



LOUISIANA DEPARTMENT OF
WILDLIFE AND FISHERIES

STRATEGIC PLAN PROCESS DOCUMENTATION

FOR THE PERIOD
FY 2026-2027 - FY 2030-2031

WWW.WLF.LOUISIANA.COM

OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND FINANCE (OMF)
(511)

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: MANAGEMENT AND FINANCE - Licensing and Boat Registration/Titling

Objective: To provide the best possible customer satisfaction in the areas of timeliness and assistance regarding issuance of commercial licenses and permits, oyster tags, recreational licenses and permits and boat registration and titling.

Indicator Name: Processing return time on mailed-in applications (in working days) - PI Code 23786

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?

Licensing and Boat Registration/Titling serves the public. Processing return time tracks the amount of time in work days that it takes to process mailed-in applications which may serve as an indicator of employee performance and appropriate assignment of duties.

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 results will be used to determine if work flow processes need to be altered and if adequate resources have been assigned to processing mailed-in applications.

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 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?

It has not been audited by the 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)?

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

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

Mailed-in applications are date stamped upon receipt and tracked for completion.

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.

Secunda Byrd, Director Licensing, 225-765-2881
Cara Tyler, Deputy Undersecretary, 225-765-2590

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST

Program: Management and Finance

Activity: Licensing and Boat Registration/Titling

Objective 1: To provide the best possible customer satisfaction in the areas of timeliness and assistance regarding issuance of commercial licenses and permits, oyster tags, recreational licenses and permits and boat registration and titling.

Strategy 1.1: Ensure staff has adequate knowledge and skills to perform the job duties to meet the needs of the department's customers.

<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Analysis:</u>
	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
		<u>Authorization:</u>
x		Authorization exists
		Authorization needed
		<u>Organization Capacity:</u>
x	x	Needed structural or procedural changes identified
	x	Resource needs identified
	x	Strategies developed to implement needed changes
x		Responsibility assigned
		<u>Time Frame:</u>
x		Already ongoing
	x	Lifetime of strategy identified
		<u>Fiscal Impact:</u>
	x	Impact on operating budget
	x	Impact on capital outlay budget
	x	Means of Finance identified
	x	Return on investment determined to be favorable

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY - ADMINISTRATION
(512)

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY - Administration

Objective: Through the Administrative activity, to provide executive leadership and legal support and internal audits to all department programs so that they are enabled to protect and preserve the wildlife and fish resources of the state.

Indicator Name: Number of repeat audit findings by the Legislative Auditor
- PI Code 23182

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.

Lack of repeat audit findings provides assurance of corrected exceptions discovered by the Auditors as well as compliance with industry standards and best practices.

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 to determine what policies and procedures need to be implemented or changed.

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 name clearly indicates what is measured. There is no jargon, 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 by the 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)?

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?

The number of repeat audit findings.

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 audits are conducted 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.

Cara Tyler, Deputy Undersecretary, 225-765-2950

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST

Program: **OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY - Administration**

Activity: **Administrative**

Objective: **ALL**

Strategy: **ALL**

<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Analysis:</u>
	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
		<u>Authorization:</u>
x		Authorization exists
		Authorization needed
		<u>Organization Capacity:</u>
x		Needed structural or procedural changes identified
x		Resource needs identified
x		Strategies developed to implement needed changes
x		Responsibility assigned
		<u>Time Frame:</u>
x		Already ongoing
	x	Lifetime of strategy identified
		<u>Fiscal Impact:</u>
	x	Impact on operating budget
	x	Impact on capital outlay budget
	x	Means of Finance identified
	x	Return on investment determined to be favorable

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY - ENFORCEMENT PROGRAM
(512)

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: ENFORCEMENT - Wildlife, Fisheries and Ecosystem Enforcement

Objective: Provide professional law enforcement presence to execute statutory mandates for the management, protection and conservation of natural resources on our state's lands and waters, improve regulatory compliance to successfully support resource management plans and protect the supporting ecosystem.

Indicator Name: Compliance Intercepts associated with wildlife, fisheries and ecosystem patrols, investigations, education and community policing/outreach – PI Code 23183

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, support.

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 compliance intercepts encountered by Wildlife Agents who are performing Law Enforcement work. Compliance Intercepts associated with wildlife, fisheries and ecosystem enforcement, education and outreach programs by enforcement are the most relevant measures for the activities related toward documenting levels of compliance by the public. This indicator was selected because of its direct relationship to numerically calculating the objective. It has been documented for several years and is a measure of Law Enforcement objectives. Compliance intercepts will further enhance regulatory information.

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 to identify trends in wildlife, fisheries and ecosystem activities and to address those trends with manpower allocations, management goals and conservation compliance.

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. A compliance intercept is contact made when a wildlife agent intercepts 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 for a specific activity for which the person is participating in.

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 subjected to Relevance Testing by the Louisiana Legislative Auditor in August 2012. The testing determined that the indicator is valid, reliable and accurate as set forth by the criteria from the state's performance budgeting manual. The indicator is being more finely tuned as the efficiency of collection is improved.

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 by individual Wildlife agents and submitted bi-weekly. These time and attendance reports are stored digitally in a web-based database.

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

The numbers of recorded compliance intercepts from the time and attendance reports are automatically calculated through a report within the database for each activity for any 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 and it can be broken down by parish or region.

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 on the time and attendance reports by Wildlife Agents. (The new electronic format will reduce Errors and calculate multiple compliance intercepts based on engaged activities in real time).

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 compliance intercepts on their time and attendance reports. These reports update real time into a web-based portal. Ashley Gubancsik, Contracts / Grants Reviewer at 225-763-5441 with the Enforcement Division retrieves the information from the database, analyzes and reports the data for each reporting period.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: ENFORCEMENT - Wildlife, Fisheries and Ecosystem Enforcement

Objective: Provide professional law enforcement presence to execute statutory mandates for the management, protection and conservation of natural resources on our state's lands and waters, improve regulatory compliance to successfully support resource management plans and protect the supporting ecosystem.

Indicator Name: Number of wildlife, fisheries and ecosystem enforcement hours - PI Code 23184

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 measures the number of patrol hours worked by Wildlife Agents who are performing field work. Effective patrols, investigations, education and outreach programs by enforcement will increase public trust and awareness maximizing voluntary compliance and better identify illegal activity. This indicator was selected because of its relationship to achieving the objective. It has been effectively used for several years and 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 to identify conservation and activity management trends in wildlife, fisheries and ecosystem activities and to address those trends with manpower allocations.

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. A patrol hour represents time spent patrolling for a specified 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?

This indicator was subjected to Relevance Testing by the Louisiana Legislative Auditor in August 2012. The testing determined that the indicator is valid, reliable and accurate as set forth by the criteria from the state's performance budgeting manual.

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 by individual Wildlife agents and submitted bi-weekly. The reports are sent real time to a web-based portal and stored digitally in a web-based database.

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

The numbers of recorded patrol hours from the time and attendance reports are automatically calculated through a report within the database for each activity for any 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 and it can be broken down by parish or region, as well as specific programmatic and individual accountability.

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 on the time and attendance reports 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 patrol hours on their time and attendance reports. These reports are updated real time into a web-based portal stored digitally in a web-based database. Ashley Gubancsik, Contracts / Grants Reviewer at 225-763-5441 with the Enforcement Division retrieves the information from the database, analyzes and reports the data for each reporting period.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: ENFORCEMENT - Wildlife, Fisheries and Ecosystem Enforcement

Objective: Provide professional law enforcement presence to execute statutory mandates for the management, protection and conservation of natural resources on our state's lands and waters, improve regulatory compliance to successfully support resource management plans and protect the supporting ecosystem.

Indicator Name: Observed Compliance – wildlife, fisheries and ecosystem - PI Code 24423

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 percent of the public observed to be in compliance with the state's laws, rules and regulations relative to wildlife, fisheries and ecosystem. Effective patrols, investigations, education and outreach programs by enforcement will increase public trust and awareness maximizing voluntary compliance and better identify illegal activity. This indicator was selected because of its relationship to achieving this objective. It is an effective method used in conjunction with compliance intercepts and 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 to identify conservation and activity management trends in wildlife, fisheries and ecosystem activities and to address those trends with manpower allocations.

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 was subjected to Relevance Testing by the Louisiana Legislative Auditor in August 2012. The testing determined that the indicator is valid, reliable and accurate as set forth by the criteria from the state's performance budgeting manual.

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)?

Wildlife agents enter warnings and citations into the Enforcement database on a daily basis. Compliance intercept data is derived from time and attendance reports, which are recorded daily by individual Wildlife agents and submitted bi-weekly. These reports are stored digitally in a web-based database.

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

An Enforcement database automatically generates a report that calculates the number of identified non-compliance instances based on citations and warnings for each violation type. Another database automatically calculates the number of corresponding compliance intercepts.

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 and it can be broken down by parish or region within any given time frame.

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 human errors in reporting on the time and attendance reports by Wildlife Agents or by personnel entries of warnings and citations.

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 enter issued warnings and citations into the Enforcement database. Individual Wildlife agents also record the daily number of public contacts and specific activity into a time and attendance digital portal. Both of these reports are stored digitally in a web-based database. Ashley Gubancsik, Contracts / Grants Reviewer at 225-763-5441 with the Enforcement Division retrieves the information from both databases, analyzes and reports the data for each reporting period.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: ENFORCEMENT - Wildlife, Fisheries and Ecosystem Enforcement

Objective: Provide professional law enforcement presence to execute statutory mandates for the management, protection and conservation of natural resources on our state's lands and waters, improve regulatory compliance to successfully support resource management plans and protect the supporting ecosystem.

Indicator Name: Observed Compliance – recreational fishing - PI Code 23185

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 percent of the public observed to be in compliance with the state's laws, rules and regulations relative to recreational fishing. Effective patrols, investigations, education and outreach programs by enforcement will increase public trust and awareness maximizing voluntary compliance and better identify illegal activity. This indicator was selected because of its relationship to achieving the objective. It is an effective method used in conjunction with compliance intercepts and 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 to identify conservation and activity management trends in wildlife, fisheries and ecosystem activities and to address those trends with manpower allocations.

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 was subjected to Relevance Testing by the Louisiana Legislative Auditor in August 2012. The testing determined that the indicator is valid, reliable and accurate as set forth by the criteria from the state's performance budgeting manual.

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)?

Wildlife agents enter warnings and citations into the Enforcement database on a daily basis. Compliance intercept data is derived from time and attendance reports, which are recorded daily by individual Wildlife Agents and submitted bi-weekly. These reports are stored digitally in a web-based database.

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

An Enforcement database automatically generates a report that calculates the number of identified non-compliance instances for each violation type. Another database automatically calculates the number of corresponding compliance intercepts.

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 and it can be broken down by parish or region within any given time frame.

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 human errors in reporting on the time and attendance reports by Wildlife Agents or by personnel entries of warnings and citations.

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 enter issued warnings and citations into the Enforcement database. Individual Wildlife agents also record the daily number of public contacts and specific activity into a time and attendance digital application. Both of these reports are stored digitally in a web-based database. Ashley Gubancsik, Contracts / Grants Reviewer at 225-763-5441 with the Enforcement Division retrieves the information from both databases, analyzes and reports the data for each reporting period.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: ENFORCEMENT - Wildlife, Fisheries and Ecosystem Enforcement

Objective: Provide professional law enforcement presence to execute statutory mandates for the management, protection and conservation of natural resources on our state's lands and waters, improve regulatory compliance to successfully support resource management plans and protect the supporting ecosystem.

Indicator Name: Observed Compliance – commercial fishing/excluding oysters
- PI Code 23186

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 percent of the public observed to be in compliance with the state's laws, rules and regulations relative to commercial fishing/excluding oysters. Effective patrols, investigations, education and outreach programs by enforcement will increase public trust and awareness maximizing voluntary compliance and better identify illegal activity. This indicator was selected because of its relationship to achieving the objective. It is an effective method used in conjunction with compliance intercepts and 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 to identify conservation and activity management trends in commercial fishing/excluding oysters activities and to address those trends with manpower allocations.

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 was subjected to Relevance Testing by the Louisiana Legislative Auditor in August 2012. The testing determined that the indicator is valid, reliable and accurate as set forth by the criteria from the state's performance budgeting manual.

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)?

Wildlife agents enter warnings and citations into the Enforcement database on a daily basis. Compliance intercept data is derived from time and attendance reports, which are recorded daily by individual Wildlife agents and submitted biweekly. These reports are stored digitally in a web-based database.

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

An Enforcement database automatically generates a report that calculates the number of identified non-compliance instances based on citations and warnings for each violation type. Another database generates a report that automatically calculates the number of corresponding compliance intercepts.

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 and it can be broken down by parish or region within any given time frame.

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 human errors in reporting on the time and attendance reports by Wildlife Agents or by personnel entries of warnings and citations.

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 enter issued warnings and citations into the Enforcement database. Individual Wildlife agents also record the daily number of public contacts and specific activity into a time and attendance digital application. Both of these reports are stored digitally in a web-based database. Ashley Gubancsik, Contracts / Grants Reviewer at 225-763-5441 of the Enforcement Division retrieves the information from both databases, analyzes and reports the data for each reporting period.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: ENFORCEMENT - Wildlife, Fisheries and Ecosystem Enforcement

Objective: Provide professional law enforcement presence to execute statutory mandates for the management, protection and conservation of natural resources on our state's lands and waters, improve regulatory compliance to successfully support resource management plans and protect the supporting ecosystem.

Indicator Name: Observed Compliance – oyster fishing - PI Code 23187

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 percent of the public observed to be in compliance with the state's laws, rules and regulations relative to oyster fishing. Effective patrols, investigations, education and outreach programs by enforcement will increase public trust and awareness maximizing voluntary compliance and better identify illegal activity. This indicator was selected because of its relationship to achieving the objective. It is an effective method used in conjunction with compliance intercepts and 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 to identify conservation and activity management trends in oyster fishing activities and to address those trends with manpower allocations.

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 was subjected to Relevance Testing by the Louisiana Legislative Auditor in August 2012. The testing determined that the indicator is valid, reliable and accurate as set forth by the criteria from the state's performance budgeting manual.

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)?

Wildlife agents enter warnings and citations into the Enforcement database on a daily basis. Compliance intercept data is derived from time and attendance reports, which are recorded daily by individual Wildlife agents and submitted bi-weekly. These reports are stored digitally in a web-based database.

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

An Enforcement database automatically generates a report that calculates the number of identified non-compliance instances based on citations and warnings for each violation type. Another database generates a report that automatically calculates the number of corresponding compliance intercepts.

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 and it can be broken down by parish or region within any given time frame.

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 human errors in reporting on the time and attendance reports by Wildlife Agents or by personnel entries of warnings and citations.

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 enter issued warnings and citations into the Enforcement database. Individual Wildlife agents also record the daily number of public contacts and specific activity on their time and attendance digital application. Both of these reports are stored digitally in a web-based database. Ashley Gubancsik, Contracts / Grants Reviewer at 225-763-5441 of the Enforcement Division retrieves the information from both databases, analyzes and reports the data for each reporting period.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: ENFORCEMENT - Wildlife, Fisheries and Ecosystem Enforcement

Objective: Provide professional law enforcement presence to execute statutory mandates for the management, protection and conservation of natural resources on our state's lands and waters, improve regulatory compliance to successfully support resource management plans and protect the supporting ecosystem.

Indicator Name: Observed Compliance – commercial fishing - PI Code 23789

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 percent of the public observed to be in compliance with the state's laws, rules and regulations relative to commercial fishing. Effective patrols, investigations, education and outreach programs by enforcement will increase public trust and awareness maximizing voluntary compliance and better identify illegal activity. This indicator was selected because of its relationship to achieving the objective. It is an effective method used in conjunction with compliance intercepts and 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 to identify conservation and activity management trends in commercial fishing activities and to address those trends with manpower allocations.

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 was subjected to Relevance Testing by the Louisiana Legislative Auditor in August 2012. The testing determined that the indicator is valid, reliable and accurate as set forth by the criteria from the state's performance budgeting manual.

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)?

Wildlife agents enter warnings and citations into the Enforcement database on a daily basis. Compliance intercept data is derived from time and attendance reports, which are recorded daily by individual Wildlife agents and submitted biweekly. These reports are stored digitally in a web-based database.

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

An Enforcement database automatically generates a report that calculates the number of identified non-compliance instances based on citations and warnings for each violation type. Another database generates a report that automatically calculates the number of corresponding compliance intercepts.

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 and it can be broken down by parish or region within any given time frame.

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 human errors in reporting on the time and attendance reports by Wildlife agents or by personnel entries of warnings and citations.

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 enter warnings and citations into the Enforcement database. Individual Wildlife agents also record the daily number of public contacts and specific activity into a time and attendance digital application. Both of these reports are stored digitally in a web-based database. Ashley Gubancsik, Contracts / Grants Reviewer at 225-763-5441 of the Enforcement Division retrieves the information from both databases, analyzes and reports the data for each reporting period.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: ENFORCEMENT - Wildlife, Fisheries and Ecosystem Enforcement

Objective: Provide professional law enforcement presence to execute statutory mandates for the management, protection and conservation of natural resources on our state's lands and waters, improve regulatory compliance to successfully support resource management plans and protect the supporting ecosystem.

Indicator Name: Observed Compliance – hunting/wildlife - PI Code 23188

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 percent of the public observed to be in compliance with the state's laws, rules and regulations relative to hunting/wildlife. Effective patrols, investigations, education and outreach programs by enforcement will increase public trust and awareness maximizing voluntary compliance and better identify illegal activity. This indicator was selected because of its relationship to achieving the objective. It is an effective method used in conjunction with compliance intercepts and 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 to identify conservation and activity management trends in hunting/wildlife activities and to address those trends with manpower allocations.

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 was subjected to Relevance Testing by the Louisiana Legislative Auditor in August 2012. The testing determined that the indicator is valid, reliable and accurate as set forth by the criteria from the state's performance budgeting manual.

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)?

Wildlife agents enter warnings and citations into the Enforcement database on a daily basis. Compliance intercept data is derived from time and attendance reports, which are recorded daily by individual Wildlife Agents and submitted bi-weekly. The reports are stored digitally in a web-based database.

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

An Enforcement database automatically generates a report that calculates the number of identified non-compliance instances based on citations and warnings for each violation type. Another database generates a report that automatically calculates the number of corresponding compliance intercepts.

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 and it can be broken down by parish or region within any given time frame.

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 human errors in reporting on the time and attendance reports by Wildlife Agents or by personnel entries of warnings and citations.

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 enter issued warnings and citations into the Enforcement database. Individual Wildlife agents also record the daily number of public contacts and specific activity into a time and attendance digital application. Both of these reports are stored digitally in a web-based database. Ashley Gubancsik, Contracts / Grants Reviewer at 225-763-5441 of the Enforcement Division retrieves the information from both databases, analyzes and reports the data for each reporting period.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: ENFORCEMENT - Boating Safety and Waterway Enforcement

Objective: Reduce recreational boating incident casualties and injuries statewide by providing law enforcement services, foster safe operation of vessels and administer mandated outreach and education programs. Promote voluntary compliance through effective and efficient public safety services.

Indicator Name: Compliance Intercepts associated with boating safety patrols, investigations, education and community policing/outreach - PI Code 23189

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 number of compliance intercepts encountered by Wildlife agents who are performing Law Enforcement work. Compliance intercepts associated with recreational boating safety and waterway enforcement, education and outreach programs by Enforcement are the most relevant measures of the activities related to work toward reducing illegal and dangerous activities. This indicator was selected because of its relationship to achieving the objective. It has been effectively used for several years and 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 to identify trends in recreational boating activities and to address those trends with manpower allocations.

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. A compliance intercept is defined as a 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.

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 subjected to Relevance Testing by the Louisiana Legislative Auditor in August 2012. The testing determined that the indicator is valid, reliable and accurate as set forth by the criteria from the state's performance budgeting manual.

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)?

Wildlife agents enter warnings and citations into the Enforcement database on a daily basis. Compliance intercept data is derived from time and attendance reports, which are recorded daily by individual Wildlife agents and submitted bi-weekly. These reports are stored digitally in a web-based database.

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

An Enforcement database automatically generates a report that calculates the number of identified non-compliance instances based on citations and warnings for each violation type. Another database generates a report that automatically calculates the number of corresponding compliance intercepts.

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 and it can be broken down by parish or region within any given time frame.

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 human errors in reporting on the time and attendance reports 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 enter issued warnings and citations into the Enforcement database. Individual Wildlife agents also record the daily number of public contacts and specific activity into a time and attendance digital application. Both of these reports are stored digitally in a web-based database. Ashley Gubancsik, Contracts / Grants Reviewer at 225-763-5441 of the Enforcement Division retrieves the information from both databases, analyzes and reports the data for each reporting period.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: ENFORCEMENT - Boating Safety and Waterway Enforcement

Objective: Reduce recreational boating incident casualties and injuries statewide by providing law enforcement services, foster safe operation of vessels and administer mandated outreach and education programs. Promote voluntary compliance through effective and efficient public safety services.

Indicator Name: Number of Enforcement hours associated with boating safety patrols, investigations, education and community policing/outreach - PI Code 23190

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 measures the number of enforcement hours worked by Wildlife agents who are performing field work. Effective patrols, investigations, education and outreach programs by enforcement will increase public trust and awareness maximizing voluntary compliance and better identify illegal activity. This indicator was selected because of its relationship to achieving the objective. It has been effectively used for several years and 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 to identify trends in recreational boating activities and to address those trends with manpower allocations.

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. A law enforcement hour represents time spent patrolling and working a specified program.

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 subjected to Relevance Testing by the Louisiana Legislative Auditor in August 2012. The testing determined that the indicator is valid, reliable and accurate as set forth by the criteria from the state's performance budgeting manual.

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 by individual Wildlife agents and submitted bi-weekly. These time and attendance reports are stored digitally in a web-based database.

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

The hours recorded in time and attendance reports are automatically totaled by a database report for each activity within any given 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 and it can be broken down by parish or region.

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 on the time and attendance reports 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 patrol hours on their time and attendance reports. These time and attendance reports are stored digitally in a web-based database. Ashley Gubancsik, Contracts / Grants Reviewer at 225-763-5441 of the Enforcement Division retrieves the information from the database, analyzes and reports the data for each reporting period.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: ENFORCEMENT - Boating Safety and Waterway Enforcement

Objective: Reduce recreational boating incident casualties and injuries/incidents statewide, by providing law enforcement services, foster safe operation of vessels and administer mandated outreach and education programs. Promote voluntary compliance through effective and efficient public safety services.

Indicator Name: Number of boating crashes - PI Code 13241

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 provides the actual number of recreational boating crashes. 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?

This indicator will be used to identify trends in recreational boating activities and boating crashes, and to address those trends with manpower allocations. The department will strive to increase law enforcement presence through increased patrols and this indicator will verify achievement. By investigating all reportable recreational boating crash incidents, management can utilize compiled data to implement programs, regulations, and patrol efforts that help ensure a safe, secure, and enjoyable recreational boating experience for Louisiana citizens.

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. 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.

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 subjected to Relevance Testing by the Louisiana Legislative Auditor in August 2012. The testing determined that the indicator is valid, reliable and accurate as set forth by the criteria from the state's performance budgeting manual.

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 crashes is reported to the department through the Boating Incident Report Form as they occur.

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

The number of boating crashes 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 and it can be broken down by parish or region within any given time frame.

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 enforcement hours and compliance intercepts 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.

Boating crashes are reported to and collected by Lieutenant Garret Kimble / 225-765-2984. The data is reported by Ashley Gubancsik, Contracts / Grants Reviewer at 225-763-5441 with the Enforcement Division each reporting period.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: ENFORCEMENT - Boating Safety and Waterway Enforcement

Objective: Reduce recreational boating incident casualties and injuries statewide by providing law enforcement services, foster safe operation of vessels and administer mandated outreach and education programs. Promote voluntary compliance through effective and efficient public safety services.

Indicator Name: Number of boating crashes with alcohol or drugs as a contributing factor - PI Code 21267

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 provides the actual number of boating crashes with alcohol or drugs involved. It was selected to gauge the level of enforcement presence in boating safety and how it relates to the number of boating crashes with alcohol or drugs as a contributing factor

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 to identify trends in recreational boating activities and boating crashes with alcohol or drugs involved, and to address those trends with manpower allocations. The department will strive to increase law enforcement presence through increased patrols and this indicator will verify achievement.

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. 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. This indicator clearly indicates when alcohol or drugs is involved.

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 subjected to Relevance Testing by the Louisiana Legislative Auditor in August 2012. The testing determined that the indicator is valid, reliable and accurate as set forth by the criteria from the state's performance budgeting manual.

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 crashes is reported to the department through the Boating Incident Report Form as they occur.

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

The number of boating crashes with alcohol or drugs involved 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 and it can be broken down by parish or region within any given time frame.

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 enforcement hours and compliance intercepts cannot guarantee a reduction in boating crashes with alcohol or drugs involved.

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.

Boating crashes are reported to and collected by Lieutenant Garrett Kimble / 225-765-2984. The data is reported by Ashley Gubancsik, Contracts / Grants Reviewer at 225-763-5441 with the Enforcement Division each reporting period.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: ENFORCEMENT - Boating Safety and Waterway Enforcement

Objective: Reduce recreational boating incident casualties and injuries statewide by providing law enforcement services, foster safe operation of vessels and administer mandated outreach and education programs. Promote voluntary compliance through effective and efficient public safety services.

Indicator Name: Observed compliance – boating safety and waterway enforcement; percent of boating public observed to be in compliance with the state's boating safety and waterways regulations - PI Code 23191

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 percent of the public observed to be in compliance with the state's laws, rules and regulations relative to recreational boating safety and waterway enforcement. Effective patrols, investigations, education and outreach programs by enforcement will increase public trust and awareness maximizing voluntary compliance and better identify illegal activity, while reducing the number of recreational boating incident casualties and injuries. This indicator was selected because of its relationship to achieving the objective. It is an effective method used in conjunction with compliance intercepts and 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 to identify trends in recreational boating activities, boating crashes, casualties and injuries and to address those trends with manpower allocations.

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 was subjected to Relevance Testing by the Louisiana Legislative Auditor in August 2012. The testing determined that the indicator is valid, reliable and accurate as set forth by the criteria from the state's performance budgeting manual.

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)?

Wildlife agents enter warnings and citations into the Enforcement database on a daily basis. Compliance intercept data is derived from time and attendance reports, which are recorded daily by individual Wildlife agents and submitted bi-weekly. These reports are stored digitally in a web-based database.

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

An Enforcement database automatically generates a report that calculates the number of citations and warnings for recreational boating activities. Another database generates a report that automatically calculates the number of corresponding compliance intercepts.

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 and it can be broken down by parish or region within any given time frame.

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 human errors in reporting on the time and attendance reports by Wildlife agents or by personnel entries of warnings and citations.

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 enter issued warnings and citations for recreational boating into the Enforcement database. Individual Wildlife agents also record the daily number of public contacts and specific activity into a time and attendance digital application. Both of these reports are stored digitally in a web-based database. Ashley Gubancsik, Contracts / Grants Reviewer at 225-763-5441 with the Enforcement Division retrieves the information from both databases, analyzes and reports the data for each reporting period.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: ENFORCEMENT - Boating Safety and Waterway Enforcement

Objective: Reduce recreational boating incident casualties and injuries statewide by providing law enforcement services, foster safe operation of vessels and administer mandated outreach and education programs. Promote voluntary compliance through effective and efficient public safety services.

Indicator Name: Number of students completing boating safety course - PI Code 7062

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 relates to the objective using the assumption that persons who are better educated about boating are less likely to make a mistake that could lead to a reportable crash. We have increased the number of students certified in boating education by increasing the opportunities to take the course online as well as free classroom courses. Additionally, legislation enacted requires certain individuals to be certified in boating safety.

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 an approved boating safety course. Effective July 1, 2010, all persons who were born on or after January 1, 1984 must complete a boater safety education course in order to operate a vessel in excess of ten horsepower.

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 subjected to Relevance Testing by the Louisiana Legislative Auditor in August 2012. The testing determined that the indicator is valid, reliable and accurate as set forth by the criteria from the state's performance budgeting manual.

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?

A report totaling the number of students who have completed the course is generated from the department's database used to track these completions.

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 and can be broken down by parish or region.

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.

Lieutenant Garrett Kimble / 225-765-2984 of the Enforcement Division collects this data. It is reported by Ashley Gubancsik, Contracts / Grants Reviewer at 225-763-5441 with the Enforcement Division for each reporting period.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: ENFORCEMENT - Boating Safety and Waterway Enforcement

Objective: Reduce recreational boating incident casualties and injuries statewide by providing law enforcement services, foster safe operation of vessels and administer mandated outreach and education programs. Promote voluntary compliance through effective and efficient public safety services.

Indicator Name: Number of boating crashes per 100,000 registered boats - PI Code 24424

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 is an accurate representation of the number of recreational boating crashes relative to the number of registered boats. It has been used for many years and is a direct measure 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?

This indicator is used to identify trends in the number of crashes and to address those trends with 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.

The indicator 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.

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 subjected to Relevance Testing by the Louisiana Legislative Auditor in August 2012. The testing determined that the indicator is valid, reliable and accurate as set forth by the criteria from the state's performance budgeting manual.

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 all crashes reported to the department through the Boating Incident Report Form. Crashes are reported as they occur. The number of registered boats is reported quarterly.

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

The actual number of registered boats is divided by 100,000. That number is then divided into the actual number of recreational boating crashes to determine the number of boating crashes per 100,000 registered boats.

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 and it can be broken down by parish or region within any given time frame.

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. However, many external factors may affect the output of 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.

Lieutenant Garrett Kimble / 225-765-2984 with the Enforcement Division is responsible for collecting and documenting all boating crash reports. Boat registrations are managed by Secunda Byrd, Licensing Director / 225-765-2881 (Office of Management and Finance Division). Ashley Gubancsik, Contracts and Grants Reviewer at 225-763-5441 with the Enforcement Division is responsible for reporting this data each reporting period.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: ENFORCEMENT - Boating Safety and Waterway Enforcement

Objective: Reduce recreational boating incident casualties and injuries statewide by providing law enforcement services, foster safe operation of vessels and administer mandated outreach and education programs. Promote voluntary compliance through effective and efficient public safety services.

Indicator Name: Number of boating fatalities per 100,000 vessels - PI Code 24425

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 is an accurate representation of the number of boating fatalities per 100,000 vessels. It has been used for many years and is a direct measure 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?

This indicator is used to identify trends in the number of boating fatalities and to address those trends with 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.

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 was subjected to Relevance Testing by the Louisiana Legislative Auditor in August 2012. The testing determined that the indicator is valid, reliable and accurate as set forth by the criteria from the state's performance budgeting manual.

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 all crashes reported to the department through the Boating Incident Report Form. Crashes are reported as they occur. The number of registered boats is reported quarterly.

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

The actual number of registered boats is divided by 100,000. That number is then divided into the actual number of recreational boating fatalities to determine the number of boating fatalities per 100,000 registered boats.

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 disaggregated because it cannot be broken down into smaller parts by parish or region.

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. However, many external factors may affect the output of 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.

Lieutenant Garrett Kimble / 225-765-2984 with the Enforcement Division is responsible for collecting and documenting all boating crash reports. Boat registrations are managed by Secunda Byrd, Licensing Director / 225-765-2881 (Office of Management and Finance Division). Ashley Gubancsik, Contracts / Grants Reviewer at 225-763-5441 with the Enforcement Division is responsible for reporting this data each reporting period.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: ENFORCEMENT - Boating Safety and Waterway Enforcement

Objective: Reduce recreational boating incident casualties and injuries statewide by providing law enforcement services, foster safe operation of vessels and administer mandated outreach and education programs. Promote voluntary compliance through effective and efficient public safety services.

Indicator Name: Number of registered boats - PI Code 13243

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, 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?

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 subjected to Relevance Testing by the Louisiana Legislative Auditor in August 2012. The testing determined that the indicator is valid, reliable and accurate as set forth by the criteria from the state's performance budgeting manual.

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 agency's boat registration database, housed in the Licensing section (Office of Management and Finance). It is updated in real time and reported quarterly

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

A report is generated from the Licensing Section's (Office of Management and Finance) boat registration database.

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.

Secunda Byrd, Licensing Director / 225-765-2881 (Office of Management and Finance Division) is responsible for collecting and storing this data. Ashley Gubancsik, Contracts / Grants Reviewer at 225-763-5441 with the Enforcement Division reports the data.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: ENFORCEMENT - Boating Safety and Waterway Enforcement

Objective: Reduce recreational boating incident casualties and injuries statewide by providing law enforcement services, foster safe operation of vessels and administer mandated outreach and education programs. Promote voluntary compliance through effective and efficient public safety services.

Indicator Name: Observed Compliance Boating Safety administrative regulations; percent of vessels observed to be in compliance with the state's boating safety and waterways administrative compliance - PI Code 25088

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 identifies observed levels of compliance as related to administrative boating regulations and determines programmatic needs for public safety.

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 to identify educational areas to focus activities, which promote voluntary compliance. Also for budgeting purposes it will help identify registration renewals and compliance with Administrative regulations for 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 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 was subjected to Relevance Testing by the Louisiana Legislative Auditor in August 2012. The testing determined that the indicator is valid, reliable and accurate as set forth by the criteria from the state's performance budgeting manual.

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)?

Wildlife agents enter warnings and citations into the Enforcement database on a daily basis. Compliance intercept data is derived from time and attendance reports, which are recorded daily by individual Wildlife agents and submitted bi-weekly. These reports are stored digitally in a web-based database.

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

An Enforcement database automatically generates a report that calculates the number of citations and warnings for recreational boating activities. Another database generates a report that automatically calculates the number of corresponding compliance intercepts.

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 and it can be broken down by parish or region.

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 human errors in reporting on the time and attendance reports by Wildlife Agents or by personnel entries of warnings and citations.

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 enter issued warnings and citations into the Enforcement database. Individual Wildlife agents also record the daily number of public contacts and specific activity into a time and attendance digital application. Both of these reports are stored digitally in a web-based database. Ashley Gubancsik, Contracts / Grants Reviewer at 225-763-5441 with the Enforcement Division retrieves the information from both databases, analyzes and reports the data for each reporting period.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: ENFORCEMENT - Boating Safety and Waterway Enforcement

Objective: Reduce recreational boating incident casualties and injuries statewide by providing law enforcement services, foster safe operation of vessels and administer mandated outreach and education programs. Promote voluntary compliance through effective and efficient public safety services.

Indicator Name: Observed Compliance Boating Safety Operational and Safety Equipment regulations; percent of vessels observed to be in compliance with the state's boating safety and waterways operational and safety regulations - PI Code 25089

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 identifies observed levels of compliance as related to operational and equipment boating regulations and determines programmatic needs for public safety.

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 for Management and Budget purposes. Management utilizes information to modify patrols, identify educational needs and combat persons who operate in an unsafe manner.

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 was subjected to Relevance Testing by the Louisiana Legislative Auditor in August 2012. The testing determined that the indicator is valid, reliable and accurate as set forth by the criteria from the state's performance budgeting manual.

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)?

Wildlife agents enter warnings and citations into the Enforcement database on a daily basis. Compliance intercept data is derived from time and attendance reports, which are recorded daily by individual Wildlife agents and submitted biweekly. These reports are stored digitally in a web-based database.

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

An Enforcement database automatically generates a report that calculates the number of citations and warnings for recreational boating activities. Another database generates a report that automatically calculates the number of corresponding compliance intercepts.

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 and it can be broken down by parish or region within any given time frame

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 human errors in reporting on the time and attendance reports by Wildlife agents or by personnel entries of warnings and citations.

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 enter issued warnings and citations into the Enforcement database. Individual Wildlife agents also record the daily number of public contacts and specific activity into a time and attendance digital portal. Both of these reports are stored digitally in a web-based database. Ashley Gubancsik, Contracts / Grants Reviewer at 225-763-5441 with the Enforcement Division retrieves the information from both databases, analyzes and reports the data for each reporting period.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: ENFORCEMENT - Search and Rescue & Maritime Security

Objective: Enhance Louisiana's collaborative efforts in the maritime domain to build a safe and secure environment that supports public safety, promotes public confidence and ensures economic stability; lead and coordinate and provide emergency response services for search and rescue and maritime security operations.

Indicator Name: Hours worked associated with search and rescue, maritime and homeland security and other emergency support activities - PI Code 23192

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 was selected to build a safe and secure environment that supports public safety, promotes public confidence and ensures economic stability and to lead, coordinate and provide emergency response services for search and rescue and maritime security operations.

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 to identify the increased work demand associated with our agency's responsibility as the state's designated lead agency for emergency support search and rescue functions and lead for maritime security functions and as support for emergency support functions for transportation, communications, firefighting, emergency management and public safety and security.

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. A patrol hour represents time spent patrolling for a specified 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?

This indicator was subjected to Relevance Testing by the Louisiana Legislative Auditor in August 2012. The testing determined that the indicator is valid, reliable and accurate as set forth by the criteria from the state's performance budgeting manual.

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 by individual Wildlife agents and submitted bi-weekly. These reports are stored digitally in a web-based database.

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

Hours worked on search and rescue, maritime and homeland security and other emergency support activities as recorded in time and attendance reports are automatically calculated by a database report for each activity within the 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 and it can be broken down by parish or region within any given time frame.

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 on the time and attendance reports 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 patrol hours into a time and attendance digital application. The report is stored digitally in a web-based database. Ashley Gubancsik, Contracts / Grants Reviewer at 225-763-5441 with the Enforcement Division analyzes and reports the data for each reporting period.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: ENFORCEMENT - Search and Rescue & Maritime Security (Public Safety, Hurricane Protection)

Objective: Enhance Louisiana's collaborative efforts in the maritime domain to build a safe and secure environment that supports public safety, promotes public confidence and ensures economic stability; lead and coordinate and provide emergency response services for search and rescue and maritime security operations.

Indicator Name: Percent of search and rescue missions conducted safely - PI Code 23193

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 was selected to quantify the number of search and rescue missions conducted safely.

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 to identify the increased work demand associated with our agency's responsibility as the state's designated lead agency for emergency support search and rescue functions and lead for maritime security functions and as support for emergency support functions for transportation, communications, firefighting, emergency management and public safety and security.

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 was subjected to Relevance Testing by the Louisiana Legislative Auditor in August 2012. The testing determined that the indicator is valid, reliable and accurate as set forth by the criteria from the state's performance budgeting manual.

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 the Public Assistance Report Search/Rescue Form completed by Wildlife agents when applicable. This form is filed bi-weekly. Data from the forms is entered into a specific database by HQ Enforcement staff.

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

The indicator is calculated by determining the number of Public Assistance Report Search/Rescue Forms with “Search/Rescue Mission” and/or “Rescue” checked 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 and it can be broken down by parish or region within any given time frame

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 by Wildlife agents in reporting on the Public Assistance Report Search/Rescue Form.

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 complete the Public Assistance Report Search/Rescue Form. Data from these forms is entered in a specific database by HQ Enforcement staff in Baton Rouge. Ashley Gubancsik, Contracts / Grants Reviewer at 225-763-5441 with the Enforcement Division retrieves the information from the database, analyzes and reports the data for each reporting period.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: ENFORCEMENT - Search and Rescue & Maritime Security (Public Safety, Hurricane Protection)

Objective: Enhance Louisiana's collaborative efforts in the maritime domain to build a safe and secure environment that supports public safety, promotes public confidence and ensures economic stability; lead and coordinate and provide emergency response services for search and rescue and maritime security operations.

Indicator Name: Percent of search and rescue missions conducted successfully
- PI Code 23194

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 was selected to quantify the number of search and rescue missions conducted successfully.

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 to identify the increased work demand associated with our agency's responsibility as the state's designated lead agency for emergency support search and rescue functions and lead for maritime security functions and as support for emergency support functions for transportation, communications, firefighting, emergency management and public safety and security.

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 was subjected to Relevance Testing by the Louisiana Legislative Auditor in August 2012. The testing determined that the indicator is valid, reliable and accurate as set forth by the criteria from the state's performance budgeting manual.

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)?

Public Assistance Search/Rescue data is captured by dispatchers and field agents at the CAD incident level. It is stored in our CAD database, which supports the reporting and analysis.

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

The indicator is calculated by determining the number of Public Assistance Report Search/Rescue entries with “Search/Rescue Mission” and/or “Rescue” checked 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 and it can be broken down by parish or region.

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 by Wildlife agents in reporting on the Public Assistance Report Search/Rescue Form.

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.

Public Assistance Search/Rescue data is captured by dispatchers and Wildlife agents at the CAD incident level. It is stored in our CAD database, which supports reporting and analysis. Ashley Gubancsik, Contracts / Grants Reviewer at 225-763-5441 with the Enforcement Division, analyzes and reports the data for each reporting period.

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST

Program: **ENFORCEMENT – Wildlife, Fisheries and Ecosystem Enforcement**

Objective: **Conduct Wildlife, Fisheries and Ecosystem Enforcement activities, to enhance compliance by monitoring persons engaged in the use of Louisiana’s natural resources.**

Strategy: **Increase the number of compliance intercepts of individuals associated with wildlife, fisheries, and ecosystem patrols, investigations, education and community policing/outreach in order to increase voluntary compliance and identify purposeful non-compliant 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

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST

Program: **ENFORCEMENT – Boating Safety and Waterway Enforcement**

Objective: **Conduct Boating Safety and Waterway Enforcement activities, to enhance public safety on the state’s waterways by monitoring persons who utilize the waterways.**

Strategy: **Increase the number of compliance intercepts of individuals associated with boating safety patrols, investigations, education and community policing/outreach in order to increase voluntary compliance and identify purposeful non-compliant 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

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST

Program: **ENFORCEMENT – Search and Rescue and Maritime Security**

Objective: **Conduct Search and Rescue and Maritime Security activities, to provide search and rescue, maritime security and public safety services through proactive and reactive law enforcement responses**

Strategy: **Effectively and efficiently conduct activities associated with search and rescue, maritime and homeland security and other emergency support 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

OFFICE OF WILDLIFE
(513)

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: WILDLIFE – Habitat Stewardship

Objective: Improve the quality and quantity of wildlife habitat and provide the public with conservation related opportunities.

Indicator Name: Number of acres in Wildlife Management Areas, Refuge System, and Conservation Areas - PI Code 23195

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 documents the number of acres secured for conservation management by the Office of Wildlife.

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 total amount of property acquired by the department will influence internal management decisions that will affect the level of management implemented. Land management and associated costs accounts for the majority of expenditures for the Office of Wildlife. Therefore, this performance indicator will assist in making budgetary decisions.

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, this language in this indicator clearly identifies the sum of acres acquired and under management by the Office of Wildlife. All land acquired for the purpose of conservation management is converted into one of the following:

- a. Wildlife Management Area
- b. Refuge
- c. 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?

Each acquired property is surveyed to obtain accurate acreage amounts and boundary locations. Survey records are retained in the property file, which is maintained by LDWF's legal section and available for audit whenever requested.

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)?

There is no set frequency for land acquisition since the process is sometimes lengthy and determined by available budget. Therefore, this PI will be reported annually.

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

It is a simple tabulation of the current acres of land acquired or the purpose of conservation management and converted into one of the following:

- a. Wildlife Management Area
 - b. Refuge
 - c. Conservation Area
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. Statewide totals will be reported. However, it can be broken down by region, parish, etc. if requested.

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

Yes. Budget availability can affect results.

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.

Crystal Jones, Budget Analyst, 225-765-2956

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: WILDLIFE – Habitat Stewardship

Objective: Improve the quality and quantity of wildlife habitat and provide the public with conservation related opportunities.

Indicator Name: Acres impacted by habitat enhancement projects and habitat management activities - PI Code 21337

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 measures the amount of wildlife habitat improvements in respect to the total number of acres under the Office of Wildlife's 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?

The total amount of acres impacted by habitat enhancement projects and management activities each year will play a part in planning and scheduling management rotation frequency and the level of effort implemented for subsequent years. Habitat manipulation and associated costs account for a large portion of expenditures for the Office of Wildlife. Therefore, this indicator will assist in making both management and budgetary decisions.

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 language in this indicator clearly defines the sums of acres impacted by the following activities by habitat enhancement projects and management activities.

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. LDWF staff in charge of habitat enhancement projects maintain a record of the total number of acres impacted by their project. Staff will submit their records up their chain of command for review. A master record will be maintained for all reports.

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 is a sum of acres impacted by the following activities:

Habitat Enhancement Projects: 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.

Wildlife Habitat Management Activities: Vegetation Management, Impoundment/Greentree Reservoir Management, Forestry Practices, Food Plots, and Nest Boxes activities.

A master record will be maintained and submitted quarterly.

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

Staff in charge of habitat enhancement projects maintain a record of the total number of acres impacted by their project. Staff will submit their records up their chain of command for review. A master record will be maintained for all 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?

Aggregated. Statewide totals will be reported. However, it can be broken down by region, parish, etc. if requested.

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

Yes. Weather, natural events, and Budget availability can affect results.

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.

Crystal Jones, Budget Analyst, 225-765-2956

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: WILDLIFE – Habitat Stewardship

Objective: Improve the quality and quantity of wildlife habitat and provide the public with conservation related opportunities.

Indicator Name: Number of users that utilize the Department's Wildlife Management Areas and Wildlife Refuges - PI Code 23196

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 PI measures the amount users that take advantage of Office of Wildlife managed property to engage in wildlife conservation 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?

The total number of users will signify the level of hunting pressure applied to managed properties and assist in the setting of appropriate season timing, duration, and bag limits. This indicator will also assist in planning for infrastructure needs. Infrastructure development and maintenance and associated costs account for a large portion of expenditures for the Office of Wildlife. Therefore, this performance indicator will assist in making budgetary decisions.

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 language in this indicator clearly defines the sums of individuals that utilize properties managed by the Office of 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?

This indicator has not been audited. A self-clearing permit is required for all activities (hunting, fishing, hiking, birdwatching, sightseeing, etc.) on WMA's. The self-clearing permit requires each user to check-in and check-out and document their usage type. There are two methods of filling out a self-clearing permit; 1. physical cards located at kiosk on WMA properties. 2. self-clearing permit smart phone app. Office of Wildlife regional staff collect physical self-clearing permits and maintain a record of usage. Records are submitted

up the chain of command for review. A master record that sums up the total number of users from both collection methods will be maintained.

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)?

A self-clearing permit is required for all activities (hunting, fishing, hiking, birdwatching, sightseeing, etc.) on WMA's. The self-clearing permit requires each user to check-in and check-out and document their usage type. There are two methods of filling out a self-clearing permit; 1. physical cards located at kiosk on WMA properties. 2. self-clearing permit smart phone app.

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

Office of Wildlife regional staff collect physical self-clearing permits and maintain a record of usage. Records are submitted up the chain of command for review. A master record that sums up the total number of users from both collection methods will be 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. Statewide totals will be reported. However, it can be broken down by region, parish, etc. if requested.

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

Yes. There is no guarantee of 100% compliance with mandatory self-clearing permit requirements. Staff on site do their best to enforce this requirement but a decrease in staffing may result in a lower compliance rate.

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.

Crystal Jones, Budget Analyst, 225-765-2956

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: WILDLIFE – Habitat Stewardship

Objective: Improve the quality and quantity of wildlife habitat and provide the public with conservation related opportunities.

Indicator Name: Participants in designated youth hunting activities on the Wildlife Management Areas - PI Code 21340

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?

The Office of Wildlife 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?

This indicator provides an index to the desire of youth to take advantage of specific recreational hunting opportunities on Office of Wildlife managed properties. The utilization of this activity will assist in planning for future youth hunt events. These events are managed hunts and staffing levels may have impacts on the number of youth hunt events offered. Because of this, budgetary elements will be play a big part in the results collected from this indicator.

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 language in this indicator clearly defines the sums of individuals that participate in designated youth hunts managed by Office of Wildlife 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?

This indicator has not been audited. Youth hunt events are managed by Office of Wildlife staff and accurate numbers are recorded. Records are submitted up the chain of command for review. A master record that sums up the total number of users is maintained.

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 has not been audited. Youth hunt events are managed by Office of Wildlife staff and accurate participation numbers are recorded. Records are submitted up the chain of command for review. A master record that sums up the total number of participants will be maintained and reported quarterly.

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

Youth hunt events are managed by Office of Wildlife staff and accurate numbers are recorded.

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. Statewide totals will be reported. However, it can be broken down by region, parish, etc. if requested.

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

Yes. Utilization of youth events has reduced greatly due to changes in public attitudes towards hunting and the increase in competitive sporting opportunities and demands on youth. The Office of Wildlife strives to engage youth in shooting sports and wildlife conservation activities in an attempt to compete with other youth interests. In addition, staffing levels play a large role in the availability of youth hunting events.

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.

Crystal Jones, Budget Analyst, 225-765-2956

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: WILDLIFE – Species Management

Objective: Improve knowledge of species and habitat needs through research and analysis to address species management issues.

Indicator Name: Number of habitat evaluations and population surveys - PI Code 21322

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?

Habitat evaluations and population surveys provide important data that will be used to evaluate 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?

This indicator provides an index to species health and is used for developing management plans and regulation recommendations. This indicator also shows the workload of the Office of Wildlife biological staff. Budgetary elements resulting in restricting or reducing staffing levels will be play a big part in the results collected from this indicator.

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 language in this indicator clearly defines the sums of habitat evaluation and population surveys conducted by Office of Wildlife biological 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?

This indicator has not been audited. Office of Wildlife staff in charge of habitat evaluation and population surveys report each project up their chain of command for review. A master record is maintained.

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 is a sum of habitat and evaluation population surveys on the following species: Louisiana black bear, wild turkey, white tailed deer, red cockaded woodpecker, northern bobwhite, American woodcock, mourning dove, squirrels, rabbits, scaup, white-fronted geese, mottled duck, snow goose, ross goose, wood duck, black bellies whistling duck, blue winged teal, feral hogs. As needs arise, additional species may be surveyed. A master record will be maintained and submitted quarterly.

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

Office of Wildlife staff in charge of habitat evaluation and population surveys report each project up their chain of command for review. A master record is maintained.

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. Statewide totals will be reported. However, it can be broken down by species, habitat, location, etc. if requested.

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

Yes. Weather, natural events, and Budget availability can affect results.

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.

Crystal Jones, Budget Analyst, 225-765-2956

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: WILDLIFE – Species Management

Objective: Improve knowledge of species and habitat needs through research and analysis to address species management issues.

Indicator Name: Number of wood ducks banded - PI Code 21325

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 the assessment of game populations. Data gathered will be used to evaluate 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?

This indicator, along with additional data collected on the wood ducks, provides an index to the effectiveness of management programs and season duration, timing, and bag limit regulations. It also shows the workload of the Office of Wildlife biological staff. Budgetary elements resulting in the restriction or reeducation of staffing levels will play a big part in the results collected from this indicator.

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 language in this indicator clearly defines the sums of wood ducks banded by Office of Wildlife biological 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?

This indicator has not been audited. Office of Wildlife staff in charge of wood duck banding report the number of banded birds along with band identifiers up their chain of command for review. A master record of wood ducks banded statewide is maintained.

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 is a sum of all wood ducks banded by Office of Wildlife biological staff. A master record will be maintained and submitted quarterly.

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

Office of Wildlife staff document each bird banded and the associated band identifier. All records are submitted up their chain of command for review. A master record is maintained.

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. Statewide totals will be reported. However, it can be broken down by region if requested.

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

Yes. Weather can adversely affect production. In contrast, ideal weather conditions result in favorable habitat and result in higher than normal production. Budget availability can also result in staffing limitations resulting in fewer birds banded.

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.

Crystal Jones, Budget Analyst, 225-765-2956

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: WILDLIFE – Species Management

Objective: Improve knowledge of species and habitat needs through research and analysis to address species management issues.

Indicator Name: Number of Alligator nest counts in the Louisiana coastal zone surveyed (PI Code 26488)

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?

Long-term alligator breeding success indices provide important data for the assessment of population health. This data will assist in evaluating management activities and for regulation setting processes.

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, along with additional data collected, provides an index to the effectiveness of management programs. Budgetary elements resulting in the restriction or reduction of staffing levels will play a big part in the results collected from this indicator.

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 language in this indicator clearly defines the sums of alligator nest counted during alligator nest count surveys by Office of Wildlife biological 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?

This indicator has not been audited. Office of Wildlife staff in charge of alligator nest count surveys report the number of nest counted to their chain of command for review. A master record of is maintained.

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 is a sum of alligator nest counted by Office of Wildlife biological staff. A master record will be maintained and submitted annually.

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

Office of Wildlife staff document the number of alligator nests counted. All records are submitted up their chain of command for review. A master record is maintained.

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. Coast wide totals will be reported. However, it can be broken down by habitat or parish if requested.

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

Yes. Weather can adversely affect production. In contrast, ideal weather condition result in favorable habitat and result in higher than normal production. Budget availability can also result in staffing limitations resulting in fewer nest surveyed.

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.

Crystal Jones, Budget Analyst, 225-765-2956

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: WILDLIFE – Species Management

Objective: Improve knowledge of species and habitat needs through research and analysis to address species management issues.

Indicator Name: Number of Wood Ducks harvested - PI Code 23798

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?

Wood ducks are one of the top game species in Louisiana. This PI demonstrates long-term trend data of estimated harvest numbers and will be used to evaluate 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?

This PI demonstrates long-term trend data of estimated harvest numbers. It, along with additional data collected about wood duck, will be used to evaluate management activities and for the regulation setting process.

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 language in this indicator clearly defines the sums of wood ducks harvested, which is collected from the annual harvest survey.

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. Office of Wildlife staff in charge of analyzing the harvest survey report the results up their chain of command for review. A master record of is maintained.

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 harvest survey will be sent to 6% of individuals that purchased a license that allowed basic hunting privilege to gauge hunter success. This survey is conducted once a year so results for this PI will be reported annually.

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

Results from the harvest survey will be summarized and added to long-term index of hunter harvest and success rates. All records are submitted up their chain of command for review. A master record is maintained.

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. Statewide totals will be reported. However, it can be broken down by region, habitat, parish, etc. if requested.

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

Yes. Since the harvest survey is not mandatory, the number of hunters that complete and return the survey may fluctuate. The department is exploring options to increase survey completion.

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.

Crystal Jones, Budget Analyst, 225-765-2956

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: WILDLIFE – Species Management

Objective: Improve knowledge of species and habitat needs through research and analysis to address species management issues.

Indicator Name: Number of White tail deer harvested - PI Code 13270

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?

White-tailed deer are one of the top game species in Louisiana. This PI demonstrates long-term trend data of estimated harvest numbers and will be used to evaluate 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?

This PI demonstrates long-term trend data of estimated harvest numbers. It, along with additional data collected about white-tailed deer, will be used to evaluate management activities and for the regulation setting process.

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 language in this indicator clearly defines the sums of white-tailed deer harvested, which is collected from the annual harvest survey.

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. Office of Wildlife staff in charge of analyzing the harvest survey report the results up their chain of command for review. A master record of is maintained.

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 harvest survey will be sent to 6% of individuals that purchased a license that allowed basic hunting privilege to gauge hunter success. This survey is conducted once a year so results for this PI will be reported annually.

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

Results from the harvest survey will be summarized and added to a long-term index of hunter harvest and success rates. All records are submitted up the chain of command for review. A master record is maintained.

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. Statewide totals will be reported. However, it can be broken down by region, habitat, parish, etc. if requested.

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

Yes. Since the harvest survey is not mandatory, the number of hunters that complete and return the survey may fluctuate. The department is exploring options to increase survey completion.

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.

Crystal Jones, Budget Analyst, 225-765-2956

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: WILDLIFE – Species Management

Objective: Improve knowledge of species and habitat needs through research and analysis to address species management issues.

Indicator Name: Acres impacted by nutria herbivory - PI Code 15227

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 language in this indicator clearly defines the sums of acres impacted by nutria herbivory.

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. Results are reported up the chain of command and a master record is maintained.

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 acres of coastal wetland habitats affected is estimated by conducting an annual coast wide survey, searching for areas of damaged wetlands. The reporting frequency will be annually.

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.

11. 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. Statewide totals will be reported. However, it can be broken down by region, parish, etc. if requested.

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

Yes. The Coast wide Nutria Control Program is a CWPPRA project, therefore the continuation of the program is contingent upon continued federal funding.

9. 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.

Crystal Jones, Budget Analyst, 225-765-2956

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: WILDLIFE – Species Management

Objective: Improve knowledge of species and habitat needs through research and analysis to address species management issues.

Indicator Name: Total number hunter-days annually - PI Code 21323

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 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.

Yes, the language in this indicator clearly defines the sums of hunter-days offered annually.

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. Office of Wildlife staff in charge of analyzing the total number of hunter-days offered annually report the results up their chain of command for review. A master record of is maintained.

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 a simple sum of all hunter-days offered for each game species that is reported annually.

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

This is a simple sum of all hunter-days offered for each game 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?

Aggregated. All hunter-days will be totals. However, it can be broken down by species, month, etc. if requested.

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

Yes, this indicator 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 LDWF.

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.

Crystal Jones, Budget Analyst, 225-765-2956

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: WILDLIFE – Species Management

Objective: Improve knowledge of species and habitat needs through research and analysis to address species management issues.

Indicator Name: Number of acres in the Deer Management Assistance Program (DMAP) - PI Code 23197

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 statewide deer management influence on private lands.

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 shows the number of acres in the DMAP program in correlation to the number of participants and LDWF staff. Both Internal and budgetary decisions will be made utilizing the results of this indicator.

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 language in this indicator clearly defines the sums of acres enrolled in DMAP.

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. Office of Wildlife staff in charge of analyzing the total number of acres enrolled in DMAP report the results up their chain of command for review. A master record of is maintained.

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 program is a deer management program that allows land owners with 500 acres or more to apply for antlerless deer tags that can be used during any part of the deer season and requires mandatory reporting of physical deer data. All participants enroll via an

application and fee payment process that is based on acres. The total number of acres enrolled in this programs is reported annually.

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

All participants enroll via an application and fee payment process that is based on acres.

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 statewide total will be reported. However, it can be broken down by parish, deer zone etc. if requested.

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

Yes. LDWF has no control over the number of DMAP participants. Changes from current deer hunting regulations could greatly influence the number of acres 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.

Crystal Jones, Budget Analyst, 225-765-2956

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: WILDLIFE – Species Management

Objective: Improve knowledge of species and habitat needs through research and analysis to address species management issues.

Indicator Name: Number of acres in Louisiana Waterfowl Program (LWP)
- PI Code 21320

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 one measure of statewide waterfowl management influence on private lands.

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 shows the number of acres in the LWP program in correlation to the number of participants and LDWF staff. Both Internal and budgetary decisions will be made utilizing the results of this indicator.

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 language in this indicator clearly defines the sums of acres enrolled in LWP.

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. Office of Wildlife staff in charge of analyzing the total number of acres enrolled in LWP report the results up their chain of command for review. A master record of is maintained.

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)?

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. The total number of acres enrolled in this programs is reported annually.

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

It is the simple count of the number of acres in LWP.

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 statewide total will be reported. However, it can be broken down by parish, region, etc. if requested.

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

Yes. The LDWF 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.

Crystal Jones, Budget Analyst, 225-765-2956

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: WILDLIFE – Species Management

Objective: Improve knowledge of species and habitat needs through research and analysis to address species management issues.

Indicator Name: Number of new or updated Element Occurrence Records (EORs)
- PI Code 15207

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?

An EOR is a single record showing the location and status of one of the species of special concern in Louisiana. 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.

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 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, the language in this indicator clearly defines the sums of new or updated EORs.

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. Office of Wildlife staff track the number of new or updated EORs through a data management system. Quarterly reports are submitted up the chain of command for review. A master record of is maintained.

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 entered weekly and reported on quarterly.

7. Calculation and Methodology: How is the indicator calculated? The simple addition of the data is from field collection with data being entered.

Office of Wildlife staff track the number of new or updated EORs through a data management system. Quarterly reports are submitted up the chain of command for review. A master record is maintained.

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 statewide total will be reported. However, it can be broken down by parish, region, etc. if requested.

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

Yes. The amount of these can vary by public participation.

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.

Crystal Jones, Budget Analyst, 225-765-2956

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: WILDLIFE – Species Management

Objective: Improve knowledge of species and habitat needs through research and analysis to address species management issues.

Indicator Name: Number of Scenic River Permit determinations issued - PI Code 15222

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?

The indicator reflects the frequency of LDWF input to determine the necessary actions for scenic river permits request. This PI measures the LDWF's influence to protect Louisiana wildlife and fish 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 be 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, the language in this indicator clearly defines the sums scenic river permit determinations issued.

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. Office of Wildlife staff track the number of Scenic River Permit determinations issued through simple record keeping. Quarterly reports are submitted up the chain of command for review. A master record of is maintained.

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)?

Office of Wildlife staff track the number of Scenic River Permit determinations issued through record keeping. The indicator will be reported quarterly.

7. Calculation and Methodology: How is the indicator calculated? It is the simple addition of the data from field collection occurring weekly with data being reported quarterly.

Office of Wildlife staff track the number of Scenic River Permit determinations issued through record keeping. Quarterly reports are submitted up the chain of command for review. A master record of is maintained.

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 statewide total will be reported. However, it can be broken down by parish, region, watershed, etc. if requested.

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

Yes. The number of requests for a permit is dependent on development projects planned to occur on 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.

Crystal Jones, Budget Analyst, 225-765-2956

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: WILDLIFE – Species Management

Objective: Improve knowledge of species and habitat needs through research and analysis to address species management issues.

Indicator Name: Number of written comments issued on environmental permit applications - PI Code 15218

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?

The indicator reflects the frequency of LDWF input for environmental permit applications. This PI measures the LDWF's influence to protect Louisiana wildlife and fish 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 be 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, the language in this indicator clearly defines the sums comments issued on environmental permit applications.

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. Office of Wildlife staff track the number of comments issued on environmental permit applications through simple record keeping. Quarterly reports are submitted up the chain of command for review. A master record of is maintained.

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)?

Office of Wildlife staff track the number of comments issued on environmental permit applications through simple record keeping. The indicator will be reported quarterly.

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

Simple addition of the data is from field collection occurring weekly with data being reported semi-annually.

Office of Wildlife staff track the number of comments issued on environmental permit applications through simple record keeping. Quarterly reports are submitted up the chain of command for review. A master record of is maintained.

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 statewide total will be reported. However, it can be broken down by parish, region, etc. if requested.

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

Yes, 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.

Crystal Jones, Budget Analyst, 225-765-2956

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: WILDLIFE – Species Management

Objective: Improve knowledge of species and habitat needs through research and analysis to address species management issues.

Indicator Name: Number of all certified hunting licensed holders and commercial alligator and trapping licensed holders - PI Code 23204

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?

The indicator reflects the level of public participation through license purchased through the LDWF.

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 represents the level of public participation through license purchased through the LDWF. This information will be used in the management and budgeting of the Agency's 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, the language in this indicator clearly defines the sums of hunting and commercial alligator and trapping licensed holders.

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. The indicator is a direct accounting of the number of specified licensing 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 certified hunting licensed holders and commercial alligator and trapping licensed holders. This information is provided and validated by the Federal U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service each year.

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

Simple addition of sold products offered through the agency.

11. 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 statewide total will be reported. However, it can be broken down by parish, region, etc. if requested.

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

Yes, seasonal variants and natural events can impact participation beyond the influence of the LDWF.

9. 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.

Crystal Jones, Budget Analyst, 225-765-2956

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: WILDLIFE – Education Outreach

Objective: Increase hunter awareness in order to reduce the number of hunting related accidents and increase public knowledge and involvement in wildlife conservation and shooting sports activities.

Indicator Name: Number of hunter education participants - PI Code 3992

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. This indicator will show an annual trend in the number of new hunters recruited.

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 its approach. This information will be used in the management and budgeting of the Agency's 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, the language in this indicator clearly defines the sums of 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?

This indicator has not been audited. The indicator is a direct accounting of the number of 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)?

Office of Wildlife staff track the number of hunter education participants through a data management system. Quarterly reports are submitted up the chain of command for review. A master record of is maintained.

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

It is a simple count of the participants who successfully completed 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. The statewide total will be reported. However, it can be broken down by parish, region, etc. if requested.

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

Yes, public desire may influence this indicator output.

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.

Crystal Jones, Budget Analyst, 225-765-2956

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: WILDLIFE – Education Outreach

Objective: Increase hunter awareness in order to reduce the number of hunting related accidents and increase public knowledge and involvement in wildlife conservation and shooting sports activities.

Indicator Name: Number of participants in the Archery in Louisiana Schools (ALAS)
- PI Code 26489

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?

There is a need to provide Louisiana citizens with programs that promote hunting, shooting sports, and wildlife conservation management techniques. The ALAS program engages Louisiana's youth and provides LDWF and opportunity to educate and recruit future wildlife conservationist. The number of participants in this program shows the success rate of this 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?

The number of participants will indicate that the department needs to develop/modify its approach of this program to continue engaging Louisiana's youth. The number of participants will determine staff demands. This information will be used in the management and budgeting of the Agency's 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, the language in this indicator clearly defines the sums of ALAS 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?

This indicator has not been audited. The indicator is a direct accounting of the number of participants in the ALAS program.

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)?

Office of Wildlife staff track the number of ALAS participants through a data management system. The total is reported up the chain of command for review. A master record of is maintained. This indicator will be reported annually.

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

It is a simple count of the number of ALAS participants. Office of Wildlife staff track the number of ALAS participants through a data management system. The total is reported up the chain of command for review. A master record of is maintained.

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 statewide total will be reported. However, it can be broken down by parish, region, etc. if requested.

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

Yes, public desire may influence this indicator output.

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.

Crystal Jones, Budget Analyst, 225-765-2956

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: WILDLIFE – Education Outreach

Objective: Increase hunter safety awareness in order to reduce the number of hunting related accidents and furthering environmental knowledge.

Indicator Name: Number of active hunter education volunteer instructors - PI Code 21329

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. Volunteer instructors are essential to accomplishing 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, the language in this indicator clearly defines the sums of hunter education volunteer instructors.

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 a simple count of those instructors who are considered active. **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.

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)?

Office of Wildlife staff track the number of active volunteer instructors through a data management system. This indicator will be reported annually.

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

It is a simple count of the active 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. The statewide total will be reported. However, it can be broken down by parish, region, etc. if requested.

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.

Crystal Jones, Budget Analyst, 225-765-2956

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST

Program: OFFICE OF WILDLIFE

Activity: All

Objective: All

Strategy: All

<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Analysis:</u>
x		Cost/benefit analysis conducted
x		SWOT analysis conducted
x		Financial or performance audit used
x		Benchmarking for best 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
		<u>Authorization for Goals:</u>
x		Authorization exists
		Authorization needed
		<u>Organizational Capacity:</u>
x		Needed structural or procedural changes identified
x		Resource needs identified
x		Strategies developed to implement needed change
x		Responsibility assigned
		<u>Time Frame:</u>
x		Already ongoing
	x	Lifetime of strategy identified
		<u>Fiscal Impact:</u>
x		Impact on operating budget
x		Impact on capital outlay budget
x		Means of finance identified
x		Return on investment determined to be favorable

OFFICE OF FISHERIES
(514)

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: FISHERIES - Fisheries Resource Management

Objective: Reduce the spread of aquatic nuisance species (ANS) and enhance fishing opportunities.

Indicator Name: Number of acres treated to control undesirable aquatic vegetation -
PI Code 4090

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?

Aquatic vegetation shall be controlled so as to provide boating access for fishing and hunting interests. It shall be the policy of the Department to eradicate, if possible, or control those plants designated under Federal and State statutes as invasive and exotic noxious species. The control rather than elimination of problematic native species shall be advocated, as these plants are part of and provide benefit to our natural aquatic ecosystem.

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 to determine the effort necessary to maintain boating access in water bodies with nuisance aquatic vegetation problems. The number of acres treated will be used to determine the number of employees needed and the budget for the plant control 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.

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?

Yes, this indicator was evaluated by the Legislative Auditor's Performance Audit section in 2012. This indicator was deemed to be relevant. Reliability was not assessed because at that time, this indicator was not deemed a key performance indicator. Currently, staff track the indicator and the information is entered into a data management system.

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 acres treated to control aquatic nuisance vegetation is entered into the Data Management System (DMS). Data is entered into the system on a daily basis.

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

The indicator is the sum of acres treated statewide.

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 and is the sum of acres treated by nine Inland Fisheries districts. The number of acres can be broken down by district, water body, parish, and/or crew.

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

If the number of acres treated decreases from one year to the next, this could be a result of a decrease in vegetation coverage and not a decrease in effort.

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.

Kristi Butler, Inland Fisheries Biologist Director, (225) 765-2331, kbutler@wlf.la.gov.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: FISHERIES – Fisheries Resource Management

Objective: Reduce the spread of aquatic nuisance species (ANS) and enhance fishing opportunities.

Indicator Name: Number of fish stocked - PI Code 15237

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, general.

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

The fish hatchery program provides and stocks fish as a management tool to enhance statewide sport fisheries, hasten the recovery of fisheries affected by natural or man-made disasters, and produce threatened or endangered species when necessary. The hatchery program also assists other local, state and federal agencies by providing fish and/or fish transportation services for outreach activities that introduce or encourage fishing.

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 used to monitor the effectiveness of this activity in meeting objective goals.

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?

No. Information for this indicator is entered and tracked in a data management system. The number of fish stocked is entered following every stocking event.

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?

Estimates are made for each load of fish being stocked. A sample of fish is used to determine a number of fish per weight then that number is multiplied by the total weight of the load. The estimate numbers for each load are summed to get a number of fish stocked per quarter.

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 – Yes it can be broken down by parish or region

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.

Kristi Butler, Inland Fisheries Biologist Director, (225) 765-2331, kbutler@wlf.la.gov.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: FISHERIES - Fisheries Resource Management

Objective: Collect, analyze, and distribute data to guide effective fisheries management.

Indicator Name: Number of scheduled saltwater finfish samples - PI Code 25190

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, general.

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 resource management and contributes to the overall goal of maintaining sustainable populations and increasing the opportunities for the public. Results of the samples are used to monitor stock status, ensuring health of renewable resources.

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 used to monitor the effectiveness of this activity in meeting objective goals.

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?

No. Staff track the indicator and the information is based on the sampling schedule utilized by staff on a daily basis.

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 by fisheries staff throughout the fiscal year and is reported annually.

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

Numeric goals are set annually for finfish samples. Actual samples completed are reported from field offices and staff on a monthly basis for monitoring purposes, and compiled 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?

Aggregated

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

The indicator can be impacted by uncontrollable, external factors such as climatic events and manmade or natural disasters. Bad weather (e.g. prolonged periods of high winds, tropical events, etc.) could impact the ability to collect scheduled samples. Such factors could reduce the percentage of samples collected.

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.

Christian Winslow, Marine Fisheries Biologist Director, (985) 847-2426, cwinslow@wlf.la.gov.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: FISHERIES - Fisheries Resource Management

Objective: Collect, analyze, and distribute data to guide effective fisheries management.

Indicator Name: Number of scheduled freshwater finfish samples -PI Code 25191

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, general

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

For inland water bodies, fisheries personnel estimated relative abundance, age, growth and mortality, size class structure and species composition, and genetics of sport fish populations and physiochemical characteristics of the water on 81 lakes, rivers and streams. All waters are sampled using standardized methods so data from the different water bodies is comparable from year to year.

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 used to monitor the effectiveness of this activity in meeting objective goals

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?

No. Staff track the indicator and the information is based on the sampling schedule utilized by staff on a daily basis.

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 is entered into the Data Management System (DMS). Information is collected from various gear types year round.

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

Sum of samples collected from all gear types.

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.

Kristi Butler, Inland Fisheries Biologist Director, (225) 765-2331, kbutler@wlf.la.gov.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: FISHERIES - Fisheries Resource Management

Objective: Collect, analyze, and distribute data to guide effective fisheries management.

Indicator Name: Number of scheduled shellfish samples - PI Code 25192

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, general.

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 resource management and contributes to the overall goal of maintaining sustainable populations and increasing the opportunities for the public. Results of the samples are used to monitor stock status, ensuring health of renewable resources.

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 used to monitor the effectiveness of this activity in meeting objective goals

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?

No. Staff track the indicator and the information is based on the sampling schedule utilized by staff on a daily basis.

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 by fisheries staff throughout the fiscal year and is reported annually.

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

Numeric goals are set annually for finfish samples. Actual samples completed are reported from field offices and staff on a monthly basis for monitoring purposes, and compiled 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?

Aggregated

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

The indicator can be impacted by uncontrollable, external factors such as climatic events and manmade or natural disasters. Bad weather (e.g. prolonged periods of high winds, tropical events, etc.) could impact the ability to collect scheduled samples. Such factors could reduce the percentage of samples collected.

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.

Christian Winslow, Marine Fisheries Biologist Director, (985) 847-2426, cwinslow@wlf.la.gov.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: FISHERIES - Fisheries Resource Management

Objective: Collect, analyze, and distribute data to guide effective fisheries management.

Indicator Name: Number of scheduled oyster samples - PI Code 25193

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, general.

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 resource management and contributes to the overall goal of maintaining sustainable populations and increasing the opportunities for the public. Results of the samples are used to monitor stock status, ensuring health of renewable resources.

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 used to monitor the effectiveness of this activity in meeting objective goals.

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?

No. Staff track the indicator and the information is based on the sampling schedule utilized by staff on a daily basis.

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 by fisheries staff throughout the fiscal year and is reported annually.

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

Numeric goals are set annually for finfish samples. Actual samples completed are reported from field offices and staff on a monthly basis for monitoring purposes, and compiled 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?

Aggregated

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

The indicator can be impacted by uncontrollable, external factors such as climatic events and manmade or natural disasters. Bad weather (e.g. prolonged periods of high winds, tropical events, etc.) could impact the ability to collect scheduled samples. Such factors could reduce the percentage of samples collected.

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.

Christian Winslow, Marine Fisheries Biologist Director, (985) 847-2426, cwinslow@wlf.la.gov.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: FISHERIES - Fisheries Resource Management

Objective: Collect, analyze, and distribute data to guide effective fisheries management.

Indicator Name: Percentage of state mandated stock assessments completed annually – PI Code 26490

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, key

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

Completed stock assessments are used to measure and evaluate the health of fish stocks statewide to ensure sustainable populations and estimate effects of regulatory changes.

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?

Stock assessments are used to evaluate the status of the fisheries through the monitoring of trends and evaluating the benefits of regulations. Stock assessments can inform future fisheries management actions including future sampling, analysis and development of recommendations to renovate and enhance fish populations.

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?

No. This indicator is based on the number of legislatively mandated stock assessments. Staff report the number of reports completed 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)?

The percentage of stock assessments completed annually (some stock assessments are mandated annually, others every five years).

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

The percentage of stock assessments completed that are mandated to be completed that 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?

This indicator is aggregated within the Stock Assessment Office within the Fisheries Research and Assessment Section.

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.

Andy Fischer, Research and Assessment Biologist Director, (225) 765-5020, afischer@wlf.la.gov.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: FISHERIES – Fisheries Extension

Objective: Promote public interest and awareness of and provide access to aquatic resources.

Indicator Name: National ranking in recreational marine finfishing (# days fished) - PI Code 13289

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.

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

Recreational fishing activity can be an indicator of how many marine fin-fishing trips are taken in comparison to 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?

Internal management. Low levels of fishing activity in comparison to other states can alert LDWF that there is a problem with the resource and indicate the need to review management measures.

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?

No. This information is reported directly by Federal recreational landings 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)?

LDWF and Federal recreational landings data

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

Recreational effort is summed and directly compared to that of other states.

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)?

Seasonal variants and natural events can impact participation beyond the influence of 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.

Jason Duet, Fisheries Extension Biologist Director, (225) 765-2333, jduet@wlf.la.gov.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: FISHERIES – Fisheries Extension

Objective: Promote public interest and awareness of and provide access to aquatic resources.

Indicator Name: National ranking in commercial marine shellfish landings - PI Code 13285

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.

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 an indirect measure of how effectively LDWF is managing the resource. Commercial industry fishing activity can be an indicator of how abundant and economically viable a fishery is in comparison to 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?

Internal management. Low levels of fishing activity in comparison to other states can alert LDWF that there is a problem with the resource and indicate the need to review management measures.

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?

No. This information is reported directly by Federal commercial landings 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)?

LDWF and Federal commercial landings data

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

Commercial shellfish landings are summed and directly compared to landings of other states.

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)?

Seasonal variants and natural events can impact participation beyond the influence of 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.

Jason Duet, Fisheries Extension Biologist Director, (225) 765-2333, jduet@wlf.la.gov.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: FISHERIES – Fisheries Extension

Objective: Promote public interest and awareness of and provide access to aquatic resources.

Indicator Name: National ranking in commercial marine finfish landings - PI Code 13287

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.

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 an indirect measure of how effectively LDWF is managing the resource. Commercial industry fishing activity can be an indicator of how abundant and economically viable a fishery is in comparison to 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?

Internal management. Low levels of fishing activity in comparison to other states can alert LDWF that there is a problem with the resource and indicate the need to review management measures.

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?

No. This information is reported directly by Federal commercial landings 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)?

LDWF and Federal commercial landings data

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

Commercial finfish landings are summed and directly compared to landings of other states.

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)?

Seasonal variants and natural events can impact participation beyond the influence of 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.

Jason Duet, Fisheries Extension Biologist Director, (225) 765-2333, jduet@wlf.la.gov.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: FISHERIES – Fisheries Extension

Objective: Promote public interest and awareness of and provide access to aquatic resources.

Indicator Name: Number of licensed commercial fishers - PI Code 21378

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.

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 an indirect measure of how effectively LDWF is managing the resource. Commercial license sales can be an indicator of how abundant and economically viable a fishery is.

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. Low levels of license sales can alert LDWF that there is a problem with the resource and indicate the need to review management measures.

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?

No. The information is reported directly from the LDWF Licensing database that is monitored and managed by 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)?

LDWF licensing database

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

Direct sum of the number of commercial fishing licenses sold

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)?

Seasonal variants and natural events can impact participation beyond the influence of 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.

Jason Duet, Fisheries Extension Biologist Director, (225) 765-2333, jduet@wlf.la.gov.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: FISHERIES – Fisheries Extension

Objective: Promote public interest and awareness of and provide access to aquatic resources.

Indicator Name: Number of licensed saltwater recreational fishers - PI Code 21379

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.

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 an indirect measure of how effectively LDWF is managing the resource. Recreational license sales can be an indicator of how abundant and economically viable a fishery is.

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. Low levels of license sales can alert LDWF that there is a problem with the resource and indicate the need to review management measures.

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?

No. The information is reported directly from the LDWF Licensing database that is monitored and managed by 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)?

LDWF licensing database

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

Direct sum of the number of saltwater recreational fishing licenses sold

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)?

Seasonal variants and natural events can impact participation beyond the influence of 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.

Jason Duet, Fisheries Extension Biologist Director, (225) 765-2333, jduet@wlf.la.gov

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: FISHERIES – Fisheries Extension

Objective: Promote public interest and awareness of and provide access to aquatic resources.

Indicator Name: Number of Certified Fishing Licenses - PI Code 25194

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.

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 public participation in recreational fishing. The level of participation indicates that the public is aware of the resource, interested in the resource and that the resource is available for use.

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 creates an index to validate or scrutinize the success of fisheries management efforts, public access availability and outreach efforts.

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?

No, 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 certified recreational fishing license holders. This information is provided to and validated by the Federal United States Fish and Wildlife Service each year.

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

The indicator is calculated by adding the number of various recreational fishing licenses within a license 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)?

Seasonal variants, natural events, and budgetary constraints can impact participation beyond the influence 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.

Melissa Longman, Biologist DCL B, (225) 765-2343, mlongman@wlf.la.gov.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: FISHERIES – Fisheries Extension

Objective: Promote public interest and awareness of and provide access to aquatic resources.

Indicator Name: Number of individuals reached at events through direct communications – PI Code 26482

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?

To determine the number of individuals staff educate and make aware of aquatic resources 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?

This indicator could potentially determine whether there needs to be a greater effort in reaching more Louisiana residents. This will likely 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.

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. Time and activity reports are kept for each event as well as a spreadsheet with the number of event 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)?

Data is collected by staff and volunteers at events by determining the number of individuals they came in contact with at the event.

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

Sum of attendance from each event.

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 number is reported as a whole, statewide, but has the ability to be broken down by parish.

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

Some of the numbers reported are estimates based on approximate number of individuals staff had direct communications with at an event.

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.

Jason Duet, Fisheries Extension Biologist Director, (225) 765-2333, jduet@wlf.la.gov.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: FISHERIES – Fisheries Extension

Objective: Promote public interest and awareness of and provide access to aquatic resources.

Indicator Name: Number of boating and fishing access sites selected annually – PI Code 26493

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, general.

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

The indicator was selected to provide information regarding the number of boating and fishing access sites selected for funding each year. It helps measure the level of new or improved public access opportunities available 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?

The indicator will be used to provide trend data regarding the number of projects that were selected each year. The reason for any decline or increase would most likely be based on the amount of money that was available for public access projects each year or outreach efforts regarding the 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.

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?

No, the indicator is a direct count of the number of projects selected for funding 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)?

Data are stored in a spreadsheet and reported annually.

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

The indicator is a direct count of the number of projects selected for funding 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?

The indicator is aggregated and can be broken down by region/parish if necessary.

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

The indicator is limited by available funding and interested partners.

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.

Melissa Longman, Biologist DCL B, (225) 765-2343, mlongman@wlf.la.gov.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: FISHERIES – Fisheries Extension

Objective: Promote public interest and awareness of and provide access to aquatic resources.

Indicator Name: Number of pounds of fish stocked through the Community Fishing Program - PI Code 26491

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?

In order to continue to provide easy access to quality fishing, stocking of the community fishing sites is required. It continues to provide access to aquatic resources.

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 number of pounds of fish stocked may vary depending on budgeting purposes or availability of fish.

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.

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. A purchase order is created for each stocking event leaving a record of when fish were purchased and stocked.

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)?

Number of pounds of stocked is recorded after each stocking event and reported quarterly.

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

Sum of number of pounds of fish stocked.

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?

Statewide figure that can be broken down by parish/region.

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

There is a potential that not all sites will be stocked during each stocking event due to pond issues, lack of fishing activity, or 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.

Jason Duet, Fisheries Extension Biologist Director, (225) 765-2333, jduet@wlf.la.gov.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: FISHERIES – Fisheries Extension

Objective: Support a sustainable and economically viable fisheries environment.

Indicator Name: Number of state managed fisheries closed due to overharvesting -
PI Code 25181

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 resource management and contributes to the overall goal of maintaining sustainable populations and increasing the opportunities for 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?

It is used to monitor the effectiveness of this activity in meeting objective goals.

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?

No. This is a direct count of the number of fisheries closed due to overharvesting.

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 will be reported annually based on data collected through the Office of Fisheries monitoring program.

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

Through standardized fishery independent and dependent data collection.

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)?

Managed fisheries can be impacted by climatic events as well as manmade or natural disasters.

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.

Christian Winslow, Marine Fisheries Biologist Director, (985) 847-2426, cwinslow@wlf.la.gov.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DOCUMENTATION

Program: FISHERIES – Fisheries Extension

Objective: Support a sustainable and economically viable fisheries environment.

Indicator Name: Number of commercial fishing trips - PI Code 21377

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.

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 an indirect measure of how effectively LDWF is managing the resource. Commercial industry fishing activity can be an indicator of how abundant and economically viable a fishery is.

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. Low levels of fishing activity can alert LDWF that there is a problem with the resource and indicate the need to review management measures.

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?

No. This information is reported from the LDWF trip ticket database that is reviewed for QA/QC following data entry.

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)?

LDWF trip ticket database. Reported annually.

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

Direct sum of the number of vessel trips reported on trip tickets

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)?

Seasonal variants and natural events can impact participation beyond the influence of 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.

Jason Duet, Fisheries Extension Biologist Director, (225) 765-2333, jduet@wlf.la.gov.

STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST

Program: **OFFICE OF FISHERIES**

Activity: **All**

Objective: **All**

Strategy: **All**

<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Analysis:</u>
	x	Cost/benefit analysis conducted
	x	SWOT 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
		<u>Authorization for Goals:</u>
x		Authorization exists
		Authorization needed
		<u>Organization Capacity:</u>
x		Needed structural or procedural changes identified
x		Resource needs identified
x		Strategies developed to implement needed change
x		Responsibility assigned
		<u>Time Frame:</u>
x		Already ongoing
	x	Lifetime of strategy identified
		<u>Fiscal Impact:</u>
	x	Impact on operating budget
	x	Impact on capital outlay budget
	x	Means of Finance identified
	x	Return on investment determined to be favorable