

# SOURCE JUSTIFICATION FORM

Bureau of Procurement

The objective of this form is to capture all relevant documentation an Agency may have to assist the Department of General Services ("DGS"), Bureau of Procurement, in expediting the source justification review process. This form must be completed electronically, signed, and submitted with all relevant documentation to DGS. If a question is neither mandatory nor applicable, please indicate "N/A". Please use standard terminology and define acronyms.

## SECTION A

<b>1. Agency Name:</b>	Game Commission		
<b>2. Procurement Description:</b> This description will appear on the eMarketplace website for public viewing	Survey of Conservation Law Enforcement personnel in each state, and a nationwide survey of US residents ages 18 and older in each state. This is funded by a Multistate Conservation Grant from the US Fish and Wildlife Services and Assoc. of Fish & Wildlife Agencies.		
<b>Materials Description:</b>			
<b>Services Description:</b>	Survey		
<b>3. Materials Shopping Cart # or Services SPR#</b>	<b>Estimated Cost:</b>	\$10,001 - \$50K	
	<b>Initial Contract Term:</b>	1	
	<b>Renewals:</b>	0	
<b>4. Supplier - Name:</b>	National Association of Conservation Law Enforcement Chiefs		
<b>Full Address:</b>	536 Aurora Ave		
<b>Contact Name:</b>	Larry Yamnitz		
<b>Telephone:</b>	573-690-2210	<b>FAX:</b>	
<b>E-mail:</b>	yamdelar@juno.com		
<b>SRM Supplier #:</b>	100929		
<b>5. Delivery or service location:</b>	Harrisburg		

## SECTION B

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>1. Sole Source:</b> Only known source - Not available from another supplier.
<input type="checkbox"/> <b>2. Material/Repair/Maintenance:</b> Material or service MUST be compatible with existing equipment. Documentation must be provided from the manufacturer.
<input type="checkbox"/> <b>3. Used Equipment:</b> Value set by 2 independent 3rd party appraisals.
<input type="checkbox"/> <b>4. Professional Expert:</b> Describe in detail in Section C.
<input type="checkbox"/> <b>5. Exempt (Law):</b> A federal or state statute or regulation exempts the procurement from the competitive procedure. Any applicable information precluding the procurement from competitive procedures must be attached.
<input type="checkbox"/> <b>6. Feasibility:</b> Clearly not feasible to award the contract on a competitive basis.

# SOURCE JUSTIFICATION FORM

Bureau of Procurement

## SECTION C

1. Describe the unique features of this procurement that prohibit a competitive environment. If applicable, attach a Statement of Work ("SOW").

This survey is funded through a Multistate Conservation Grant from the US Fish and Wildlife Services and the Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies, and entails a partnership between NACLEC and Responsive Management a specialized firm in fish and wildlife and outdoor recreation issues.

2. Document and attach the research that has been conducted to date to verify the supplier is the only known source.

See Attached

3. Does the supplier utilize distributors, dealers, resellers, etc.? If "Yes," please identify.

Yes, Responsive Management and other state wildlife agencies

4. Are there compatibility requirements or compliance requirements with a warranty or service agreement? If "Yes," please explain.

Yes, this is a multistate survey and project.

5. How has the material or service been procured in the past? Please provide previous source justifications, contracts, & PO's for this material or service.

NA

6. If procured through the IT ITQ process, please provide original \$ amount and contract period of order. Is this the final phase of the project?

NA

7. If this is an upgrade, addition, alteration, etc., to an earlier procurement, please describe in detail.

NA

8. What are the consequences of not approving this procurement?

The Commission will not be able to take advantage of the multistate conservation Grant and consequently will be unable to proactively maintain strategic relevance through effective leadership, management, and conservation of resources in the 21st Century.

9. If timing is a factor, what is the time factor and why?

Timing is a critical factor because the vendor will be conducting the data collection and analysis for the study in 2019. Participating states can expect to receive a final report by the close of 2019 or early 2020.

10. List any other information relevant to the acquisition of this procurement here or as an attachment.

NA

11. For requests > \$100,000, has the supplier signed cost or pricing data certification and is the pricing breakdown attached?

NA

# SOURCE JUSTIFICATION FORM

Bureau of Procurement

## SECTION D

**IMPORTANT:** The printed names on this form shall constitute the signatures of these individuals. Agencies must insure that these individuals review the completed form and give their consent to apply their printed name on this form. No handwritten signatures shall be required in order for the form to be considered "signed" by those individuals whose names appear in the signature section of the form.

### Shopping Cart Contact Person (Person whom DGS will contact regarding the Shopping Cart):

<b>Name:</b>	Randy Shoup	<b>P-Group:</b>	Game	<b>Date:</b>	08-14-19
<b>Title:</b>	Bur. Dir of Wildlife Protection	<b>Telephone:</b>		<b>Fax:</b>	

### Agency Contact Person: Person in your agency that DGS can contact for additional information, etc.

<b>Name:</b>	Bobbi Mercer	<b>Title:</b>	Contracts and Procurement	<b>Date:</b>	08-14-19
<b>Telephone:</b>	717-787-6594	<b>Fax:</b>		<b>Email:</b>	bmercer@pa.gov

### Approving Authority (Agency Head or Deputy reviewing and approving this request): Approving Authority connotes approval of the source justification and the cost or pricing data certification.

<b>Name:</b>	Daniel Dunlap	<b>Title:</b>	Bur. Dir of Admin	<b>Date:</b>	8-14-19
<b>Telephone:</b>	717-787-6594	<b>Fax:</b>			

### Additional Approvals (if required by Agency):

<b>Name:</b>		<b>Title:</b>		<b>Date:</b>	
<b>Telephone:</b>		<b>Fax:</b>		<b>Email:</b>	
<b>Name:</b>		<b>Title:</b>		<b>Date:</b>	
<b>Telephone:</b>		<b>Fax:</b>		<b>Email:</b>	
<b>Name:</b>		<b>Title:</b>		<b>Date:</b>	
<b>Telephone:</b>		<b>Fax:</b>		<b>Email:</b>	
<b>Name:</b>		<b>Title:</b>		<b>Date:</b>	
<b>Telephone:</b>		<b>Fax:</b>		<b>Email:</b>	
<b>Name:</b>		<b>Title:</b>		<b>Date:</b>	
<b>Telephone:</b>		<b>Fax:</b>		<b>Email:</b>	



## **RESPONSIVE MANAGEMENT**



July 15, 2019

Dear Colonel/Chief,

I am writing to let you know about a new research study that the National Association of Conservation Law Enforcement Chiefs (NACLEC) is embarking on to help the conservation law enforcement community anticipate and respond to emerging needs related to conservation law enforcement.

To help the community stay abreast of ongoing demographic, social, and recreational trends, and to plan for future conservation law enforcement strategies and priorities in the United States, new data will be collected from members of the conservation law enforcement community as well as U.S. general population residents. This data collection will identify the key management challenges, areas of focus, leadership development needs, and other essential considerations on the horizon for the conservation law enforcement community. As a result, agencies will be able to proactively maintain strategic relevance through effective leadership, management, and conservation of resources in the 21<sup>st</sup> century.

### **A Changing National Landscape for Conservation Law Enforcement**

It is inevitable that the changing demographic makeup of the United States will have implications on how fish and wildlife agencies conduct law enforcement efforts in the future. Not only is the total population of the United States increasing, but so are the populations of urban residents, older residents, minority residents, and immigrant residents. These trends are rapidly changing the landscape in which conservation law enforcement personnel are accustomed to operating.

In addition to demographic shifts, changes in Americans' wildlife values orientations are also likely to affect how residents perceive conservation law enforcement priorities. Recent national research suggests that as the country becomes increasingly urbanized, Americans may become more protective of wildlife, being more likely to view them in emotional, familial terms—it is all but assured that this trend will have some effect on the current paradigm of wildlife management.

Finally, in many states, the number of hunting and fishing licenses sold and the percent of the population participating in hunting and fishing have both shown flat to downward trends over the past several decades. Under the current model, diminishing sales of hunting and fishing licenses and equipment will threaten the financial stability of state fish and wildlife agencies; the fish and wildlife conservation community will therefore be obligated to explore alternative funding mechanisms, especially those that generate support from residents who do not take part in hunting or fishing.

## Study Background

Funded through a Multistate Conservation Grant from the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and the Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies, the study entails a partnership between NACLEC and Responsive Management, an internationally recognized research firm specializing in studies on natural resource, fish and wildlife, and outdoor recreation issues; and the University of Wisconsin-Stevens Point, which offers courses on Conservation Law Enforcement Theory and Principles, Conservation Law Enforcement Investigations, and Resource Policy and Law, among other subjects.

## Study Methodology

Two major surveys will be conducted for this study: a survey of conservation law enforcement personnel in each state, and a nationwide survey of U.S. residents ages 18 years old and older (n=200 per state). Each survey will consist of many of the same questions—by asking identical questions of the two groups, the survey results can be compared to determine how opinions and priorities differ between conservation law enforcement personnel and U.S. general population residents. These comparisons will help to identify and clarify key management challenges, areas of focus, leadership development needs, and other essential considerations on the horizon for the conservation law enforcement community.

The survey of law enforcement personnel will be conducted through a closed-population email questionnaire (meaning the survey will *only* be distributed to verified law enforcement employees); the survey of U.S. residents will be conducted by telephone (both landlines and cell phones will be called in their exact proportions within each state). NACLEC, Responsive Management, and the University of Wisconsin-Stevens Point will collaborate with law enforcement chiefs to develop a standardized survey instrument for each group of respondents.

## State-Level Options for the General Population Resident Survey

This project marks an important opportunity for the conservation law enforcement community to learn about the opinions and attitudes of state residents with regard to key conservation law enforcement issues and concerns. As such, the study methodology involves tailoring the general population resident surveys so that each state obtains the data necessary to base management decisions on a solid foundation of fact. In many cases, important conservation issues differ by state; while the standardized survey questionnaire administered to all U.S. residents will address issues, functions, and activities common to all states, each state may determine a further need to explore additional issues and areas unique to the state.

With this in mind, the project partners will use a “menu approach” to the general population resident survey to allow agencies to customize the survey instrument to fit their needs by including additional questions in the survey or by sampling beyond the 200 completed interviews in each state. This same approach was employed in a recent major nationwide Wildlife Values Study, coordinated by the Western Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies and for which Responsive Management handled the data collection.

The state-level options for the resident survey are as follows:

- **Level 1** entails the baseline quota of 200 completed interviews per state using the core survey instrument, with agencies receiving a report graphically depicting the results on the national level only. For this option, there is no cost to the state (the cost will be covered entirely by the grant). **The Level 1 core survey instrument is attached for your review.**

- **Level 2** entails all Level 1 data and results, as well as an additional 8-10 state-specific survey questions and a state-specific report. Agencies will receive a report graphically depicting the results on the national and state levels, including results to all state-specific questions. For this option, the cost to the state is \$11,000. Examples of states that contracted for a Level 2 survey option in the Wildlife Values study mentioned earlier include Colorado, Idaho, Indiana, Kansas, Michigan, Montana, Oklahoma, Virginia, and Wyoming (each agency received results from a unique series of questions examining resident opinions on state-specific issues).
- **Level 3** entails all Level 1 data and results, as well as 8-10 state-specific questions, additional strata-level sampling (e.g., to obtain data at the county level), and a state-specific report. Agencies will receive a report graphically depicting results on the national, state, and individual strata levels (county, region, etc.), including results to all state-specific questions. For this option, the cost to the state is based on the additional number of completed interviews and strata (for example, 800 additional completed interviews encompassing 200 interviews in each of four state regions will cost \$33,600). A total of 9 states contracted for a Level 3 survey option in the Wildlife Values study, including California (county-level data for 58 counties), Minnesota (regional data for 4 regions), North Carolina (county-level data for 100 counties), Pennsylvania (regional data for 3 regions, including two major metro areas versus the rest of the state).

States that opt to contract for Level 2 or Level 3 data collection will need to coordinate with Larry Yamnitz at the National Conservation Law Enforcement Education Foundation ([yamdelar@juno.com](mailto:yamdelar@juno.com)); the Foundation will then work directly with Responsive Management regarding your state's survey specifications. **We encourage you to review the attached Level 1 core survey instrument to determine any needs you may have for additional data collection.**

### **Important Time-Sensitive Action Items to Help Make the Project a Success**

Data collection and analysis for the study will be completed in 2019—states can expect to receive a final report by the end of the year or early 2020. Following are some time-sensitive action items that will help make the project a success:

- **Designate a point of contact for your state:** Once you identify a point of contact for your state who will be able to coordinate with the research team and your agency's purchasing/contracting staff, please share the person's name and contact information with Larry Yamnitz.
- **Determine your state's survey needs:** As outlined above, states have the option of contracting for data collection beyond the Level 1 survey covered by the grant. Once you have determined your state's survey needs, please relay this information to Larry Yamnitz by **August 5, 2019**. **Regarding purchasing/contracting considerations, note that the work for this project will span fiscal years 2018-2019 and 2019-2020 (this is due to the time needed for survey development, data collection, analysis, and reporting).**
- **Payment process:** Payments for Level 2 and Level 3 requests are due no later than **September 30, 2019**. Please payments will be made to the National Conservation Law Enforcement Educational Foundation. The attached letter from the IRS contains the tax I.D. number for the Foundation.
- **Get in touch with any questions:** If you would like additional information or have questions about the study purpose, survey options, or costs, please contact Larry Yamnitz, point of contact for the National Conservation Law Enforcement Education Foundation, at [yamdelar@juno.com](mailto:yamdelar@juno.com), or Mark Damian Duda, Executive Director of Responsive Management, at [mark@responsivemanagement.com](mailto:mark@responsivemanagement.com).