvested from public reefs.

8. Scope: Is the indicator aggregated or disaggregated (is it a sum of smaller parts or is it a part of a larger whole)? Example – if the indicator is a statewide figure, can it be broken down by parish or region?

   It is aggregated and can be broken down by public seed ground.

9. Caveats: Does the indicator have limitations or weaknesses (lack of precision or timeliness, difficult to collect, external factors)?

   It assumes that if supply of available oysters exceeds harvest, then industry demand has been met. Seed oyster harvest is estimated from boarding report surveys; weather and other operational factors may affect the precision of the estimate.

10. Responsible Person: Who is responsible for data collection, analysis and quality? Provide name, title, and contact information for all persons involved in collection and reporting.

    It is compiled and reported by the Oyster Program Manager, Marine Fisheries Division (currently vacant).

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **Fisheries**

Objective: **Administer a leasing system for oyster waterbottoms such that 99% of all leases result in no legal challenges related to the leasing system and manage public reefs to fulfill 100% of the industry's seed oyster demand and make at least one area available for sack oyster harvest on the public seed grounds.**

Indicator Name: **Number of sacks of oysters harvested from the public grounds**

1. Type and Level: What is the type of the indicator (input, output, outcome, efficiency, quality)? What is the level at which the indicator will be reported (key, supporting, general performance information)?

   This outcome indicator provides supporting performance information.

2. Rationale: What is the rationale for the indicator? Why was it selected? How does it help measure achievement of the objective?

   Sack oyster harvest from a public reef is one indicator of the viability of the reef for seed production.

3. Use: How will the indicator be used in management decision-making and other agency processes? Will it be used only for internal management purposes or will it also be used for budgeted purposes?

   To determine the need for sack oysters to allow for more effective planning of future management activities on the public reefs. The primary use is internal, but budgetary factors affect allocation of effort.

4. Clarity: Does the indicator name clearly identify what is being measured? If the name contains jargon, acronyms, or unclear terms, define or clarify them here.

   N/A

5. Validity, Reliability, and Accuracy: Has the indicator been audited by the Office of the Legislative Auditor? If so, what was the result/finding? If not, how can you assure that the indicator is valid, reliable and accurate?

   It has not been audited. It is the number of sacks of marketable oysters harvested from public reefs.

6. Data Source, Collection and Reporting: What is the source of data to be reported? What is the frequency and timing of collection and reporting (monthly, quarterly, annual)?

   The data source is Marine Fisheries Division operations. Data are collected and should be reported annually.

7. Calculation and Methodology: How is the indicator calculated?

   It is the number of sacks of marketable oysters harvested from public reefs.

8. Scope: Is the indicator aggregated or disaggregated (is it a sum of smaller parts or is it a part of a larger whole)? Example – if the indicator is a statewide figure, can it be broken down by parish or region?

   It is aggregated and can be broken down by public seed ground.

9. Caveats: Does the indicator have limitations or weaknesses (lack of precision or timeliness, difficult to collect, external factors)?

   It assumes that if supply of available oysters exceeds harvest, then industry demand has been met.

10. Responsible Person: Who is responsible for data collection, analysis and quality? Provide name, title, and contact information for all persons involved in collection and reporting.

    It is compiled and reported by the Oyster Program Manager, Marine Fisheries Division (currently vacant).

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **Fisheries**

Objective: **Administer a leasing system for oyster waterbottoms such that 99% of all leases result in no legal challenges related to the leasing system and manage public reefs to fulfill 100% of the industry's seed oyster demand and make at least one area available for sack oyster harvest on the public seed grounds.**

Indicator Name: **Number of lessees adversely affected by lack of timeliness in issuing leases**

1. Type and Level: What is the type of the indicator (input, output, outcome, efficiency, quality)? What is the level at which the indicator will be reported (key, supporting, general performance information)?

   This outcome indicator provides supporting performance information.

2. Rationale: What is the rationale for the indicator? Why was it selected? How does it help measure achievement of the objective?

   IT provides an index to the efficiency of the leasing process.

3. Use: How will the indicator be used in management decision-making and other agency processes? Will it be used only for internal management purposes or will it also be used for budgeted purposes?

   To determine the level of service provided to the constituent. The primary use is internal, but budgetary factors affect allocation of effort

4. Clarity: Does the indicator name clearly identify what is being measured? If the name contains jargon, acronyms, or unclear terms, define or clarify them here.

   N/A

5. Validity, Reliability, and Accuracy: Has the indicator been audited by the Office of the Legislative Auditor? If so, what was the result/finding? If not, how can you assure that the indicator is valid, reliable and accurate?

   It has not been audited. It is the total number of complaints from lessees based on lack of timeliness in lease processing.

6. Data Source, Collection and Reporting: What is the source of data to be reported? What is the frequency and timing of collection and reporting (monthly, quarterly, annual)?

   Oyster Lease Survey Section operations are the source of the data which are collected and reported continuously.

7. Calculation and Methodology: How is the indicator calculated?

   It is the total number of complaints from lessees based on lack of timeliness in lease processing.

8. Scope: Is the indicator aggregated or disaggregated (is it a sum of smaller parts or is it a part of a larger whole)? Example – if the indicator is a statewide figure, can it be broken down by parish or region?

   It is disaggregated.

9. Caveats: Does the indicator have limitations or weaknesses (lack of precision or timeliness, difficult to collect, external factors)?

   A moratorium on issuance of new oyster leases was declared by the Wildlife and Fisheries Commission on 2/7/02; only renewal leases will be surveyed during the moratorium. New applications are not accepted or processed during the moratorium.

10. Responsible Person: Who is responsible for data collection, analysis and quality? Provide name, title, and contact information for all persons involved in collection and reporting.

    It is compiled and reported by the Oyster Leasing Supervisor, Marine Fisheries Division: Raymond Impastato, rimpastato@wlf.louisiana.gov.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **Fisheries**

Objective: **Administer a leasing system for oyster waterbottoms such that 99% of all leases result in no legal challenges related to the leasing system and manage public reefs to fulfill 100% of the industry's seed oyster demand and make at least one area available for sack oyster harvest on the public seed grounds.**

Indicator Name: **Percent of leases with no legal challenges**

1. Type and Level: What is the type of the indicator (input, output, outcome, efficiency, quality)? What is the level at which the indicator will be reported (key, supporting, general performance information)?

   This output indicator provides key performance information.

2. Rationale: What is the rationale for the indicator? Why was it selected? How does it help measure achievement of the objective?

   The indicator measures one method identifying needs to improve efficiency in services and is an index to the service provided.

3. Use: How will the indicator be used in management decision-making and other agency processes? Will it be used only for internal management purposes or will it also be used for budgeted purposes?

   It allows the Division to target specific needs related to serving oyster industry constituency. The primary use is internal, but budgetary factors affect allocation of effort.

4. Clarity: Does the indicator name clearly identify what is being measured? If the name contains jargon, acronyms, or unclear terms, define or clarify them here.

   N/A

5. Validity, Reliability, and Accuracy: Has the indicator been audited by the Office of the Legislative Auditor? If so, what was the result/finding? If not, how can you assure that the indicator is valid, reliable and accurate?

   It has not been audited. It is the proportion of challenged leases to all leases.

6. Data Source, Collection and Reporting: What is the source of data to be reported? What is the frequency and timing of collection and reporting (monthly, quarterly, annual)?

   The data source is Marine Fisheries Division operations and the oyster leasing data base. Data are collected and reported continuously.

7. Calculation and Methodology: How is the indicator calculated?

   It is the proportion of challenged leases to all leases.

8. Scope: Is the indicator aggregated or disaggregated (is it a sum of smaller parts or is it a part of a larger whole)? Example – if the indicator is a statewide figure, can it be broken down by parish or region?

   It is disaggregated.

9. Caveats: Does the indicator have limitations or weaknesses (lack of precision or timeliness, difficult to collect, external factors)?

   A moratorium on issuance of new oyster leases was declared by the Wildlife and Fisheries Commission on 2/7/02; only renewal leases will be surveyed during the moratorium. New applications are not accepted or processed during the moratorium. There are presently pending legal challenges to some of the clauses in the oyster leases, particularly those related to coastal restoration. While the cases do not name as a universal class all leaseholders, they will as a practical matter, have universal application and affect. Additionally, there is a pending lawsuit that challenges the statutorily-established leasing system framework, which will also have a universal application and affect.
   Having said that, and excluding the above referenced challenges which are of a general nature, there are no other legal challenges being maintained by an applicant or any other party challenging the validity of a specific lease or competing for a specific lease based upon any grounds, including but not limited to, application irregularities, survey irregularities or any other administrative basis.

10. Responsible Person: Who is responsible for data collection, analysis and quality? Provide name, title, and contact information for all persons involved in collection and reporting.

    It is compiled and reported by the Oyster Leasing Supervisor, Marine Fisheries Division: Raymond Impastato, rimpastato@wlf.louisiana.gov.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **Fisheries**

Objective: **Administer a leasing system for oyster waterbottoms such that 99% of all leases result in no legal challenges related to the leasing system and manage public reefs to fulfill 100% of the industry's seed oyster demand and make at least one area available for sack oyster harvest on the public seed grounds.**

Indicator Name: **Percent of demand for seed oysters met**

1. Type and Level: What is the type of the indicator (input, output, outcome, efficiency, quality)? What is the level at which the indicator will be reported (key, supporting, general performance information)?

   This efficiency indicator provides key performance information.

2. Rationale: What is the rationale for the indicator? Why was it selected? How does it help measure achievement of the objective?

   It is a measure of whether demand for seed oysters is being met.

3. Use: How will the indicator be used in management decision-making and other agency processes? Will it be used only for internal management purposes or will it also be used for budgeted purposes?

   It will be used to determine the need for seed oysters by the oyster harvesting industry to allow for more effective planning of future management activities on public reefs.

4. Clarity: Does the indicator name clearly identify what is being measured? If the name contains jargon, acronyms, or unclear terms, define or clarify them here.

   N/A

5. Validity, Reliability, and Accuracy: Has the indicator been audited by the Office of the Legislative Auditor? If so, what was the result/finding? If not, how can you assure that the indicator is valid, reliable and accurate?

   It has not been audited. It is harvest data from oyster fishers divided by information on availability of seed oysters from Department fishery management data.

6. Data Source, Collection and Reporting: What is the source of data to be reported? What is the frequency and timing of collection and reporting (monthly, quarterly, annual)?

   It is based on harvest data and direct survey data from reefs. Data collection and reporting is annual.

7. Calculation and Methodology: How is the indicator calculated?

   It is harvest data from oyster fishers divided by information on availability of seed oysters from Department fishery management data.

8. Scope: Is the indicator aggregated or disaggregated (is it a sum of smaller parts or is it a part of a larger whole)? Example – if the indicator is a statewide figure, can it be broken down by parish or region?

   It is aggregated and can be broken down by region.

9. Caveats: Does the indicator have limitations or weaknesses (lack of precision or timeliness, difficult to collect, external factors)?

   Demand is determined by economic and environmental factors beyond the control of the Department.

10. Responsible Person: Who is responsible for data collection, analysis and quality? Provide name, title, and contact information for all persons involved in collection and reporting.

    It is compiled and reported by the Oyster Program Manager, Marine Fisheries Division (currently vacant).

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **Fisheries**

Objective: **To conserve, protect, manage, and improve Louisiana's marine and coastal habitats by participating in 15 major coastal protection/improvement projects**

Indicator Name: **Number of oyster reefs sampled to monitor health of reef habitat**

1. Type and Level: What is the type of the indicator (input, output, outcome, efficiency, quality)? What is the level at which the indicator will be reported (key, supporting, general performance information)?

   This input indicator provides supporting performance information.

2. Rationale: What is the rationale for the indicator? Why was it selected? How does it help measure achievement of the objective?

   It measures one method of conserving/protecting marine fish habitat and is an index to the service provided.

3. Use: How will the indicator be used in management decision-making and other agency processes? Will it be used only for internal management purposes or will it also be used for budgeted purposes?

   It identifies a specific habitat-related issue. The primary use is internal, but budgetary factors affect resource allocation.

4. Clarity: Does the indicator name clearly identify what is being measured? If the name contains jargon, acronyms, or unclear terms, define or clarify them here.

   N/A

5. Validity, Reliability, and Accuracy: Has the indicator been audited by the Office of the Legislative Auditor? If so, what was the result/finding? If not, how can you assure that the indicator is valid, reliable and accurate?

   It has not been audited. It is the total number of reefs sampled to evaluate habitat conditions.

6. Data Source, Collection and Reporting: What is the source of data to be reported? What is the frequency and timing of collection and reporting (monthly, quarterly, annual)?

The data source is Marine Fisheries Division operations and the Division fisheries information database. Data are collected and reported annually.

7. Calculation and Methodology: How is the indicator calculated?

   It is the total number of reefs sampled to evaluate habitat conditions.

8. Scope: Is the indicator aggregated or disaggregated (is it a sum of smaller parts or is it a part of a larger whole)? Example – if the indicator is a statewide figure, can it be broken down by parish or region?

   It is aggregated and can be broken down by region.

9. Caveats: Does the indicator have limitations or weaknesses (lack of precision or timeliness, difficult to collect, external factors)?

   N/A

10. Responsible Person: Who is responsible for data collection, analysis and quality? Provide name, title, and contact information for all persons involved in collection and reporting.

    It is compiled and reported by the Oyster Program Manager, Marine Fisheries Division (currently vacant).

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **Fisheries**

Objective: **To conserve, protect, manage, and improve Louisiana's marine and coastal habitats by participating in 15 major coastal protection/improvement projects**

Indicator Name: **Number of spills investigated**

1. Type and Level: What is the type of the indicator (input, output, outcome, efficiency, quality)? What is the level at which the indicator will be reported (key, supporting, general performance information)?

   This input indicator provides supporting performance information.

2. Rationale: What is the rationale for the indicator? Why was it selected? How does it help measure achievement of the objective?

   It measures one method of conserving/protecting marine fish habitat and is an index to the service provided.

3. Use: How will the indicator be used in management decision-making and other agency processes? Will it be used only for internal management purposes or will it also be used for budgeted purposes?

   It identifies a specific habitat-related issue. The primary use is internal, but budgetary factors affect resource allocation.

4. Clarity: Does the indicator name clearly identify what is being measured? If the name contains jargon, acronyms, or unclear terms, define or clarify them here.

   N/A

5. Validity, Reliability, and Accuracy: Has the indicator been audited by the Office of the Legislative Auditor? If so, what was the result/finding? If not, how can you assure that the indicator is valid, reliable and accurate?

   It has not been audited. Response consists of reviewing spills reported to the Department by outside agencies (primarily Louisiana Oil Spill Coordinator's Office) and taking appropriate action based on the information received. The Department has no control over this indicator.

6. Data Source, Collection and Reporting: What is the source of data to be reported? What is the frequency and timing of collection and reporting (monthly, quarterly, annual)?

   Spills are reported to the US Coast Guard and Louisiana Department of Public Safety, and transmitted to the Department through the Louisiana Oil Spill Coordinator's Office. Data collection and reporting are continuous.

7. Calculation and Methodology: How is the indicator calculated?

   The data source is the number of spills reported to the US Coast Guard and Louisiana Department of Public Safety, and transmitted to the Department through the Louisiana Oil Spill Coordinator's Office. Data are collected continuously and are reported annually.

8. Scope: Is the indicator aggregated or disaggregated (is it a sum of smaller parts or is it a part of a larger whole)? Example – if the indicator is a statewide figure, can it be broken down by parish or region?

   It is aggregated and can be broken down by region.

9. Caveats: Does the indicator have limitations or weaknesses (lack of precision or timeliness, difficult to collect, external factors)?

   It is based on the number of spills that occur and are reported through the appropriate federal and state agencies; the Department receives the data from other agencies. Information reported may not be complete or accurate.

10. Responsible Person: Who is responsible for data collection, analysis and quality? Provide name, title, and contact information for all persons involved in collection and reporting.

    It is compiled and reported by the Habitat Program Manager, Marine Fisheries Division: Martin Bourgeois, mbourgeois@wlf.louisiana.gov.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **Fisheries**

Objective: **To conserve, protect, manage, and improve Louisiana's marine and coastal habitats by participating in 15 major coastal protection/improvement projects**

Indicator Name: **Number of spills requiring restoration**

1. Type and Level: What is the type of the indicator (input, output, outcome, efficiency, quality)? What is the level at which the indicator will be reported (key, supporting, general performance information)?

   This input indicator provides supporting performance information.

2. Rationale: What is the rationale for the indicator? Why was it selected? How does it help measure achievement of the objective?

   It measures one method of conserving/protecting marine fish habitat and is an index to the service provided.

3. Use: How will the indicator be used in management decision-making and other agency processes? Will it be used only for internal management purposes or will it also be used for budgeted purposes?

   It identifies a specific habitat-related issue. The primary use is internal, but budgetary factors affect resource allocation.

4. Clarity: Does the indicator name clearly identify what is being measured? If the name contains jargon, acronyms, or unclear terms, define or clarify them here.

   Restoration planning is pursued according to state and/or federal laws and regulations if the impacts of a particular spill are determined to have significantly affected public trust natural resources.

5. Validity, Reliability, and Accuracy: Has the indicator been audited by the Office of the Legislative Auditor? If so, what was the result/finding? If not, how can you assure that the indicator is valid, reliable and accurate?

   It has not been audited. Restoration planning is pursued according to state and/or federal laws and regulations if the impacts of a particular spill are determined to have

significantly affected public trust natural resources. The Department has no control over this indicator.

6. Data Source, Collection and Reporting: What is the source of data to be reported? What is the frequency and timing of collection and reporting (monthly, quarterly, annual)?

   The data source is the number of spills of sufficient magnitude or impact to warrant restoration pursuant to federal and state law and regulation. Data are collected continuously and are reported annually.

7. Calculation and Methodology: How is the indicator calculated?

   The sum total of spills of sufficient magnitude or impact to warrant restoration pursuant to federal and state law and regulation.

8. Scope: Is the indicator aggregated or disaggregated (is it a sum of smaller parts or is it a part of a larger whole)? Example – if the indicator is a statewide figure, can it be broken down by parish or region?

   It is aggregated and can be broken down by region.

9. Caveats: Does the indicator have limitations or weaknesses (lack of precision or timeliness, difficult to collect, external factors)?

   The need for restoration is governed by state and federal law and regulation. Only spills of sufficient magnitude and that cause sufficient environmental injury are candidates for restoration planning and implementation.

10. Responsible Person: Who is responsible for data collection, analysis and quality? Provide name, title, and contact information for all persons involved in collection and reporting.

    It is compiled and reported by the Habitat Program Manager, Marine Fisheries Division: Martin Bourgeois, mbourgeois@wlf.louisiana.gov.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **Fisheries**

Objective: **To conserve, protect, manage, and improve Louisiana's marine and coastal habitats by participating in 15 major coastal protection/improvement projects**

Indicator Name: **Percent of seismic projects in the state monitored for compliance with DWF rules**

1. Type and Level: What is the type of the indicator (input, output, outcome, efficiency, quality)? What is the level at which the indicator will be reported (key, supporting, general performance information)?

   This efficiency indicator provides supporting performance information.

2. Rationale: What is the rationale for the indicator? Why was it selected? How does it help measure achievement of the objective?

   It measures one method of conserving/protecting marine fish habitat and is an index to the service provided.

3. Use: How will the indicator be used in management decision-making and other agency processes? Will it be used only for internal management purposes or will it also be used for budgeted purposes?

   It identifies a specific habitat-related issue. The primary use is internal, but budgetary factors affect resource allocation.

4. Clarity: Does the indicator name clearly identify what is being measured? If the name contains jargon, acronyms, or unclear terms, define or clarify them here.

   Seismic exploration projects are monitored statewide.

5. Validity, Reliability, and Accuracy: Has the indicator been audited by the Office of the Legislative Auditor? If so, what was the result/finding? If not, how can you assure that the indicator is valid, reliable and accurate?

   It has not been audited. It provides an index to the service provided.

6. Data Source, Collection and Reporting: What is the source of data to be reported? What is the frequency and timing of collection and reporting (monthly, quarterly, annual)?

It is compiled from records of the Seismic Section, Marine Fisheries Division. Data collection and reporting are continuous.

7. Calculation and Methodology: How is the indicator calculated?

   The proportion of all permitted seismic exploration projects regularly inspected by the Seismic Section.

8. Scope: Is the indicator aggregated or disaggregated (is it a sum of smaller parts or is it a part of a larger whole)? Example – if the indicator is a statewide figure, can it be broken down by parish or region?

   It is aggregated and can be broken down by region.

9. Caveats: Does the indicator have limitations or weaknesses (lack of precision or timeliness, difficult to collect, external factors)?

   The number of permitted seismic exploration projects is influenced by economic conditions, particularly the price of oil.

10. Responsible Person: Who is responsible for data collection, analysis and quality? Provide name, title, and contact information for all persons involved in collection and reporting.

    It is compiled and reported by the Seismic Section Supervisor, Marine Fisheries Division: Patrick Banks, pbanks@wlf.louisiana.gov.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **Fisheries**

Objective: To conserve, protect, manage, and improve Louisiana's marine and coastal habitats by participating in 15 major coastal protection/improvement projects

Indicator Name: **Number of abandoned crab trap cleanup areas**

1. Type and Level: What is the type of the indicator (input, output, outcome, efficiency, quality)? What is the level at which the indicator will be reported (key, supporting, general performance information)?

   This outcome indicator provides supporting performance information.

2. Rationale: What is the rationale for the indicator? Why was it selected? How does it help measure achievement of the objective?

   It is an index to the service provided.

3. Use: How will the indicator be used in management decision-making and other agency processes? Will it be used only for internal management purposes or will it also be used for budgeted purposes?

   It identifies a specific habitat-related issue, specifically removal of abandoned crab traps from coastal waters. The primary use is internal, but budgetary factors affect resource allocation.

4. Clarity: Does the indicator name clearly identify what is being measured? If the name contains jargon, acronyms, or unclear terms, define or clarify them here.

   "Abandoned crab trap" is defined in the statute creating the Louisiana crab trap removal program. Negative impacts of abandoned crab traps include: ghost fishing, crab mortality, bycatch; user group conflicts, navigational hazard, and, decreased visual aesthetics.

5. Validity, Reliability, and Accuracy: Has the indicator been audited by the Office of the Legislative Auditor? If so, what was the result/finding? If not, how can you assure that the indicator is valid, reliable and accurate?

   It has not been audited. It is the total number of areas identified for cleanup each year.

6. Data Source, Collection and Reporting: What is the source of data to be reported? What is the frequency and timing of collection and reporting (monthly, quarterly, annual)?

   Marine Fisheries Division operations.

7. Calculation and Methodology: How is the indicator calculated?

   It is the total number of areas identified for abandoned crab trap cleanup each year.

8. Scope: Is the indicator aggregated or disaggregated (is it a sum of smaller parts or is it a part of a larger whole)? Example – if the indicator is a statewide figure, can it be broken down by parish or region?

   It is disaggregated.

9. Caveats: Does the indicator have limitations or weaknesses (lack of precision or timeliness, difficult to collect, external factors)?

   N/A

10. Responsible Person: Who is responsible for data collection, analysis and quality? Provide name, title, and contact information for all persons involved in collection and reporting.

    It is compiled and reported by the Shellfish Program Manager, Marine Fisheries Division (currently vacant).

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **Fisheries**

Objective: **To conserve, protect, manage, and improve Louisiana's marine and coastal habitats by participating in 15 major coastal protection/improvement projects**

Indicator Name: **Number of platforms added to the Louisiana Artificial Reef Program**

1. Type and Level: What is the type of the indicator (input, output, outcome, efficiency, quality)? What is the level at which the indicator will be reported (key, supporting, general performance information)?

   This outcome indicator provides supporting performance information.

2. Rationale: What is the rationale for the indicator? Why was it selected? How does it help measure achievement of the objective?

   It measures one method of conserving/protecting marine fish habitat and is an index to the service provided.

3. Use: How will the indicator be used in management decision-making and other agency processes? Will it be used only for internal management purposes or will it also be used for budgeted purposes?

   It identifies a specific habitat-related issue affecting marine fisheries management measures. The primary use is internal, but budgetary factors affect resource allocation.

4. Clarity: Does the indicator name clearly identify what is being measured? If the name contains jargon, acronyms, or unclear terms, define or clarify them here.

   N/A

5. Validity, Reliability, and Accuracy: Has the indicator been audited by the Office of the Legislative Auditor? If so, what was the result/finding? If not, how can you assure that the indicator is valid, reliable and accurate?

   It has not been audited. It is the sum total of oil/gas platforms added to the Program each year.

6. Data Source, Collection and Reporting: What is the source of data to be reported? What is the frequency and timing of collection and reporting (monthly, quarterly, annual)?

The data source is the number of oil/gas platforms added to the Program each year. Data are collected continuously and are reported annually.

7. Calculation and Methodology: How is the indicator calculated?

   It is the sum total of oil/gas platforms added to the Program each year.

8. Scope: Is the indicator aggregated or disaggregated (is it a sum of smaller parts or is it a part of a larger whole)? Example – if the indicator is a statewide figure, can it be broken down by parish or region?

   It is disaggregated.

9. Caveats: Does the indicator have limitations or weaknesses (lack of precision or timeliness, difficult to collect, external factors)?

   It relies on oil/gas industry participation in the Program.

10. Responsible Person: Who is responsible for data collection, analysis and quality? Provide name, title, and contact information for all persons involved in collection and reporting.

    It is compiled and reported by the Artificial Reef Coordinator, Marine Fisheries Division: Rick Kasprzak, rkasprzak@wlf.louisiana.gov.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **Fisheries**

Objective: **To conserve, protect, manage, and improve Louisiana's marine and coastal habitats by participating in 15 major coastal protection/improvement projects**

Indicator Name: **Number of major coastal protection/restoration projects participated in**

1. Type and Level: What is the type of the indicator (input, output, outcome, efficiency, quality)? What is the level at which the indicator will be reported (key, supporting, general performance information)?

   This outcome indicator provides key performance information.

2. Rationale: What is the rationale for the indicator? Why was it selected? How does it help measure achievement of the objective?

   It measures agency participation in major interagency habitat protection and improvement projects and is an index to the service provided.

3. Use: How will the indicator be used in management decision-making and other agency processes? Will it be used only for internal management purposes or will it also be used for budgeted purposes?

   It allows the Division to identify specific habitat-related issues affecting marine fisheries management measures. The primary use is internal, but budgetary factors affect resource allocation.

4. Clarity: Does the indicator name clearly identify what is being measured? If the name contains jargon, acronyms, or unclear terms, define or clarify them here.

   N/A

5. Validity, Reliability, and Accuracy: Has the indicator been audited by the Office of the Legislative Auditor? If so, what was the result/finding? If not, how can you assure that the indicator is valid, reliable and accurate?

   It has not been audited. It is an attempt to monitor the range of government activities affecting marine fish habitat and the Department's input to planning, habitat conservation, and management.

6. Data Source, Collection and Reporting: What is the source of data to be reported? What is the frequency and timing of collection and reporting (monthly, quarterly, annual)?

   The data are a compilation of Department participation in a variety of major interagency planning and implementation projects. The Department currently participates in the following projects: CWPPRA, LCA, Morganza to the Gulf, Acadiana to the Gulf of Mexico Access Channel, Sabine Neches Waterway, Beneficial Use of Material Program, Donaldsonville to the Gulf Hurricane Protection Levee, Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council and Gulf States Marine Fisheries Commission habitat initiatives, Liquified Natural Gas facilities, Sand Management, Hypoxia and Nutrient Management Task Forces, Mariculture, spill response and restoration, seismic monitoring, fisheries habitat monitoring, artificial reef planning, and others. Data collection is dependent on each individual project and should be reported annually.

7. Calculation and Methodology: How is the indicator calculated?

   The sum total of major projects participated in by the Department.

8. Scope: Is the indicator aggregated or disaggregated (is it a sum of smaller parts or is it a part of a larger whole)? Example – if the indicator is a statewide figure, can it be broken down by parish or region?

   It is aggregated and can be broken down by region.

9. Caveats: Does the indicator have limitations or weaknesses (lack of precision or timeliness, difficult to collect, external factors)?

   As stated above, the indicator is a compilation of a variety of major habitat-related projects that the agency participates in and is strongly influenced by external factors.

10. Responsible Person: Who is responsible for data collection, analysis and quality? Provide name, title, and contact information for all persons involved in collection and reporting.

    It is compiled and reported by the Habitat Program Manager, Marine Fisheries Division: Heather Finley, hfinley@wlf.louisiana.gov.

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST

Program: **Fisheries**

Objective: **Ensure that Louisiana's major marine fish stocks are not overfished.**

Strategy: **Enhance the collection of biological and environmental data associated with marine fish and habitat resources from the State's major coastal bay systems and territorial sea.**

Yes	No	
		Analysis:
	X	Cost/benefit analysis conducted
	X	Financial or performance audit used
	X	Benchmarking for best management practices used
	X	Act 160 Reports used
X		Other analysis or evaluation tools used
X		Impact on other strategies considered
	X	Stakeholders identified and involved
		Authorization:
X		Authorization exists
	X	Authorization needed
		Organization Capacity:
	X	Needed structural or procedural changes identified
X		Resource needs identified
X		Strategies developed to implement needed changes
X		Responsibility assigned
		Time Frame:
X		Already ongoing
	X	Lifetime of strategy identified
		Fiscal Impact:
	X	Impact on operating budget
	X	Impact on capital outlay budget
	X	Means of Finance identified

X	Return on investment determined to be favorable

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST

Program: **Fisheries**

Objective: **Ensure that Louisiana's major marine fish stocks are not overfished.**

Strategy: **Develop indices of abundance for age-based stock assessments using enhanced fishery independent data.**

Yes	No	
		Analysis:
	X	Cost/benefit analysis conducted
	X	Financial or performance audit used
	X	Benchmarking for best management practices used
	X	Act 160 Reports used
X		Other analysis or evaluation tools used
X		Impact on other strategies considered
	X	Stakeholders identified and involved
		Authorization:
X		Authorization exists
	X	Authorization needed
		Organization Capacity:
	X	Needed structural or procedural changes identified
X		Resource needs identified
X		Strategies developed to implement needed changes
X		Responsibility assigned
		Time Frame:
X		Already ongoing
	X	Lifetime of strategy identified
		Fiscal Impact:
	X	Impact on operating budget
	X	Impact on capital outlay budget
	X	Means of Finance identified

X	Return on investment determined to be favorable

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST

Program: **Fisheries**

Objective: **Ensure that Louisiana's major marine fish stocks are not overfished.**

Strategy: **Improve the accuracy of and develop new stock assessments by enhancing fishery dependent information collected from the harvesters of the resource to develop area specific harvest.**

Yes	No	
		Analysis:
	X	Cost/benefit analysis conducted
	X	Financial or performance audit used
	X	Benchmarking for best management practices used
	X	Act 160 Reports used
X		Other analysis or evaluation tools used
X		Impact on other strategies considered
	X	Stakeholders identified and involved
		Authorization:
X		Authorization exists
	X	Authorization needed
		Organization Capacity:
	X	Needed structural or procedural changes identified
X		Resource needs identified
X		Strategies developed to implement needed changes
X		Responsibility assigned
		Time Frame:
X		Already ongoing
	X	Lifetime of strategy identified
		Fiscal Impact:
	X	Impact on operating budget
	X	Impact on capital outlay budget

X	Means of Finance identified
X	Return on investment determined to be favorable

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST

Program: **Fisheries**

Objective: **Ensure that Louisiana's major marine fish stocks are not overfished.**

Strategy: **Prepare and update management plans for major marine species to keep up-to-date with new research findings to improve the accuracy and develop new stock assessments.**

Yes	No	
		Analysis:
	X	Cost/benefit analysis conducted
	X	Financial or performance audit used
	X	Benchmarking for best management practices used
	X	Act 160 Reports used
X		Other analysis or evaluation tools used
X		Impact on other strategies considered
	X	Stakeholders identified and involved
		Authorization:
X		Authorization exists
	X	Authorization needed
		Organization Capacity:
	X	Needed structural or procedural changes identified
X		Resource needs identified
X		Strategies developed to implement needed changes
X		Responsibility assigned
		Time Frame:
X		Already ongoing
	X	Lifetime of strategy identified
		Fiscal Impact:
	X	Impact on operating budget
	X	Impact on capital outlay budget

X	Means of Finance identified
X	Return on investment determined to be favorable

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST

Program: **Fisheries**

Objective: **Ensure that Louisiana's major marine fish stocks are not overfished.**

Strategy: **Coordinate management of interjurisdictional fisheries with the other Gulf States and Federal government to improve our collective knowledge of species of concern and to continue the development of innovative stock assessments techniques.**

Yes	No	
		Analysis:
	X	Cost/benefit analysis conducted
	X	Financial or performance audit used
	X	Benchmarking for best management practices used
	X	Act 160 Reports used
X		Other analysis or evaluation tools used
X		Impact on other strategies considered
	X	Stakeholders identified and involved
		Authorization:
X		Authorization exists
	X	Authorization needed
		Organization Capacity:
	X	Needed structural or procedural changes identified
X		Resource needs identified
X		Strategies developed to implement needed changes
X		Responsibility assigned
		Time Frame:
X		Already ongoing
	X	Lifetime of strategy identified
		Fiscal Impact:
	X	Impact on operating budget
	X	Impact on capital outlay budget

X	Means of Finance identified
X	Return on investment determined to be favorable

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST

Program: **Fisheries**

Objective: **Ensure that Louisiana's major marine fish stocks are not overfished.**

Strategy: **Prepare recommendations to the Louisiana Wildlife and Fisheries Commission and the Louisiana Legislature; promulgate, administer, and enforce rules and regulations as provided for in law; and administer statutorily authorized permit programs.**

Yes	No	
		Analysis:
	X	Cost/benefit analysis conducted
	X	Financial or performance audit used
	X	Benchmarking for best management practices used
	X	Act 160 Reports used
X		Other analysis or evaluation tools used
X		Impact on other strategies considered
	X	Stakeholders identified and involved
		Authorization:
X		Authorization exists
	X	Authorization needed
		Organization Capacity:
	X	Needed structural or procedural changes identified
X		Resource needs identified
X		Strategies developed to implement needed changes
X		Responsibility assigned
		Time Frame:
X		Already ongoing
	X	Lifetime of strategy identified
		Fiscal Impact:
	X	Impact on operating budget
	X	Impact on capital outlay budget

X	Means of Finance identified
X	Return on investment determined to be favorable

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST

Program: **Fisheries**

Objective: **Administer a leasing system for oyster waterbottoms such that 99% of all leases result in no legal challenges related to the leasing system and manage public reefs to fulfill 100% of the industry's seed oyster demand and make at least one area available for sack oyster harvest on the public seed grounds.**

Strategy: **Administer a harvest area grid system for oyster lease production information and collect production information from leaseholders.**

Yes	No	
		Analysis:
	X	Cost/benefit analysis conducted
	X	Financial or performance audit used
	X	Benchmarking for best management practices used
	X	Act 160 Reports used
X		Other analysis or evaluation tools used
X		Impact on other strategies considered
	X	Stakeholders identified and involved
		Authorization:
X		Authorization exists
	X	Authorization needed
		Organization Capacity:
	X	Needed structural or procedural changes identified
X		Resource needs identified
X		Strategies developed to implement needed changes
X		Responsibility assigned
		Time Frame:
X		Already ongoing
	X	Lifetime of strategy identified
		Fiscal Impact:
	X	Impact on operating budget
	X	Impact on capital outlay budget

X	Means of Finance identified
X	Return on investment determined to be favorable

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST

Program: **Fisheries**

Objective: **Administer a leasing system for oyster waterbottoms such that 99% of all leases result in no legal challenges related to the leasing system and manage public reefs to fulfill 100% of the industry's seed oyster demand and make at least one area available for sack oyster harvest on the public seed grounds.**

Strategy: **Streamline processing procedures for increased numbers of renewal lease applications expected because of coastal restoration restrictions on lease time periods.**

Yes	No	
		Analysis:
	X	Cost/benefit analysis conducted
	X	Financial or performance audit used
	X	Benchmarking for best management practices used
	X	Act 160 Reports used
X		Other analysis or evaluation tools used
X		Impact on other strategies considered
	X	Stakeholders identified and involved
		Authorization:
X		Authorization exists
	X	Authorization needed
		Organization Capacity:
	X	Needed structural or procedural changes identified
X		Resource needs identified
X		Strategies developed to implement needed changes
X		Responsibility assigned
		Time Frame:
X		Already ongoing
	X	Lifetime of strategy identified
		Fiscal Impact:
	X	Impact on operating budget

X	Impact on capital outlay budget
X	Means of Finance identified
X	Return on investment determined to be favorable

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST

Program: **Fisheries**

Objective: **Administer a leasing system for oyster waterbottoms such that 99% of all leases result in no legal challenges related to the leasing system and manage public reefs to fulfill 100% of the industry's seed oyster demand and make at least one area available for sack oyster harvest on the public seed grounds.**

Strategy: **Manage and maintain the public reefs to produce seed and sacking oysters.**

Yes	No	
		Analysis:
	X	Cost/benefit analysis conducted
	X	Financial or performance audit used
	X	Benchmarking for best management practices used
	X	Act 160 Reports used
X		Other analysis or evaluation tools used
X		Impact on other strategies considered
	X	Stakeholders identified and involved
		Authorization:
X		Authorization exists
	X	Authorization needed
		Organization Capacity:
	X	Needed structural or procedural changes identified
X		Resource needs identified
X		Strategies developed to implement needed changes
X		Responsibility assigned
		Time Frame:
X		Already ongoing
	X	Lifetime of strategy identified
		Fiscal Impact:
	X	Impact on operating budget
	X	Impact on capital outlay budget
	X	Means of Finance identified

X	Return on investment determined to be favorable

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST

Program: **Fisheries**

Objective: **To conserve, protect, manage, and improve Louisiana's marine and coastal habitats by participating in 15 major coastal protection/improvement projects.**

Strategy: **Conserve, protect, restore, and enhance marine fish habitat in cooperation with other state and federal agencies that share public trust responsibilities for those resources.**

Yes	No	
		Analysis:
	X	Cost/benefit analysis conducted
	X	Financial or performance audit used
	X	Benchmarking for best management practices used
	X	Act 160 Reports used
X		Other analysis or evaluation tools used
X		Impact on other strategies considered
	X	Stakeholders identified and involved
		Authorization:
X		Authorization exists
	X	Authorization needed
		Organization Capacity:
	X	Needed structural or procedural changes identified
X		Resource needs identified
X		Strategies developed to implement needed changes
X		Responsibility assigned
		Time Frame:
X		Already ongoing
	X	Lifetime of strategy identified
		Fiscal Impact:
	X	Impact on operating budget
	X	Impact on capital outlay budget

X	Means of Finance identified
X	Return on investment determined to be favorable

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST

Program: **Fisheries**

Objective: **To conserve, protect, manage, and improve Louisiana's marine and coastal habitats by participating in 15 major coastal protection/improvement projects.**

Strategy: **Remove derelict crab traps from coastal waters.**

Yes	No	
		Analysis:
	X	Cost/benefit analysis conducted
	X	Financial or performance audit used
	X	Benchmarking for best management practices used
	X	Act 160 Reports used
X		Other analysis or evaluation tools used
X		Impact on other strategies considered
	X	Stakeholders identified and involved
		Authorization:
X		Authorization exists
	X	Authorization needed
		Organization Capacity:
	X	Needed structural or procedural changes identified
X		Resource needs identified
X		Strategies developed to implement needed changes
X		Responsibility assigned
		Time Frame:
X		Already ongoing
	X	Lifetime of strategy identified
		Fiscal Impact:
	X	Impact on operating budget
	X	Impact on capital outlay budget
	X	Means of Finance identified

X	Return on investment determined to be favorable

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST

Program: **Fisheries**

Objective: **To conserve, protect, manage, and improve Louisiana's marine and coastal habitats by participating in 15 major coastal protection/improvement projects.**

Strategy: **Monitor activities of seismic exploration companies to ensure compliance with rules and environmental protection.**

Yes	No	
		Analysis:
	X	Cost/benefit analysis conducted
	X	Financial or performance audit used
	X	Benchmarking for best management practices used
	X	Act 160 Reports used
X		Other analysis or evaluation tools used
X		Impact on other strategies considered
	X	Stakeholders identified and involved
		Authorization:
X		Authorization exists
	X	Authorization needed
		Organization Capacity:
	X	Needed structural or procedural changes identified
X		Resource needs identified
X		Strategies developed to implement needed changes
X		Responsibility assigned
		Time Frame:
X		Already ongoing
	X	Lifetime of strategy identified
		Fiscal Impact:
	X	Impact on operating budget
	X	Impact on capital outlay budget

X	Means of Finance identified
X	Return on investment determined to be favorable

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST

Program: **Fisheries**

Objective: **To conserve, protect, manage, and improve Louisiana's marine and coastal habitats by participating in 15 major coastal protection/improvement projects.**

Strategy: **Administer the Louisiana Artificial Reef Program to provide hard-bottom habitat for marine fishes using obsolete oil and gas platforms.**

Yes	No	
		Analysis:
	X	Cost/benefit analysis conducted
	X	Financial or performance audit used
	X	Benchmarking for best management practices used
	X	Act 160 Reports used
X		Other analysis or evaluation tools used
X		Impact on other strategies considered
	X	Stakeholders identified and involved
		Authorization:
X		Authorization exists
	X	Authorization needed
		Organization Capacity:
	X	Needed structural or procedural changes identified
X		Resource needs identified
X		Strategies developed to implement needed changes
X		Responsibility assigned
		Time Frame:
X		Already ongoing
	X	Lifetime of strategy identified
		Fiscal Impact:
	X	Impact on operating budget
	X	Impact on capital outlay budget

X	Means of Finance identified
X	Return on investment determined to be favorable

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST

Program: **Fisheries**

Objective: **To conserve, protect, manage, and improve Louisiana's marine and coastal habitats by participating in 15 major coastal protection/improvement projects.**

Strategy: **Enhance the collection of data associated with marine fish and habitat resources from the State's major coastal bay systems and territorial sea.**

Yes	No	
		Analysis:
	X	Cost/benefit analysis conducted
	X	Financial or performance audit used
	X	Benchmarking for best management practices used
	X	Act 160 Reports used
X		Other analysis or evaluation tools used
X		Impact on other strategies considered
	X	Stakeholders identified and involved
		Authorization:
X		Authorization exists
	X	Authorization needed
		Organization Capacity:
	X	Needed structural or procedural changes identified
X		Resource needs identified
X		Strategies developed to implement needed changes
X		Responsibility assigned
		Time Frame:
X		Already ongoing
	X	Lifetime of strategy identified
		Fiscal Impact:
	X	Impact on operating budget
	X	Impact on capital outlay budget

X Means of Finance identified
X Return on investment determined to be favorable

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **Fisheries**

Objective: **To ensure that all species of sport and commercial freshwater fish are in good condition in at least 91% of all public lakes over 500 acres**

Indicator Name: **Number of fish requested for stocking**

61. Type and Level: What is the type of the indicator (input, output, outcome, efficiency, quality)? What is the level at which the indicator will be reported (key, supporting, general performance information)?

    Input, Supporting

62. Rationale: What is the rationale for the indicator? Why was it selected? How does it help measure achievement of the objective?

    Fishery management plans often have a stocking component and managers, sometimes with public input, determine the number fish to be stocked. When all requests for the state are totaled, we have determined the annual goal for the hatchery program.

63. Use: How will the indicator be used in management decision-making and other agency processes? Will it be used only for internal management purposes or will it also be used for budgeted purposes?

    The number and species of fish requested each year allows the hatchery program to prepare for the upcoming season. Estimates are made for the number of ponds needed, the number of brood fish needed (by species), special considerations such as feed or hormones, and if we need to work with other hatcheries to reach our goal.

64. Clarity: Does the indicator name clearly identify what is being measured? If the name contains jargon, acronyms, or unclear terms, define or clarify them here.

    The name of the indicator clearly identifies what is being measured.

65. Validity, Reliability, and Accuracy: Has the indicator been audited by the Office of the Legislative Auditor? If so, what was the result/finding? If not, how can you assure that the indicator is valid, reliable and accurate?

This indicator has not been audited. The methods used to obtain the requested number of fish are clearly defined.

66. Data Source, Collection and Reporting: What is the source of data to be reported? What is the frequency and timing of collection and reporting (monthly, quarterly, annual)?

    The number of fish requested is determined on an annual basis. State-wide fisheries managers meet once a year and make their requests. Their requests are a combination of the number of fish managers would like along with justifiable requests from the public.

67. Calculation and Methodology: How is the indicator calculated?

    District fisheries managers supply a lake by lake list of fish requested. Annual totals combine all lakes and all species.

68. Scope: Is the indicator aggregated or disaggregated (is it a sum of smaller parts or is it a part of a larger whole)? Example – if the indicator is a statewide figure, can it be broken down by parish or region?

    The indicator is aggregated.

69. Caveats: Does the indicator have limitations or weaknesses (lack of precision or timeliness, difficult to collect, external factors)?

    The indicator does not have limitations or weaknesses.

70. Responsible Person: Who is responsible for data collection, analysis and quality? Provide name, title, and contact information for all persons involved in collection and reporting.

    Robert Gough, Biologist Program Manager
    Phone, (318) 748-6948; FAX, (318) 748-6930; email – rgough@wlf.louisiana.gov

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **Fisheries**

Objective: **To ensure that all species of sport and commercial freshwater fish are in good condition in at least 91% of all public lakes over 500 acres**

Indicator Name: **Number of fish stocked**

1. Type and Level: What is the type of the indicator (input, output, outcome, efficiency, quality)? What is the level at which the indicator will be reported (key, supporting, general performance information)?

   Output, supporting

2. Rationale: What is the rationale for the indicator? Why was it selected? How does it help measure achievement of the objective?

   This indicator measures the ability of the hatchery system to produce fish. It is compared to the number of fish requested to obtain the percentage of fish requested that were stocked.

3. Use: How will the indicator be used in management decision-making and other agency processes? Will it be used only for internal management purposes or will it also be used for budgeted purposes?

   This indicator, shown over time, will measure the progress of the hatchery system. Once full capacity of the hatchery system is realized, we will be able to determine if the complete hatchery system is adequate for the needs of the State. It will also indicate if priorities need to be shifted to other species or raising fish to different sizes. May be used for both internal and budget purposes.

4. Clarity: Does the indicator name clearly identify what is being measured? If the name contains jargon, acronyms, or unclear terms, define or clarify them here.

   The indicator name clearly identifies what is being measured.

5. Validity, Reliability, and Accuracy: Has the indicator been audited by the Office of the Legislative Auditor? If so, what was the result/finding? If not, how can you assure that the indicator is valid, reliable and accurate?

The indicator has not been audited. Hatchery personnel are extremely diligent to accurately count harvested fish and record the information into a database.

6. Data Source, Collection and Reporting: What is the source of data to be reported? What is the frequency and timing of collection and reporting (monthly, quarterly, annual)?

   The number of fish harvested from individual ponds is recorded on a stocking report as fish are harvested. Data from stocking reports are entered into a mainframe database. Reports are run quarterly for LaPas and annually for internal reports.

7. Calculation and Methodology: How is the indicator calculated?

   Calculations are summed totals, by species.

8. Scope: Is the indicator aggregated or disaggregated (is it a sum of smaller parts or is it a part of a larger whole)? Example – if the indicator is a statewide figure, can it be broken down by parish or region?

   The indicator is aggregated.

9. Caveats: Does the indicator have limitations or weaknesses (lack of precision or timeliness, difficult to collect, external factors)?

   The indicator has no limitations or weaknesses.

10. Responsible Person: Who is responsible for data collection, analysis and quality? Provide name, title, and contact information for all persons involved in collection and reporting.

    Robert Gough, Biologist Program Manager
    Phone, (318) 748-6948; FAX, (318) 748-6930; email – rgough@wlf.louisiana.gov

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **Fisheries**

Objective: **To ensure that all species of sport and commercial freshwater fish are in good condition in at least 91% of all public lakes over 500 acres**

Indicator Name: **The percentage of lakes with all fish species in good condition**

1. Type and Level: What is the type of the indicator (input, output, outcome, efficiency, quality)? What is the level at which the indicator will be reported (key, supporting, general performance information)?

   Outcome, key

2. Rationale: What is the rationale for the indicator? Why was it selected? How does it help measure achievement of the objective?

   This indicator measures the general health of a species of fish in a particular water body. Reductions in condition factors could indicate problems in habitat or management.

3. Use: How will the indicator be used in management decision-making and other agency processes? Will it be used only for internal management purposes or will it also be used for budgeted purposes?

   Good condition factors indicate a overall health population of fish. If condition factors are below the standard, management may need to change or habitat modifications may be necessary. May be used for both internal and budget purposes.

4. Clarity: Does the indicator name clearly identify what is being measured? If the name contains jargon, acronyms, or unclear terms, define or clarify them here.

   Condition – a length/weight ratio compared to a standard. Condition factors vary with species.

5. Validity, Reliability, and Accuracy: Has the indicator been audited by the Office of the Legislative Auditor? If so, what was the result/finding? If not, how can you assure that the indicator is valid, reliable and accurate?

   The indicator has not been audited. Data is verified before saving to the master data set.

6. Data Source, Collection and Reporting: What is the source of data to be reported? What is the frequency and timing of collection and reporting (monthly, quarterly, annual)?

   Individual districts conduct year-round fish sampling using a variety of gear. All data is recorded and entered into a mainframe dataset. Data is available for reports at any interval, but is compiled into an annual report.

7. Calculation and Methodology: How is the indicator calculated?

   Computer programs have been written to calculate the condition factors for each species by size group, by water body. Some judgment will be used to determine when a species is not considered in good condition.

8. Scope: Is the indicator aggregated or disaggregated (is it a sum of smaller parts or is it a part of a larger whole)? Example – if the indicator is a statewide figure, can it be broken down by parish or region?

   The indicator is aggregated.

9. Caveats: Does the indicator have limitations or weaknesses (lack of precision or timeliness, difficult to collect, external factors)?

   Although not considered a caveat, the indicator is greatly influenced by the climate. Two years of drought greatly reduced condition factors. However, this performance indicator documented this occurrence.

10. Responsible Person: Who is responsible for data collection, analysis and quality? Provide name, title, and contact information for all persons involved in collection and reporting.

    Gary A. Tilyou, Biologist Administrator
    Phone, (225) 765-2331; FAX, (225) 765-0459; email – gtilyou@wlf.louisiana.gov

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **Fisheries**

Objective: **To ensure that all species of sport and commercial freshwater fish are in good condition in at least 91% of all public lakes over 500 acres**

Indicator Name: **The number of major fish kills**

1. Type and Level: What is the type of the indicator (input, output, outcome, efficiency, quality)? What is the level at which the indicator will be reported (key, supporting, general performance information)?

   Outcome, supporting

2. Rationale: What is the rationale for the indicator? Why was it selected? How does it help measure achievement of the objective?

   This indicator gives an indication of the number of major fish kills that occur in public water bodies each year. It does not help measure achievement of our objective, but is a number of interest to our constituents.

3. Use: How will the indicator be used in management decision-making and other agency processes? Will it be used only for internal management purposes or will it also be used for budgeted purposes?

   Keeping track of the number of major fish kills that occurs within a year will assist the Department in allocating resources to these types of events. Will be used for internal purposes.

4. Clarity: Does the indicator name clearly identify what is being measured? If the name contains jargon, acronyms, or unclear terms, define or clarify them here.

   Major fish kill - a fish kill event that includes thousands of dead fish that are important from a fisheries standpoint.

5. Validity, Reliability, and Accuracy: Has the indicator been audited by the Office of the Legislative Auditor? If so, what was the result/finding? If not, how can you assure that the indicator is valid, reliable and accurate?

6. Data Source, Collection and Reporting: What is the source of data to be reported? What is the frequency and timing of collection and reporting (monthly, quarterly, annual)?

   District biologists, and Baton Rouge staff receive reports of fish kills from the public and various governmental agencies. Records are maintained at the district level then forwarded to the Baton Rouge headquarters.

7. Calculation and Methodology: How is the indicator calculated?

   Individual fish kill reports examined to determine if incidents were major kills. All major kills totaled.

8. Scope: Is the indicator aggregated or disaggregated (is it a sum of smaller parts or is it a part of a larger whole)? Example – if the indicator is a statewide figure, can it be broken down by parish or region?

   The indicator is aggregate.

9. Caveats: Does the indicator have limitations or weaknesses (lack of precision or timeliness, difficult to collect, external factors)?

   Not all fish kills are reported to the Department. Many reports are days late in being reported. Because of this, the division's report on fish kills will be incomplete and often vague. Also, the Department's role in fish kills is to enumerate fish killed. The DEQ is responsible for determining the cause of fish kills.

10. Responsible Person: Who is responsible for data collection, analysis and quality? Provide name, title, and contact information for all persons involved in collection and reporting.

    Joey Shepard, Biologist DCL-B
    Phone (225) 765-2343; FAX (225) 765-5176; email, jshepard@wlf.louisiana.gov

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **Fisheries**

Objective: **To ensure that all species of sport and commercial freshwater fish are in good condition in at least 91% of all public lakes over 500 acres**

Indicator Name: **Fish provided by fish hatcheries as a percentage of fish recommended for stocking public water bodies**

1. Type and Level: What is the type of the indicator (input, output, outcome, efficiency, quality)? What is the level at which the indicator will be reported (key, supporting, general performance information)?

   Outcome, key

2. Rationale: What is the rationale for the indicator? Why was it selected? How does it help measure achievement of the objective?

   This indicator measures the percentage of fish requested that were stocked. It gives an indication of the ability of the hatchery system to fulfill stocking needs of the state.

3. Use: How will the indicator be used in management decision-making and other agency processes? Will it be used only for internal management purposes or will it also be used for budgeted purposes?

   Once the hatchery system if fully functional, we will be able to determine if changes in priority are necessary and if the hatchery system is sufficient to address the fish stocking needs of the state. May be used for both internal and budget purposes.

4. Clarity: Does the indicator name clearly identify what is being measured? If the name contains jargon, acronyms, or unclear terms, define or clarify them here.

   The indicator name clearly identifies what is being measured.

5. Validity, Reliability, and Accuracy: Has the indicator been audited by the Office of the Legislative Auditor? If so, what was the result/finding? If not, how can you assure that the indicator is valid, reliable and accurate?

   The indicator has not been audited. Hatchery personnel are extremely diligent to accurately count harvested fish and record the information into a database. The manager in charge of requests maintains reports that are reviewed by district personnel.

6. Data Source, Collection and Reporting: What is the source of data to be reported? What is the frequency and timing of collection and reporting (monthly, quarterly, annual)?

   Records of the total number of fish requested and the total number of fish stocked are maintained at the Booker Fowler Fish Hatchery. Requests come from district biologists and fish stocked is derived from fish stocking reports. Collection of data is continuous but seasonal, reporting is annual.

7. Calculation and Methodology: How is the indicator calculated?

   The percent stocked is the number stocked divided by the number requested.

8. Scope: Is the indicator aggregated or disaggregated (is it a sum of smaller parts or is it a part of a larger whole)? Example – if the indicator is a statewide figure, can it be broken down by parish or region?

   The indicator is aggregated.

9. Caveats: Does the indicator have limitations or weaknesses (lack of precision or timeliness, difficult to collect, external factors)?

   Due to complications at the new fish hatchery, the hatchery system is not producing at full capacity. This indicator will reflect these problems until the problems are corrected.

10. Responsible Person: Who is responsible for data collection, analysis and quality? Provide name, title, and contact information for all persons involved in collection and reporting.

    Robert Gough, Biologist Program Manager
    Phone (318) 748-6948; FAX (318) 748-6930; email – rgough@wlf.louisiana.gov

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **Fisheries**

Objective: **To treat at least 82,000 acres of waterbodies to control nuisance aquatic vegetation.**

Indicator Name: **Number of acres of nuisance aquatic plants measured annually in late summer/fall**

1. Type and Level: What is the type of the indicator (input, output, outcome, efficiency, quality)? What is the level at which the indicator will be reported (key, supporting, general performance information)?

   Input, supporting

2. Rationale: What is the rationale for the indicator? Why was it selected? How does it help measure achievement of the objective?

   Indicates status of nuisance aquatic plants in 9 major drainage systems. It indicates the severity of nuisance problems in the state.

3. Use: How will the indicator be used in management decision-making and other agency processes? Will it be used only for internal management purposes or will it also be used for budgeted purposes?

   This indicator is a direct measurement toward achieving the Division's objective. Failure to meet the objective will require the Division to investigate reasons and formulate alternative plans. It is used for both internal and budget purposes.

4. Clarity: Does the indicator name clearly identify what is being measured? If the name contains jargon, acronyms, or unclear terms, define or clarify them here.

   The indicator name clearly identifies what is being measured.

5. Validity, Reliability, and Accuracy: Has the indicator been audited by the Office of the Legislative Auditor? If so, what was the result/finding? If not, how can you assure that the indicator is valid, reliable and accurate?

   The indicator has not been audited. The value of the indicator is a rough estimate of acreage, but is a reliable indicator of increases or decreases in nuisance aquatic plants.

6. Data Source, Collection and Reporting: What is the source of data to be reported? What is the frequency and timing of collection and reporting (monthly, quarterly, annual)?

   Regional estimates are collected by field biologists conducting annual surveys. These are submitted to the Baton Rouge office for compilation.

7. Calculation and Methodology: How is the indicator calculated?

   Summation of input based upon boat field inspections by region.

8. Scope: Is the indicator aggregated or disaggregated (is it a sum of smaller parts or is it a part of a larger whole)? Example – if the indicator is a statewide figure, can it be broken down by parish or region?

   The indicator is aggregated.

9. Caveats: Does the indicator have limitations or weaknesses (lack of precision or timeliness, difficult to collect, external factors)?

   Weather has a major role in the acreage of aquatic plants. Mild winters can dramatically increase the level of infestation and very cold winter can decrease infestations.

10. Responsible Person: Who is responsible for data collection, analysis and quality? Provide name, title, and contact information for all persons involved in collection and reporting.

    Charlie Dugas, Biologist Program Manager
    Phone, (225) 765-2332; FAX, (225) 0459; email – cdugas@wlf.louisiana.gov

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **Fisheries**

Objective: **To treat at least 82,000 acres of waterbodies to control nuisance aquatic vegetation**

Indicator Name: **Number of acres of nuisance aquatic plants treated**

1. Type and Level: What is the type of the indicator (input, output, outcome, efficiency, quality)? What is the level at which the indicator will be reported (key, supporting, general performance information)?

   Output, key

2. Rationale: What is the rationale for the indicator? Why was it selected? How does it help measure achievement of the objective?

   This indicator specifies the acreage of nuisance aquatic plants treated. It measures the performance of spray crews and their ability to treat a targeted acreage of aquatic plants.

3. Use: How will the indicator be used in management decision-making and other agency processes? Will it be used only for internal management purposes or will it also be used for budgeted purposes?

   This indicator is a direct measurement toward achieving the Division's objective of treatment of a targeted acreage of nuisance aquatic plants. Failure to meet the objective will require the Division to investigate reasons and formulate alternative plans. It will be used for both internal and budget purposes.

4. Clarity: Does the indicator name clearly identify what is being measured? If the name contains jargon, acronyms, or unclear terms, define or clarify them here.

   The indicator name clearly identifies what is being measured.

5. Validity, Reliability, and Accuracy: Has the indicator been audited by the Office of the Legislative Auditor? If so, what was the result/finding? If not, how can you assure that the indicator is valid, reliable and accurate?

   This indicator has not been audited. A test in 2003 was conducted to determine the validity of the method of estimating acreage treated.

6. Data Source, Collection and Reporting: What is the source of data to be reported? What is the frequency and timing of collection and reporting (monthly, quarterly, annual)?

   Data are compiled from EPA mandated herbicide spray logs. Data is collected continuously and can be reported quarterly, but is used annually in-house.

7. Calculation and Methodology: How is the indicator calculated?

   The number of gallons of herbicide is used as a measurement of floating acreage treated. One gallon of herbicide is used to treat two acres. For other species of nuisance aquatic vegetation, the acreage is estimated before application. Estimates of acreage treated are made for each application, entered into a database and are summed for reports.

8. Scope: Is the indicator aggregated or disaggregated (is it a sum of smaller parts or is it a part of a larger whole)? Example – if the indicator is a statewide figure, can it be broken down by parish or region?

   The indicator is aggregated.

9. Caveats: Does the indicator have limitations or weaknesses (lack of precision or timeliness, difficult to collect, external factors)?

   Weather, herbicide application waiver areas, funding and a possible new permit system can influence acreage treated.

10. Responsible Person: Who is responsible for data collection, analysis and quality? Provide name, title, and contact information for all persons involved in collection and reporting.

    Charlie Dugas, Biologist Program Manager
    Phone, (225) 765-2332; FAX, (225) 0459; email – cdugas@wlf.louisiana.gov

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **Fisheries**

Objective: **To treat at least 82,000 acres of waterbodies to control nuisance aquatic vegetation**

Indicator Name: **Percent of nuisance aquatic plants treated statewide**

1. Type and Level: What is the type of the indicator (input, output, outcome, efficiency, quality)? What is the level at which the indicator will be reported (key, supporting, general performance information)?

   Outcome, key

2. Rationale: What is the rationale for the indicator? Why was it selected? How does it help measure achievement of the objective?

   Measures acres of nuisance aquatic plants treated as compared to the total infestation. It measures the level of treatment the department is obtaining. If this indicator falls sharply, then nuisance aquatic may have gotten out of control.

3. Use: How will the indicator be used in management decision-making and other agency processes? Will it be used only for internal management purposes or will it also be used for budgeted purposes?

   Changes in this indicator will be used to determine if sufficient control of nuisance aquatic is being obtained. It may indicate a need to shift priorities. It will be used for both internal and budgeting purposes.

4. Clarity: Does the indicator name clearly identify what is being measured? If the name contains jargon, acronyms, or unclear terms, define or clarify them here.

   The indicator name clearly identifies what is being measured.

5. Validity, Reliability, and Accuracy: Has the indicator been audited by the Office of the Legislative Auditor? If so, what was the result/finding? If not, how can you assure that the indicator is valid, reliable and accurate?

   The indicator has not been audited. Although based on estimates, our staff is trained in estimating acres of nuisance aquatic and acres treated.

6. Data Source, Collection and Reporting: What is the source of data to be reported? What is the frequency and timing of collection and reporting (monthly, quarterly, annual)?

   This indicator uses two other indicators, nuisance aquatic plants statewide and acres of nuisance aquatic treated. This indicator is calculated annually.

7. Calculation and Methodology: How is the indicator calculated?

   The indicator is calculated by dividing the number of acres of nuisance aquatic plants treated by the number of acres statewide, then multiplying by 100.

8. Scope: Is the indicator aggregated or disaggregated (is it a sum of smaller parts or is it a part of a larger whole)? Example – if the indicator is a statewide figure, can it be broken down by parish or region?

   The indicator is aggregated.

9. Caveats: Does the indicator have limitations or weaknesses (lack of precision or timeliness, difficult to collect, external factors)?

   The estimates of nuisance aquatic plants statewide are an estimate. External factors, primarily climate, can greatly influence the level of nuisance aquatic plants in the state.

10. Responsible Person: Who is responsible for data collection, analysis and quality? Provide name, title, and contact information for all persons involved in collection and reporting.

    Charlie Dugas, Biologist Program Manager
    Phone, (225) 765-2332; FAX, (225) 0459; email – cdugas@wlf.louisiana.gov

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **Fisheries**

Objective: **To improve or construct four boating access projects a year**

Indicator Name: **Number of requests for assistance in improving or constructing boating access facilities**

1. Type and Level: What is the type of the indicator (input, output, outcome, efficiency, quality)? What is the level at which the indicator will be reported (key, supporting, general performance information)?

   Input, supporting

2. Rationale: What is the rationale for the indicator? Why was it selected? How does it help measure achievement of the objective?

   One of the current shortfalls of the boating access program is a lack of requests from local governments. We feel a greater number of requests will mean better and more projects requested.

3. Use: How will the indicator be used in management decision-making and other agency processes? Will it be used only for internal management purposes or will it also be used for budgeted purposes?

   This indicator will assist the Division by showing if we are getting a sufficient number of applications. We feel we should have an excess number of applications, thus allowing us to select only the most needed boat ramps.

4. Clarity: Does the indicator name clearly identify what is being measured? If the name contains jargon, acronyms, or unclear terms, define or clarify them here.

   The indicator name clearly identifies what is being measured.

5. Validity, Reliability, and Accuracy: Has the indicator been audited by the Office of the Legislative Auditor? If so, what was the result/finding? If not, how can you assure that the indicator is valid, reliable and accurate?

   This indicator has not been audited. It is the total number of completed applications received by one individual.

6. Data Source, Collection and Reporting: What is the source of data to be reported? What is the frequency and timing of collection and reporting (monthly, quarterly, annual)?

   Applications are submitted to the program manager in charge of boating access. He checks the applications for completeness and requests additional information if necessary.

7. Calculation and Methodology: How is the indicator calculated?

   The indicator is the total of all applications received in one year.

8. Scope: Is the indicator aggregated or disaggregated (is it a sum of smaller parts or is it a part of a larger whole)? Example – if the indicator is a statewide figure, can it be broken down by parish or region?

   The indicator is aggregated.

9. Caveats: Does the indicator have limitations or weaknesses (lack of precision or timeliness, difficult to collect, external factors)?

   A limitation on this indicator is that we are requesting applications, but do not control who sends in an application.

10. Responsible Person: Who is responsible for data collection, analysis and quality? Provide name, title, and contact information for all persons involved in collection and reporting.

    Mark McElroy, Biologist DCL-B
    Phone (225) 765-2865; FAX (225) 765-5176; email – mmcelroy@wlf.louisiana.gov

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: **Fisheries**

Objective: **To improve or construct four boating access projects a year**

Indicator Name: **The number of new or improved boating access facilities completed**

1. Type and Level: What is the type of the indicator (input, output, outcome, efficiency, quality)? What is the level at which the indicator will be reported (key, supporting, general performance information)?

   Outcome, key

2. Rationale: What is the rationale for the indicator? Why was it selected? How does it help measure achievement of the objective?

   This indicator directly indicates if our objective is being met.

3. Use: How will the indicator be used in management decision-making and other agency processes? Will it be used only for internal management purposes or will it also be used for budgeted purposes?

   This indicator is a direct measurement of our success in constructing boat ramps. If we fail to meet our objective, we will review the program and modify as necessary. It will be used for internal management purposes.

4. Clarity: Does the indicator name clearly identify what is being measured? If the name contains jargon, acronyms, or unclear terms, define or clarify them here.

   The indicator name clearly identifies what is being measured.

5. Validity, Reliability, and Accuracy: Has the indicator been audited by the Office of the Legislative Auditor? If so, what was the result/finding? If not, how can you assure that the indicator is valid, reliable and accurate?

   The indicator has not been audited. It is easy to measure as projects have a definable end point, the final payment.

6. Data Source, Collection and Reporting: What is the source of data to be reported? What is the frequency and timing of collection and reporting (monthly, quarterly, annual)?

The source of data is the number of final payments made to sponsors in a year. They can occur any time during the year, but reports are annual.

7. Calculation and Methodology: How is the indicator calculated?

   The indicator is the total number of final payments made in one year.

8. Scope: Is the indicator aggregated or disaggregated (is it a sum of smaller parts or is it a part of a larger whole)? Example – if the indicator is a statewide figure, can it be broken down by parish or region?

   The indicator is aggregated.

9. Caveats: Does the indicator have limitations or weaknesses (lack of precision or timeliness, difficult to collect, external factors)?

   The indicator can be influenced by external factors such as weather, the permitting process and funding problems with sponsors.

10. Responsible Person: Who is responsible for data collection, analysis and quality? Provide name, title, and contact information for all persons involved in collection and reporting.

    Mark McElroy, Biologist DCL-B
    Phone, (225) 765-2865; FAX, (225) 765-5176; email – mmcelroy@wlf.lousiana.gov

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST

Program: **Fisheries**

Objective: **To ensure that all species of sport and commercial freshwater fish are in good condition in at least 91% of all public lakes over 500 acres.**

Strategy: **Enhance the collection of fishery information from major freshwater lakes**

Yes	No	
		Analysis:
	X	Cost/benefit analysis conducted
	X	Financial or performance audit used
	X	Benchmarking for best management practices used
	X	Act 160 Reports used
X		Other analysis or evaluation tools used
X		Impact on other strategies considered
X		Stakeholders identified and involved
		Authorization:
X		Authorization exists
	X	Authorization needed
		Organization Capacity:
X		Needed structural or procedural changes identified
X		Resource needs identified
X		Strategies developed to implement needed changes
X		Responsibility assigned
		Time Frame:
X		Already ongoing
	X	Lifetime of strategy identified
		Fiscal Impact:
X		Impact on operating budget
	X	Impact on capital outlay budget
X		Means of Finance identified
	X	Return on investment determined to be favorable

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST

Program: **Fisheries**

Objective: **To ensure that all species of sport and commercial freshwater fish are in good condition in at least 91% of all public lakes over 500 acres**

Strategy: **Supplement public waters with sport fish and species of concern in support of management plans**

Yes	No	
		Analysis:
	X	Cost/benefit analysis conducted
	X	Financial or performance audit used
	X	Benchmarking for best management practices used
	X	Act 160 Reports used
X		Other analysis or evaluation tools used
X		Impact on other strategies considered
X		Stakeholders identified and involved
		Authorization:
X		Authorization exists
	X	Authorization needed
		Organization Capacity:
X		Needed structural or procedural changes identified
X		Resource needs identified
X		Strategies developed to implement needed changes
X		Responsibility assigned
		Time Frame:
X		Already ongoing
X		Lifetime of strategy identified
		Fiscal Impact:
X		Impact on operating budget
X		Impact on capital outlay budget
X		Means of Finance identified

X	Return on investment determined to be favorable

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST

Program: **Fisheries**

Objective: **To ensure that all species of sport and commercial freshwater fish are in good condition in at least 91% of all public lakes over 500 acres**

Strategy: **Ensure that aquaculture and other activities involving aquatic, exotic species result in no adverse effects upon native fish populations in Louisiana**

Yes	No	
		Analysis:
	X	Cost/benefit analysis conducted
	X	Financial or performance audit used
	X	Benchmarking for best management practices used
	X	Act 160 Reports used
X		Other analysis or evaluation tools used
X		Impact on other strategies considered
X		Stakeholders identified and involved
		Authorization:
X		Authorization exists
	X	Authorization needed
		Organization Capacity:
X		Needed structural or procedural changes identified
X		Resource needs identified
X		Strategies developed to implement needed changes
X		Responsibility assigned
		Time Frame:
X		Already ongoing
	X	Lifetime of strategy identified
		Fiscal Impact:
X		Impact on operating budget
	X	Impact on capital outlay budget
X		Means of Finance identified

X	Return on investment determined to be favorable

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST

Program: **Fisheries**

Objective: **To ensure that all species of sport and commercial freshwater fish are in good condition in at least 91% of all public lakes over 500 acres**

Strategy: **Coordinate management of interjurisdictional fisheries with the other Gulf states and Federal government**

Yes	No	
		Analysis:
	X	Cost/benefit analysis conducted
	X	Financial or performance audit used
	X	Benchmarking for best management practices used
	X	Act 160 Reports used
	X	Other analysis or evaluation tools used
X		Impact on other strategies considered
X		Stakeholders identified and involved
		Authorization:
X		Authorization exists
	X	Authorization needed
		Organization Capacity:
	X	Needed structural or procedural changes identified
X		Resource needs identified
	X	Strategies developed to implement needed changes
X		Responsibility assigned
		Time Frame:
X		Already ongoing
X		Lifetime of strategy identified
		Fiscal Impact:
X		Impact on operating budget
	X	Impact on capital outlay budget
	X	Means of Finance identified

Return on investment determined to be favorable

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST

Program: **Fisheries**

Objective: **To ensure that all species of sport and commercial freshwater fish are in good condition in at least 91% of all public lakes over 500 acres**

Strategy: **Administer statutorily authorized permit programs**

Yes	No	
		Analysis:
	X	Cost/benefit analysis conducted
	X	Financial or performance audit used
	X	Benchmarking for best management practices used
	X	Act 160 Reports used
	X	Other analysis or evaluation tools used
X		Impact on other strategies considered
X		Stakeholders identified and involved
		Authorization:
X		Authorization exists
	X	Authorization needed
		Organization Capacity:
X		Needed structural or procedural changes identified
X		Resource needs identified
X		Strategies developed to implement needed changes
X		Responsibility assigned
		Time Frame:
X		Already ongoing
X		Lifetime of strategy identified
		Fiscal Impact:
X		Impact on operating budget
	X	Impact on capital outlay budget
X		Means of Finance identified
X		Return on investment determined to be favorable

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST

Program: **Fisheries**

Objective: **To ensure that all species of sport and commercial freshwater fish are in good condition in at least 91% of all public lakes over 500 acres**

Strategy: **Develop management plans for any aquatic resources that may be of special concern**

Yes	No	
		Analysis:
	X	Cost/benefit analysis conducted
	X	Financial or performance audit used
	X	Benchmarking for best management practices used
	X	Act 160 Reports used
X		Other analysis or evaluation tools used
X		Impact on other strategies considered
X		Stakeholders identified and involved
		Authorization:
X		Authorization exists
	X	Authorization needed
		Organization Capacity:
X		Needed structural or procedural changes identified
X		Resource needs identified
X		Strategies developed to implement needed changes
X		Responsibility assigned
		Time Frame:
X		Already ongoing
	X	Lifetime of strategy identified
		Fiscal Impact:
X		Impact on operating budget
	X	Impact on capital outlay budget
X		Means of Finance identified

X	Return on investment determined to be favorable

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST

Program: **Fisheries**

Objective: **To ensure that all species of sport and commercial freshwater fish are in good condition in at least 91% of all public lakes over 500 acres**

Strategy: **Increase angler participation by providing technical assistance to private pond owners**

Yes	No	
		Analysis:
	X	Cost/benefit analysis conducted
	X	Financial or performance audit used
	X	Benchmarking for best management practices used
	X	Act 160 Reports used
X		Other analysis or evaluation tools used
X		Impact on other strategies considered
X		Stakeholders identified and involved
		Authorization:
X		Authorization exists
	X	Authorization needed
		Organization Capacity:
X		Needed structural or procedural changes identified
X		Resource needs identified
X		Strategies developed to implement needed changes
X		Responsibility assigned
		Time Frame:
X		Already ongoing
	X	Lifetime of strategy identified
		Fiscal Impact:
X		Impact on operating budget
	X	Impact on capital outlay budget
X		Means of Finance identified

X	Return on investment determined to be favorable

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST

Program: **Fisheries**

Objective: **To treat at least 82,000 acres of waterbodies to control nuisance aquatic vegetation**

Strategy: **Determine statewide infestations of problematic aquatic plants (water hyacinth, hydrilla, salvinia, alligator weed, etc.)**

Yes	No	
		Analysis:
	X	Cost/benefit analysis conducted
	X	Financial or performance audit used
	X	Benchmarking for best management practices used
	X	Act 160 Reports used
X		Other analysis or evaluation tools used
X		Impact on other strategies considered
X		Stakeholders identified and involved
		Authorization:
X		Authorization exists
	X	Authorization needed
		Organization Capacity:
X		Needed structural or procedural changes identified
X		Resource needs identified
X		Strategies developed to implement needed changes
X		Responsibility assigned
		Time Frame:
X		Already ongoing
X		Lifetime of strategy identified
		Fiscal Impact:
X		Impact on operating budget
	X	Impact on capital outlay budget
X		Means of Finance identified

X	Return on investment determined to be favorable

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST

Program: **Fisheries**

Objective: **To treat at least 82,000 acres of waterbodies to control nuisance aquatic vegetation**

Strategy: **Investigate aquatic vegetation infestations in selected public lakes**

Yes	No	
		Analysis:
	X	Cost/benefit analysis conducted
	X	Financial or performance audit used
	X	Benchmarking for best management practices used
	X	Act 160 Reports used
X		Other analysis or evaluation tools used
X		Impact on other strategies considered
X		Stakeholders identified and involved
		Authorization:
X		Authorization exists
	X	Authorization needed
		Organization Capacity:
X		Needed structural or procedural changes identified
X		Resource needs identified
	X	Strategies developed to implement needed changes
X		Responsibility assigned
		Time Frame:
X		Already ongoing
X		Lifetime of strategy identified
		Fiscal Impact:
X		Impact on operating budget
	X	Impact on capital outlay budget
X		Means of Finance identified
X		Return on investment determined to be favorable

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST

Program: **Fisheries**

Objective: **To treat at least 82,000 acres of waterbodies to control nuisance aquatic vegetation**

Strategy: **Perform maintenance and control operations**

Yes	No	
		Analysis:
	X	Cost/benefit analysis conducted
	X	Financial or performance audit used
	X	Benchmarking for best management practices used
	X	Act 160 Reports used
X		Other analysis or evaluation tools used
X		Impact on other strategies considered
X		Stakeholders identified and involved
		Authorization:
X		Authorization exists
	X	Authorization needed
		Organization Capacity:
X		Needed structural or procedural changes identified
X		Resource needs identified
X		Strategies developed to implement needed changes
X		Responsibility assigned
		Time Frame:
X		Already ongoing
X		Lifetime of strategy identified
		Fiscal Impact:
X		Impact on operating budget
	X	Impact on capital outlay budget
X		Means of Finance identified
X		Return on investment determined to be favorable

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST

Program: **Fisheries**

Objective: **To increase the number boat ramps improved or constructed from an average of 2 per year to an average of 4 per year by 2009/2010**

Strategy: **Increase local government awareness of Department's boating access project through direct correspondence**

Yes	No	
		Analysis:
	X	Cost/benefit analysis conducted
	X	Financial or performance audit used
	X	Benchmarking for best management practices used
	X	Act 160 Reports used
X		Other analysis or evaluation tools used
X		Impact on other strategies considered
X		Stakeholders identified and involved
		Authorization:
X		Authorization exists
	X	Authorization needed
		Organization Capacity:
X		Needed structural or procedural changes identified
X		Resource needs identified
X		Strategies developed to implement needed changes
X		Responsibility assigned
		Time Frame:
X		Already ongoing
	X	Lifetime of strategy identified
		Fiscal Impact:
X		Impact on operating budget
X		Impact on capital outlay budget
X		Means of Finance identified

X	Return on investment determined to be favorable

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST

Program: **Fisheries**

Objective: **To increase the number boat ramps improved or constructed from an average of 2 per year to an average of 4 per year by 2009/2010**

Strategy: **Reduce time for project initiation by increasing information to project sponsors**

Yes	No	
		Analysis:
	X	Cost/benefit analysis conducted
	X	Financial or performance audit used
	X	Benchmarking for best management practices used
	X	Act 160 Reports used
X		Other analysis or evaluation tools used
X		Impact on other strategies considered
X		Stakeholders identified and involved
		Authorization:
X		Authorization exists
	X	Authorization needed
		Organization Capacity:
X		Needed structural or procedural changes identified
X		Resource needs identified
X		Strategies developed to implement needed changes
X		Responsibility assigned
		Time Frame:
X		Already ongoing
	X	Lifetime of strategy identified
		Fiscal Impact:
X		Impact on operating budget
X		Impact on capital outlay budget
X		Means of Finance identified

X	Return on investment determined to be favorable

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST

Program: **Fisheries**

Objective: **To increase the number boat ramps improved or constructed from an average of 2 per year to an average of 4 per year by 2009/2010**

Strategy: **Closely monitor Federal funds available for projects to maximize utilization of boating access funds**

Yes	No	
		Analysis:
	X	Cost/benefit analysis conducted
	X	Financial or performance audit used
	X	Benchmarking for best management practices used
	X	Act 160 Reports used
X		Other analysis or evaluation tools used
X		Impact on other strategies considered
X		Stakeholders identified and involved
		Authorization:
X		Authorization exists
	X	Authorization needed
		Organization Capacity:
X		Needed structural or procedural changes identified
X		Resource needs identified
X		Strategies developed to implement needed changes
X		Responsibility assigned
		Time Frame:
X		Already ongoing
	X	Lifetime of strategy identified
		Fiscal Impact:
X		Impact on operating budget
X		Impact on capital outlay budget
X		Means of Finance identified

X	Return on investment determined to be favorable