


FISH and WILDLIFE, DEPARTMENT of
Annual Performance Progress Report (APPR) for Fiscal Year (2012-2013)

Original Submission Date: 2013

Finalize Date:

2012-2013 KPM #	2012-2013 Approved Key Performance Measures (KPMs)
1	Hunting License Purchases - Percent of the license buying population with hunting licenses and/or tags
2	Angling License Purchases - Percent of the license buying population with angling licenses and/or tags.
3	Wildlife Damage - Number of wildlife damage complaints addressed annually.
4	Oregon Species of Concern - Percent of fish species of concern (listed as threatened, endangered, or sensitive) being monitored
5	Oregon Species of Concern Percent of wildlife species of concern (listed as threatened, endangered, or sensitive) being monitored.
6	Decreasing the Number of Unscreened Water Diversions - Number of unscreened priority water diversions.
7	Customer Service - Percent of customers rating their overall satisfaction with the agency above average or excellent. Percent of customers rating their satisfaction with the agency's customer service as "good" or "excellent" for timeliness, accuracy, helpfulness, expertise and availability of information.
8	Boards and Commissions - Percent of total best practices met by the Department of Fish and Wildlife, State Fish and Wildlife Commission.

FISH and WILDLIFE, DEPARTMENT of		I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	
Agency Mission: To protect and enhance Oregon's fish and wildlife and their habitats for use and enjoyment by present and future generations.			
Contact: W. Aaron Jenkins, Economist		Contact Phone: 503.947.6158	
Alternate: Cameron Smith		Alternate Phone: 503-947-6160	



1. SCOPE OF REPORT

Most general programs or activities are considered directly or indirectly by agency performance measures (KPMs), including: fish management, game management, hatchery production, marine resources, screens and passage, wildlife diversity, wildlife damage, habitat. For a comprehensive account of ODFW accomplishments and activities, the agency web page should be reviewed at <http://www.dfw.state.or.us>.

Rulemaking and administrative services, such as accounting, contracting, licensing and budget, are not directly addressed under the agency's KPMs.

2. THE OREGON CONTEXT

Oregon's societal needs or desired outcomes are stated in the agency's mission statement: "To protect and enhance Oregon's fish and wildlife and their habitats for the use and enjoyment of present and future generations."

There are several benchmarks that relate to the agency's mission. Benchmarks related to conservation include those linked to species at risk, such as Benchmarks 86, 87, and 88. Benchmarks related to state and local economies include those linked to income and employment such as Benchmarks 1, 4 and 11. The agency works with a wide range of partners including state agencies, local governments, businesses and non-governmental partners. Benchmarks can be accessed at <http://benchmarks.oregon.gov>.

3. PERFORMANCE SUMMARY

ODFW implements programs that influence the Oregon Benchmarks and Key Performance Measures (KPMs). The 2011 Legislature deleted three KPMs. With those changes, ODFW currently has eight Key Performance Measures. One of those (Customer Service Survey - KPM 7) is reported on even-numbered years and thus was not updated for this report. The Performance Summary pie chart includes KPM 7, whose target was met in 2011. The agency is meeting or exceeding targets for 43% (3 of 7) of its KPMs reported during this period. Another 43% (3 of 7) of its KPMs are slightly below target, while the remaining 14% (1 of 7) fall below targeted levels. The agency is interested in updating its KPMs as metrics are further developed under the Governor's 10-year Plan for Oregon.

4. CHALLENGES

The agency faces challenges to the management of fish and wildlife and their habitats in the context of a changing environment. There are a number of factors that affect the agency's ability to meet its targets. These factors include changing climate conditions, natural species population variability, habitat loss, water use, and increasing human population and development pressures. These external and environmental factors are largely out of the agency's control.

5. RESOURCES AND EFFICIENCY


The Agency Requested Budget for ODFW for 2013-15 is \$320 Million. ODFW has undertaken a variety of new projects related to Oregon's fish and wildlife resources, improving efficiency, and providing enhanced customer service.

Examples of these efforts include:

- the Mule Deer Initiative and Black Tail Deer Initiative,
- an automated landowner notification system for the wolf program,
- gaining administrative and program efficiencies through process improvement using Lean methods,
- controlling costs through a headquarters building acquisition,
- new approaches for tag sale deadline and reinstatement of preference points,

- restructure/reorganization of commercial fishery regulations,
- continued expansion of social media such Twitter; RSS; Google Maps; Facebook; YouTube Videos;
- updated Oregon Hunting Access Map with range info on upland game birds,
- introduction of video streaming of Commission meetings,
- roll out of the first state program nationally to allow hunter education students to register with Point of System agents or online for courses,
- cell and smart phone updates on closures, harvest limits, or other fishing regulation changes.
- addition of Quick Response (QR) codes to the Oregon Sport Fishing Regulations that provide a direct link to information.

KPM #1	Hunting License Purchases - Percent of the license buying population with hunting licenses and/or tags	2000
Goal	Hunting license purchases are directly related to the agency mission: "To protect and enhance Oregon's fish and wildlife and their habitats for use and enjoyment by present and future generations."	
Oregon Context	License purchases are an indicator of participation in hunting activities.	
Data Source	ODFW license database and Portland State University Population Research Center Population Report	
Owner	ODFW, Information and Education Division, Aaron Jenkins, (503) 947-6158	



1. OUR STRATEGY

The agency maintains game population levels to satisfy goals related to wildlife conservation and recreational opportunities. To help meet this goal, cooperative activities of the Access and Habitat Program are focused on improving habitat quality and access to private lands to provide hunting opportunities for the public.

2. ABOUT THE TARGETS

The original targets for this KPM anticipated growth in participation. In 2005, the target was set at at 10% of the state resident population with hunting licenses or tags.

3. HOW WE ARE DOING

When measured in proportion to the growing state population, participation in hunting is declining in Oregon. Since 2000, the participation rate for hunting has declined from 11.4% to 8.5% of the State population ages 12 to 69. The hunting participation rate has been stable the last three years, but remains below the 10% target level.

4. HOW WE COMPARE

Similar trends have been observed on a national and regional basis. Adjacent states such as California and Washington have exhibited similar or greater declines during the last decade.

5. FACTORS AFFECTING RESULTS

Many social factors affect the level of participation, such as tastes and preferences and state population demographics. Causes of the variance in participation may include but are not limited to: (1) state population increases are greater in urban than rural areas (rural residents are more likely to hunt), (2) hunter population is aging out of the sport, (3) prices increases in hunting licenses and tags in 2004 and 2010, and (4) societal tastes and preferences are changing to favor other forms of recreation. Participation is also influenced by the quality and quantity of hunting opportunity. Populations of some game species have declined due to a variety of factors, such as: (1) landscape scale changes in habitat such as increased control of wildfires and reduced timber harvest on federal lands resulting in less early seral stage habitat, (2) invasive species such as cheatgrass and medusahead outcompeting/replacing native species that provided better forage for wildlife, (3) increased predation resulting from increased protection of bears and cougars, and now the return of wolves, (4) increased human population and development means less habitat for wildlife, particularly lower elevation winter range, (5) increased disease issues including two old world louse species causing deer hair loss in western and more recently eastern Oregon. Reduced opportunity due to fewer available animals also contributes to the social factors because limited number of hunting tags means some hunters are not able to hunt their accustomed areas each year which may reduce interest in the sport and affect family hunting traditions.


6. WHAT NEEDS TO BE DONE

The agency continues to work to set game species levels to satisfy statewide goals related to wildlife conservation and recreational opportunities. Within biological constraints, the agency also seeks to improve the quality of hunting experiences according to hunter preferences. The agency must continue the Access and Habitat Program, a cooperative program between landowners, hunters, and ODFW aimed at increasing the amount and quality of wildlife habitat, and increasing hunter access to private lands. The agency will also continue its efforts to recruit new hunters and to retain existing participants through outreach, education, marketing, as well as improving license offerings and the license buying process.

7. ABOUT THE DATA

Data are reported by calendar year. The license data are from the ODFW license database annual reports. Population data are from the Portland State University Population Research Center Annual Population Report and Tables.

KPM #2	Angling License Purchases - Percent of the license buying population with angling licenses and/or tags.	2000
Goal	Angling license purchases are directly related to the ODFW mission, "To protect and enhance Oregon's fish and wildlife and their habitats for use and enjoyment by present and future generations."	
Oregon Context	License purchases are an indicator of participation in angling activities.	
Data Source	ODFW license database and Portland State University Population Research Center Population Report	
Owner	ODFW, Information and Education Division, Aaron Jenkins, (503) 947-6158	



1. OUR STRATEGY

The agency maintains and enhances fish population levels to satisfy goals related to conservation and recreational opportunities. To help meet this end, hatcheries are utilized for stocking of anadromous species and trout.

2. ABOUT THE TARGETS

The original angler participation targets anticipated growth. In 2005, the target was fixed at 21.4% of the state resident population.

3. HOW WE ARE DOING

When measured in proportion to growing state population, participation in angling in Oregon is declining. Since 2000, the participation rate for angling has declined from 21.7% to 17.4% in 2012 of the state population ages 14 to 69. However, the decline in the total number of anglers has been more stable through time, showing a decline of 9% since 2000. Angling participation rates have been basically flat over the last three years, but remain below the target level of 21.4%.

4. HOW WE COMPARE

Similar trends have been observed on a national and regional basis. California and western U.S. states in general have exhibited similar declines in angling license sales during the last decade.

5. FACTORS AFFECTING RESULTS

Many social factors affect the level of angling participation, such as preferences and state population demographics. Causes of the variance in participation may include but are not limited to: (1) state population increases are greater in urban than rural areas (rural residents are more likely to fish), (2) price increases in angling licenses and tags in 2004 and 2010, and (3) societal tastes and preferences are changing to favor other forms of recreation. In addition, in a national study of recreational fishing by American Sportfishing Association, survey respondents indicated that "not enough time", "takes time away from family", and "health/age" are the main reasons why fishing is not longer a top activity for many people. Participation is also affected by the quality and quantity of fishing opportunities. A key driver for these are fish abundances, but there are many other factors, such as the weather and public access.

6. WHAT NEEDS TO BE DONE


The agency will continue to maintain and enhance game fish species at levels needed to satisfy the statewide goals related to conservation and recreational opportunities. Within biological constraints, the agency also seeks to improve the quality of angling experiences by considering angler preferences and improving angler access (ODFW's Restoration and Enhancement Program). The agency will also continue its efforts to recruit new participants and retain existing participants through education, outreach, and marketing efforts, as well as by improving license offerings and the license buying process.

7. ABOUT THE DATA

Data are reported by calendar year. The license data are from the ODFW license database annual reports. Population data are from the Portland State University Population

Research Center Annual Population Report and Tables.

KPM #3	Wildlife Damage - Number of wildlife damage complaints addressed annually.	2000
Goal	To reduce wildlife damage and associated complaints.	
Oregon Context	To reduce negative impacts on livestock ranches and private property.	
Data Source	ODFW, Wildlife Division damage complaint database	
Owner	ODFW, Wildlife Division, Eric Rickerson (503) 947-6311, Tom Thornton (503) 947-6310	



1. OUR STRATEGY

The agency seeks to decrease levels of wildlife damage while maintaining wildlife population levels that satisfy goals associated with both conservation and recreational opportunities such as hunting and wildlife viewing.

2. ABOUT THE TARGETS

Lower numbers of damage complaints allow the reader to infer that damage issues are being addressed and cooperative solutions to wildlife damage complaints have been identified and are effective.

3. HOW WE ARE DOING

For the 2000-2012 period, the total number of complaints has varied from a high of 5,419 in 2001 to a low of 3,251 in 2012. Annual complaint numbers have tended to be lower in recent years (average of 4,067 for 2007-2012) relative to earlier years (average of 5026 for 2000-2006). The number of complaints has been below the target level for each of the last six years. While there may be a downward trend in complaints since 2000, environmental factors can cause the number of complaints to vary widely from year to year. For example, bear complaints increased from 365 in 2009 to 921 in 2010, then declined to 457 in 2011. Future reporting might concentrate on specific categories of damage for consistency, interpretation of variance, and trends.

4. HOW WE COMPARE

Since this is a state specific measure it is not possible to make comparisons to adjacent states.

5. FACTORS AFFECTING RESULTS

The population levels of wildlife causing damage relative to the location of residences, ranches and farms is a major factor, movement of people from urban to rural areas also creates conflicts as they move into areas historically inhabited by wildlife and create attractive nuisances such as gardens, ornamental plants, bird feeders and garbage. Changing land use/land cover can also cause conflicts, such as changing from pastures and forestry to nurseries and vineyards. Environmental factors can cause the number of complaints to vary widely from year to year, for example, (1) in dry years complaints of damage caused by deer and elk increase because animals move to agricultural lands, many of which are irrigated, (2) there is an increase in conflicts with bears reported during years when there are poor wild berry and acorn crops because the bear rely more on foods associated with humans, (3) years with distemper outbreaks result in increased raccoon and fox related complaints.


6. WHAT NEEDS TO BE DONE

ODFW personnel will continue working with landowners in both urban and rural areas to help address wildlife damage in a timely and cooperative manner.

7. ABOUT THE DATA

These data are reported by calendar year and include all wildlife-related complaints, including for bear, cougar, deer, elk, raccoons, coyotes, foxes, etc.

KPM #4	Oregon Species of Concern - Percent of fish species of concern (listed as threatened, endangered, or sensitive) being monitored	2005
Goal	The general goal of conserving threatened, endangered or sensitive fish and wildlife species.	
Oregon Context	Goal is linked to OBM 86-percent of monitored freshwater species not at risk	
Data Source	Oregon list of endangered, threatened and sensitive fish species	
Owner	ODFW, Fish Division, Shivonne Nesbit (503) 947-6253 and Michelle Weaver (503) 947-6254	



1. OUR STRATEGY

Monitoring of population trends and relationships between fish populations and environmental factors are the basis of future management decisions. The Oregon Conservation Strategy is related to these efforts and includes public, nonprofit and private partners.

2. ABOUT THE TARGETS

Targets provide expectations of steady increases in the proportion of populations monitored. This is a relatively new measure without historical context so the target is still being evaluated. The specific activities and goals associated with different monitoring efforts are not considered by the target. In addition, monitoring all species might not be the best use of limited agency resources, especially when there is a need for concentrated monitoring effort due to priorities or emergencies.

3. HOW WE ARE DOING

A relatively large proportion of fish species of concern are currently monitored by ODFW. The percent monitored was 85% in 2012, which is slightly below the targeted level of 90%. Collaborative projects where ODFW is not the lead entity conducting the monitoring are not included in this measure. Because of resource constraints there are uncertainties related to species' status. Variation in the types, timeframe, and purposes of monitoring efforts are not reflected in this measure. The level of certainty at the current level of monitoring is another factor that is not considered by this measure.

4. HOW WE COMPARE

Monitoring efforts in other states are likely to be similar, but each state's circumstances are different. This makes direct comparisons difficult.

5. FACTORS AFFECTING RESULTS

The actual level and types of data collected, timeframe, context of threats and species status are factors related to prioritization of monitoring efforts. Given these factors, the actual level of monitoring and dedicated resources could increase without an increase or an actual decrease in number of species monitored. In addition, when a species is removed from the list, which would be considered a positive development, that change can have the effect of lowering percentage of listed species being monitored.

6. WHAT NEEDS TO BE DONE

The agency will continue to seek funding sources that will allow for increased monitoring of these fish species.

7. ABOUT THE DATA


These data are provided by agency personnel from their knowledge of monitoring on an ongoing basis. Lists of threatened and endangered species are updated every five years and are due for update in 2013-14. The lists can be found at:

http://www.dfw.state.or.us/wildlife/diversity/species/threatened_endangered_candidate_list.asp

Lists of sensitive species can be found at:

http://www.dfw.state.or.us/wildlife/diversity/species/sensitive_species.asp

KPM #5	Oregon Species of Concern Percent of wildlife species of concern (listed as threatened, endangered, or sensitive) being monitored.	2005
Goal	The general goal of conserving threatened, endangered or sensitive fish and wildlife species.	
Oregon Context	Goal linked to OBM 88-percent of monitored terrestrial species not at risk.	
Data Source	Oregon list of endangered, threatened and sensitive species	
Owner	ODFW, Wildlife Division, Eric Rickerson (503) 947-6311 and Martin Nugent (503) 947-6309	



1. OUR STRATEGY

Monitoring of population trends and relationships between wildlife populations and environmental factors are the basis of future management decisions. The Oregon Conservation Strategy is related to these efforts and includes public, nonprofit and private partners.

2. ABOUT THE TARGETS

Targets provide expectations of an increase in the proportion of populations monitored. This is a relatively new measure without historical context, so the target is still being evaluated. The activities and goals associated with different monitoring efforts are not considered by the target. In addition, monitoring all species might not be the best use of limited agency resources, especially when there is a need for concentrated effort due to priorities or emergencies.

3. HOW WE ARE DOING

The percent of wildlife species of concern being monitored was 52% in 2012. The level has been 52% the last three years, all of which are above the target levels. The actual activities such as the associated types of monitoring, timeframe and purpose of monitoring are additional factors not addressed by this measure. Because of resource constraints there are uncertainties related to species' status. The level of certainty at the current level of monitoring is another factor that is not considered by this measure.

4. HOW WE COMPARE

Monitoring efforts in other states are likely to be similar, but each state's circumstances are different. This makes direct comparisons difficult.

5. FACTORS AFFECTING RESULTS

The actual level and types of data collected, timeframe, context of threats and species status are factors related to prioritization of monitoring efforts. Given these factors, the actual level of monitoring and dedicated resources could increase without an increase or an actual decrease in number of species monitored. A number of species are monitored by ODFW's partner agencies and nongovernmental conservation organizations.

6. WHAT NEEDS TO BE DONE

The agency will continue to seek funding sources that will allow for increased monitoring of these wildlife species.

7. ABOUT THE DATA


These data are provided by agency personnel from their knowledge of monitoring on an ongoing basis. The lists of threatened and endangered species has been updated in 2013 and the list of sensitive species will be updated in 2014. These lists can be found at:

http://www.dfw.state.or.us/wildlife/diversity/species/threatened_endangered_candidate_list.asp

Lists of sensitive species can be found at:

http://www.dfw.state.or.us/wildlife/diversity/species/sensitive_species.asp

KPM #6	Decreasing the Number of Unscreened Water Diversions - Number of unscreened priority water diversions.	2000
Goal	Improving survival of migrating salmon and steelhead and other fish inhabiting adjacent areas	
Oregon Context	Reducing the mortality of fish caused by entering irrigation diversions, linked to OBM 86, percent of freshwater species not at risk	
Data Source	Fish Screening and Passage Program database and annual report	
Owner	ODFW, Fish Division, Fish Screening and Passage Program, Alan Ritchey (503) 947-6229 and Pete Baki (503) 947-6217	



1. OUR STRATEGY

The measure is linked to the goal of improving survival rates of migrating salmon and steelhead, and improving fish habitat by decreasing the number of unscreened priority water diversions. Reducing the number of unscreened diversions will decrease fish mortality, which should contribute directly to freshwater fish population health.

2. ABOUT THE TARGETS

The target for this KPM is the number of unscreened diversions to decrease over time, as diversions are screened.

3. HOW WE ARE DOING

The target was met in 2012 by having reduced the number of unscreened priority water diversions to 1,774. The targeted number of unscreened priority water diversions has been exceeded in each of the last seven years.

4. HOW WE COMPARE

Screening efforts in other western states are likely to be similar but not directly comparable to Oregon given their unique water withdrawals and the number of waterways affected.

5. FACTORS AFFECTING RESULTS

Relevant factors influencing results include the available funds for screen installation as well as the cooperation of landowners and water rights holders.

6. WHAT NEEDS TO BE DONE

ODFW will continue to develop cooperative relationships with landowners and other entities and to seek funding for these efforts. The department has concluded the statutorily required five-year review of prioritization of fish passage. This prioritization data will allow the future selection of passage projects to be based more closely on specific criteria related to fish habitat.

7. ABOUT THE DATA

Data are reported by calendar year from records of the screens and passage program.

KPM #7	Customer Service - Percent of customers rating their overall satisfaction with the agency above average or excellent. Percent of customers rating their satisfaction with the agency's customer service as "good" or "excellent" for timeliness, accuracy, helpfulness, expertise and availability of information.	2006
Goal	To provide greater accountability and results from government by delivering service that satisfies customers .	
Oregon Context	To maintain and improve the following category ratings of agency service : overall quality of services, timeliness, accuracy, helpfulness, expertise and availability of information.	
Data Source	ODFW survey of commercial license holders, people filing wildlife damage reports, landowner preference program participants, and recreational licenseholders who purchased at ODFW offices . Conducted every two years on even-numbered years (e.g., 2010, 2012).	
Owner	ODFW Information and Education Division, Aaron Jenkins (503) 947-6158	



1. OUR STRATEGY

The groups sampled in this survey are diverse, both with respect to interests and needs. The general strategy is to utilize feedback to address cited problems and improve the

general level of service to ODFW customers.

2. ABOUT THE TARGETS

We have set a target slightly over our current performance levels in order to establish a goal for improvement of customer service. The results for all six measures are presented in the graph.

3. HOW WE ARE DOING

Satisfaction with the agency's customer service as "good" or "excellent" ranged from 84.0% to 90.8% for the six categories in 2012. Customer satisfaction levels reported this year (2012) are similar to those in 2006 and 2008. The mail survey method was used in each of those three years. In 2010, an online survey format was used, where customers completed surveys in response to postcards directing them to a website. The response rate was only 14.8% for the 2010 online survey, while the rate was 24% for the 2012 mail survey. Under both survey methods, the category "Availability of Information" continues to be the lowest ranked in the survey results, so improvement is needed here. "Helpfulness" continues to be the highest ranked category.

4. HOW WE COMPARE

ODFW's customer satisfaction numbers are on par with most other agencies. Each agency faces a unique situation in serving its customers, with varying workloads and complexity of transactions.

5. FACTORS AFFECTING RESULTS

The response rate may have been in lower in 2012 than in 2006 and 2008 because a one-piece mailer was used instead of a package of cover letter and postcard inside an envelope (as done in 2006 and 2008). However, overall response rates to mail surveys has been on the decline in recent years. A somewhat lower response rate is not expected to bias the results, as a sufficient number of surveys were returned to reach a margin of error of +/-5% at the 95% confidence level. The online survey format used in 2010 likely attracted more of the respondents who were particularly unhappy with ODFW service and management because the method required slightly more effort on the part of the customer than the mail survey. Discontent could have been a motivation for completing the 2010 survey. In addition, there was not a safeguard against customers filling out more than one online survey. For these reasons, the agency reverted to a doing a mail survey in 2012.

6. WHAT NEEDS TO BE DONE

Specific feedback will be further reviewed to improve services. One specific area to improve is information availability. ODFW continued to improve information provision in 2012 through updating the department website, growing presence in Twitter and Facebook, online hunter education course registration, and an additional online map for trout stocking in 50 Places to Fish near Medford. The department changed rules for free fishing weekend in order to align it with the Oregon Department of Parks and Recreation's free camping weekend. In 2013, the department expanded the number of fishing locations described in the "Easy Angling Oregon" publication by 2.5 times and substantially increased the


availability of hunter education classes just before the fall hunting season. The department will also be introducing a new fishing map mobile application ("app") in 2014. The fishing application will allow customers to search for fishing regulations by geographic area.

7. ABOUT THE DATA

The agency plans to collect these data every two years.

- a) Survey name: "ODFW Customer Service Survey"
- b) Surveyor: Conducted by ODFW staff
- c) Date conducted: Mailed on July 18, 2012 with all surveys received by September 24, 2012;
- d) Sampling frame: The sample frame was restricted to resident customers that had service (i.e., had contact with ODFW staff) during the 2011 calendar year. Customer addresses were obtained from ODFW databases for the following four populations,
 - (1) Commercial license holders (fishing permits, fishing license, and fur taker licenses)
 - (2) People who had filed wildlife damage or sighting reports
 - (3) Landowners enrolled in the Landowner Preference Program (LOP), and
 - (4) Sport license holders who made purchases through an ODFW office.
- e) Sampling procedure: Samples were selected in accordance with standard probability sampling formulae for a stratified random sampling design. Sampled customers were contacted via a single mailing that consisted of a mailer containing a cover letter and a detachable survey postcard.
- f) Sample characteristics: The target margin of error for this survey was ± 5 percentage points with 95% confidence level. The margin of error of 5% indicates that if 90% of the sample answered a certain way, then one can be "sure" that between 85% and 95% of the entire population would have answered that way (if they had been asked). The 95% confidence interval indicates that you are 95% sure that the true percentage of the population would answer within the margin of error (85% to 95% in this example). A potentially low response rate was anticipated and accommodated for by inflating the required sample sizes. 1520 surveys were returned for a response rate of 24.3%.
- g) Weighting: Each customer was given equal weight no matter which group they belonged to.

KPM #8	Boards and Commissions - Percent of total best practices met by the Department of Fish and Wildlife, State Fish and Wildlife Commission.	2007
Goal	To improve service and accountability to the public by evaluating commission adherence to best management practices .	
Oregon Context	Improve governance of bodies such as state boards and commissions.	
Data Source	Annual self-review of practices by commission members. Utilize feedback to take corrective actions and encourage commission members to take part in training sessions.	
Owner	ODFW, Information and Education Division, Aaron Jenkins, (503) 947-6158	



1. OUR STRATEGY

To assess current and develop future Commission activities according to best practices guidelines. The process will be used to clarify and communicate visions and ideas on the

“ideal” Commission practices and to evaluate opportunities to change processes to meet these goals.

2. ABOUT THE TARGETS

The target is set to reach 100% of the best practices identified in the survey.

3. HOW WE ARE DOING

The current performance level is slightly below the target set at 100%. For fiscal year 2012-13, Commissioners felt that 92% of the best practices were being met overall. Some members thought the Commission could be doing more in terms of being involved with review of the Annual Performance Progress Report (APPR), ODFW's key communications, and meeting with other governmental bodies. Efforts are underway to address some of these suggestions. In 2013, the Commission formalized criteria for the Director's annual performance evaluation and had an agenda item to review its KPM progress and Commission best practices.

4. HOW WE COMPARE

Other boards and commissions have practices that vary widely. The Environmental Quality Commission (representing Oregon DEQ) has reported 100%, 90%, and 82% of best practices met in the last three years.

5. FACTORS AFFECTING RESULTS

Many of the best practices are met by routine commission activities. Keeping on schedule for these activities will allow the Commission to continue to meet these practices.

6. WHAT NEEDS TO BE DONE

The self-assessment process allows the Commission to think about how its activities meet best practices standards. With this information in mind, improvements can be made where they are identified. In 2013, the Commission scheduled a review of its best practices as part of a regular agenda item during a public meeting. As part of that review, the Commission will be scheduling additional joint meetings, exploring electronic Commission packets, and other issues.

7. ABOUT THE DATA

The data are reported for fiscal year 2013. Commission members were asked to fill out a survey of 15 questions. All six commission members completed the survey for the reporting period.

FISH and WILDLIFE, DEPARTMENT of	III. USING PERFORMANCE DATA
---	------------------------------------

Agency Mission: To protect and enhance Oregon's fish and wildlife and their habitats for use and enjoyment by present and future generations.

Contact: W. Aaron Jenkins, Economist	Contact Phone: 503.947.6158
---	------------------------------------

Alternate: Cameron Smith	Alternate Phone: 503-947-6160
---------------------------------	--------------------------------------

The following questions indicate how performance measures and data are used for management and accountability purposes.

<p>1. INCLUSIVITY</p>	<p>* Staff: Each year, performance data for KPMs are collected from staff and managers and trends are discussed. Budget requests proposed for the Agency Request Budget must also be linked to KPM.</p> <p>* Elected Officials: KPM results are presented to a subcommittee of Ways and Means biennially as part of the budget process. The Legislature deleted three KPMs during the 2011 session.</p> <p>* Stakeholders: The Department has an External Budget Advisory Committee (EBAC) that provides input on the agency's budget. EBAC is composed of almost 40 members representing fishing, hunting, conservation, local government, and other organizations. In preparing the Agency Request Budget each biennium, the Department reviews trends in hunting and fishing participation (KPMs 1, 2), ending balance, agency priorities, and key investment areas.</p> <p>* Citizens: In preparing the Agency Request Budget each biennium, the Department hosts townhall meetings across the state. In 2012, the Department hosted town hall meetings in Wilsonville, La Grande, Bend, and Coos Bay. 45 members of the public participated in the town hall meetings. The Department presented information about in hunting and fishing participation (KPMs 1, 2), ending balance, and budget development. The Department also posts its annual KPM report on its website.</p>
<p>2 MANAGING FOR RESULTS</p>	<p>Each biennium the agency's leadership team reviews the mission, principles, and priorities to ensure its efforts reflect legislative direction and available resources. The leadership team identifies specific actions and timelines for each priority. This information is posted internally and externally. Progress is reviewed quarterly at the executive and management team levels. Annual progress reports are also posted on the internal website with an all staff announcement. This approach is intended to improve accountability, to ensure progress in key areas occurs during the biennium, and to communicate those priorities during the course of the biennium. Meeting these priorities will directly contribute to KPM performance.</p>

	<p>In 2011, the leadership team also conducted a comprehensive review of the agency's key performance measures in the hopes of pursuing a significant update with the Legislature during the 2013 session. In light of the Governor's 10 Year Plan for Oregon, the department plans to review and update its KPMs as metrics are developed under the 10 Year Plan.</p>
<p>3 STAFF TRAINING</p>	<p>While there is no uniform training for staff on KPMs, the data and results for programs are reviewed in a number of ways. For example, the screens and passage program staff report on the number of screens installed each year (KPM 6). Hunting and angling education staff regularly review juvenile licenses and tags sold (KPM 1, 2). Customer service staff receive the feedback from the customer service survey (KPM 7).</p>
<p>4 COMMUNICATING RESULTS</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Staff: Web page to communicate ongoing agency progress across divisions. Annual updates to agency priority efforts posted on the internal website. * Elected Officials: Budget documents to relate agency progress for topics of special interest to elected officials. * Stakeholders: Web page and budget document providing general agency information related to KPMs are reviewed with the department's External Budget Advisory Committee (EBAC). * Citizens: Web page to provide general agency information.