

**Agency Performance Measures (APMs): Status and Proposed Final Measures – May 8, 2009**

<b>APM and Status as of 3/11/09 Commission meeting</b>	<b>Proposed Final APM</b>	<b>Rationale and Anticipated Reporting Horizon</b>
<p>APM 1.1: <i>Percent and number of approved and built developments under the management plan that are visually subordinate, where required, from key viewing areas.</i></p> <p>Status: Tabled by Commission pending further consideration.</p>	<p>Recommend approving original proposal.</p>	<p>This measure is a key outcome reflecting how well we are implementing a central policy of the plan's provisions for protecting scenic resources.</p> <p>May not have data for coming fiscal year; labor-intensive.</p>
<p>APM 2.1 <i>Percent and number of applications submitted in the vicinity of sensitive natural resources where plans were modified to avoid sensitive areas.</i></p> <p>Status: Accepted as working measure by Commission. Consider a new measure evaluating compliance with conditions for projects in buffer zones.</p>	<p>Approve as is.</p>	<p>Staff does not recommend adding compliance measure just for this topic. A new APM is proposed looking at compliance with all conditions for all developments in Klickitat County.</p> <p>May have data for coming fiscal year.</p>
<p>APM 3.1: <i>Number of jobs created in the prior four years as a result of NSA grants and loans.</i></p> <p>Status: Accepted as working measure by Commission.</p>	<p>Recommend deletion.</p>	<p>Although this information is important to the Scenic Area, it does not gauge reflect Commission performance and is thus not a good APM.</p>
<p>APM 3.2(a): <i>Percent and number of farm dwellings approved that are on farms with current agricultural use at a level that meets the agricultural income test in the management plan.</i></p> <p>Status: Accepted as working measure by Commission.</p>	<p>Approve as is.</p>	<p>This measure is a key outcome intended by plan policies and regulations for new farm dwellings.</p> <p>Measure 5 years of data each time due to low numbers of new farm dwellings per year.</p> <p>May not have data for coming fiscal year; labor-intensive.</p>
<p>APM 3.2(b): Placeholder for forest lands</p> <p>Status: New measure to be developed</p>	<p>Approve the following new measure: <i>Percent and number of decisions for new dwellings approved on Small Woodlands that properly applied requirements for enrollment in tax deferral programs.</i></p>	<p>This would evaluate implementation of the one requirement tying new dwellings to forest use in the only forest designation with any appreciate amount of new dwellings.</p> <p>May have data for coming fiscal year.</p>

<b>APM and Status as of 3/11/09 Commission meeting</b>	<b>Proposed Final APM</b>	<b>Rationale and Anticipated Reporting Horizon</b>
<p>APM 4.1: <i>Percent and number of applications submitted on sites with identified cultural resources where plans were modified to avoid significant cultural resources.</i></p> <p>Status: Accepted as working measure by Commission. Consider a new measure evaluating compliance with conditions for projects near cultural resources.</p>	<p>Approve as is.</p>	<p>Staff does not recommend adding a compliance measure just for this topic. A new APM is proposed looking at compliance for all conditions for all developments in Klickitat County.</p> <p>May have data for coming fiscal year.</p>
<p>APM 6.1: <i>Percent and number of county development applications reviewed that: a) received a comment letter from GC staff; b) did not receive a comment letter from GC staff.</i></p> <p>Status: Accepted as proxy measure by Commission, pending further consideration.</p>	<p>Recommend deleting draft measure and replacing with two new APMs:  6.1(a) <i>Percent and number of county decisions where Gorge Commission comments were addressed in the decision: a) fully; or b) partially.</i>  6.1(b) <i>Percent and number of approved, built developments for Gorge Commission-issued decisions that comply with conditions of approval.</i></p>	<p>New APM 6.1(a) is a more meaningful measure of the effectiveness of Gorge Commission input on county applications than the prior APM. May have data next fiscal year.</p> <p>New APM 6.1(b) measures GC performance in monitoring and ensuring compliance with conditions of approval to reduce or avoid enforcement issues. Data to be collected as part of new system inspecting all applications in Klickitat County.</p> <p>May not have data for coming fiscal year, due to new inspection system and time frames for projects (two years to start construction).</p>
<p>APM 6.2: <i>Percent and number of Gorge Commission policy decisions per biennium that are advised by a) input from tribes; and b) input from stakeholders.</i></p> <p>Status: Tabled by Commission pending further consideration.</p>	<p>Recommend deletion.</p>	<p>Original proposal not meaningful, due to small number of policy decisions/year, and fact that all such decisions consider stakeholder input. Use customer service survey results (APM 7.1) to address this topic. Future revisions can stratify results among stakeholders to gather information specifically for tribes.</p>
<p>APM 6.3: <i>Percent and number of reported violations investigated within 2 weeks.</i></p> <p>Status: Accepted as proxy measure by Commission, pending further consideration.</p>	<p>APM 6.3(a): Recommend revising draft APM as follows: <i>"Percent and number of reported alleged violations with investigation initiated within 30 days";</i> and adding a new APM: APM 6.3(b): <i>Percent of resolved violations in Klickitat County that were resolved cooperatively in the last year.</i></p>	<p>Revise 6.3(a) and approve as final measure: it measures GC responsiveness in initiating investigation into alleged violations Gorge wide. May have data for coming fiscal year.</p> <p>6.3(b) measures Gorge Commission's ability to resolve violations voluntarily for its direct enforcement responsibilities in Klickitat County. May have data for coming fiscal year.</p>

APM and Status as of 3/11/09 Commission meeting	Proposed Final APM	Rationale and Anticipated Reporting Horizon
<p>APM 7.1: <i>Percent of Gorge Commission customers who rate commission services and actions as 'good' or 'very good' for: timeliness, accuracy, helpfulness, expertise, information, availability, and overall quality.</i></p> <p>Status: Accepted as working measure by Commission.</p>	<p>Approve as is.</p>	<p>Results of 2008 customer service survey now available and can be reported before end of this fiscal year.</p>
<p>APM 7.2: <i>Percent and number of Gorge Commission development reviews that are issued within the required time frame.</i></p> <p>Status: Accepted as working measure by Commission.</p>	<p>Approve as is.</p>	<p>Results available now and can be reported before end of this fiscal year.</p>
<p>APM 7.3: <i>Percent and number of Commission decisions and regulations appealed to court since 1994 that are affirmed.</i></p> <p>Status: Accepted as working measure by Commission.</p>	<p>Approve as is.</p>	<p>Expect to have reportable data for coming fiscal year; may be able to report data before end of this fiscal year.</p>