



To: Gorge Commissioners

From: Jill Arens, Executive Director
Brian Litt, Planning Manager

Subject: Proposed Final Agency Performance Measures

Date: May 8, 2009

Action Requested

Review and discuss proposed final agency performance measures (APMs), and accept public comment on them through June 9, 2009. Staff will request the Gorge Commission approve final agency performance measures at its June 9, 2009 meeting.

Introduction and Executive Committee Review

This memo includes proposed final agency performance measures developed by staff and reviewed by the Executive Committee at its May 7, 2009 meeting. With one exception, the committee recommends accepting staff's proposed final APMs. The committee recommends revising the wording of one proposed final APM (6.3.a). The committee's recommended revision of this proposed measure is reflected in this memo.

Review of Purpose and Scope of Agency Performance Measures

These measures are intended to provide regular reporting on how well the Commission is fulfilling its responsibilities under the Scenic Area Act and Management Plan. The goal is to provide the Commission clear feedback as to how to improve our performance. By creating one set of performance measures for Oregon and Washington, the Commission will provide a uniform approach to reporting on its performance. This information is a significant part of budget analysis to define state priorities.

The scope of these performance measures includes a strategic cross-section of the Commission's work, targeting priority strategies. Most of these strategies reflect Management Plan policy direction; others are oriented towards agency administration. The idea is to create a manageable and meaningful set of measures the Commission can realistically report on regularly.

These measures are designed to align with the Vital Signs indicators. The latter gauge the condition of gorge resources addressed in the Scenic Area Act. The APMs will track how well the Commission is doing what it committed to do under the plan, and how well plan strategies are working. Correlating results of performance measures with indicators documenting resource conditions will help the Commission evaluate cumulative impacts of plan implementation on Scenic Area resources. Both efforts together will shed light on "the state of the gorge" and our efforts to protect and enhance it.

Performance measures should be revisited periodically to examine their utility and to improve upon them. To serve their purpose, they must provide tools to help us improve our performance – to identify where we need to make adjustments and improvements along the way. Lastly, some of these measures are immediately reportable while others are in more developmental stages. Please see the accompanying table ("Agency Performance Measures: Status and Proposed Final Measures") for information about anticipated reporting horizons for these measures.

Summary of Progress to Date and Process for Final Approval

At the March 11, 2009 meeting, the Gorge Commission approved seven draft APMs as working measures. Two draft measures were accepted as proxies, subject to revision and/or replacement pending further work, and two were tabled, pending further discussion. Lastly, one placeholder existed (for forest lands) that was not modified by the Commission.

Once the Executive Committee has reviewed and made recommendations on the proposed final APMs, staff would present them (reflecting Committee input) for public review at the May 12, 2009 Commission meeting. Because several new APMs are proposed, staff recommends providing a one month public review period, culminating in Commission approval of final measures at the June 2009 meeting.

Public Review and Comment

The Commission has received one public comment letter on the revised draft APMs (from Friends of the Columbia Gorge, 4/13/09) since the March 11, 2009 Commission meeting. A copy is being sent with this memo for your review. Staff will provide the Commission with copies of all comments received and summarize them in a memo, to be included in the packet for the June meeting.

Proposed Final Revisions and Rationales

The following section lists key strategies and proposed final APMs for those strategies. Please note that other strategies and topics where a performance measure is not recommended (e.g. Recreation) are not included below. Staff and the Executive Committee recommend adding three new APMs, deleting three draft APMs, and revising one, for a total of twelve performance measures. For each APM with any changes proposed to its status since March 11, 2009 (including all proxy, tabled and placeholder APMs), a summary of rationale for the change is included. All performance measures with any proposed changes (new, revised, or deleted APM, or change in status from March Commission meeting) are indicated in italics, with ~~strikeout~~ and underline showing proposed changes where applicable. A list of all proposed final agency performance measures is included at the end of this document.

I. Resource-Specific Strategies With Related Performance Measures

A. SCENIC RESOURCES

1. Proposed Key Strategies and Related Performance Measures

S 1.1: Protect the scenic quality of the gorge/ by ensuring that new development seen from key viewing areas is visually subordinate/ through application of Management Plan guidelines.

APM 1.1: Percent and number of approved and built developments under the Management Plan that are visually subordinate, where required, from key viewing areas.

Rationale for Proposed Revision or Change in Status:

Staff recommends approval of the original draft APM. This is a key scenic outcome for measuring how well we are implementing the plan. This will provide valuable information about how well a crucial scenic protection policy is being implemented and what the policy's results are in the landscape.

B. NATURAL RESOURCES

1. Proposed Key Strategies and Related Performance Measures

S 2.1: Protect existing natural resources (wetlands; streams, ponds, lakes, and riparian areas; wildlife habitat; rare plants)/ by eliminating the adverse effects of development activities, whenever possible,/ by applying Management Plan guidelines to restrict development in and near areas that contain these resources.

APM 2.1: Percent and number of applications submitted in the vicinity of sensitive natural resources where plans were modified to avoid sensitive areas.

C. ECONOMIC RESOURCES

1. Proposed Key Strategies and Related Performance Measures

S 3.1: Protect and support the economy/ by funding economic development activities that are compatible with SNCRs/ through grants and loans.

APM 3.1: Number of jobs created in the prior four years as a result of National Scenic Area grants and loans.

Rationale for Proposed Revision or Change in Status:

Staff recommends deleting this measure. Although this information is important to the Scenic Area, it does not gauge Gorge Commission performance and is thus not a good APM.

S 3.2: Maintain the traditional economic base of the gorge/ by protecting the agriculture and forest land base/ through regulatory authority including requiring minimum lot size, limiting new dwellings and requiring setbacks where necessary.

APM 3.2(a): Percent and number of farm dwellings approved since the management plan that are on farms with current agriculture use at a level that meets the agriculture income test in the management plan.

APM 3.2(b): Percent and number of decisions for new dwellings approved on Small Woodlands that properly applied requirements for enrollment in tax deferral programs.

Rationale for Proposed Revision or Change in Status:

APM 3.2(b) would evaluate implementation of the one requirement linking new dwellings to forest use for the only forest designation with any significant residential development (GMA Small Woodland).

D. CULTURAL RESOURCES

1. Proposed Key Strategies and Related Performance Measures

S 4.1: Protect cultural resources/ by eliminating the adverse effects of development activities, whenever possible/ by applying management plan guidelines, including requirements for surveys, to avoid and restrict development in and near areas that contain these resources.

APM 4.1: Percent and number of applications submitted on sites with identified cultural resources where plans were modified to avoid significant cultural resources.

II. Commission-Wide Strategies With Related Performance Measures

A. RESOURCE-RELATED

1. Proposed Key Strategies and Related Performance Measures

S 6.1: Protect gorge scenic, natural, cultural and recreational resources/ by assuring that land use regulations are adequately administered and enforced throughout the gorge/ through monitoring regulatory activities.

APM 6.1: 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.

APM 6.1(a): 1) Percent and number of county decisions where Gorge Commission comments were addressed in the decision: a) fully; b) partially; c) not at all).

APM 6.1(b): Percent and number of approved, built developments for Gorge Commission-issued decisions that comply with conditions of approval.

Rationale for Proposed Revision or Change in Status:

APM 6.1(a): This is a more meaningful performance measure focused on the effect of Gorge Commission input on county applications, rather than just the amount of comment letters measured in the prior APM. This APM provides a measure of how our input is being used and how effective our working relationships are with county implementation partners.

New APM 6.1(b): This measures Gorge Commission performance in monitoring and ensuring compliance with conditions of approval for its administration of the Management Plan in Klickitat County. Data would be collected as part of the new inspection procedures for all approved developments started in Klickitat County. These procedures (discussed in more depth in the 5/8/09 memo to be discussed at the May 12, 2009 meeting, entitled: "Status Update on Improvements in Compliance Monitoring and Enforcement") reflect a proactive approach intended to reduce enforcement issues in the long run.

S 6.2: Protect the interests of gorge stakeholders, including treaty tribes/ by consulting with their representatives/ through regular meetings, forums and outreach.

~~APM 6.2: Percent and number of Gorge Commission policy decisions per biennium that are advised by a) input from tribes; and b) input from stakeholders.~~

Rationale for Proposed Revision or Change in Status:

The original APM is not meaningful, due to the small number of policy decisions per biennium, and fact that all such decisions consider stakeholder input. The customer service survey (APM 7.2) measures stakeholders' satisfaction with GC services. Staff recommends using the survey results to address this topic. Future revisions can allow the collection of results among stakeholders to distinguish responses specifically from the tribes.

S 6.3: Uphold management plan direction/ by identifying instances of non-compliance/ by monitoring and resolving enforcement actions.

APM 6.3(a): Percent and number of reported alleged violations investigated with investigation initiated within 2 weeks 30 days.

APM 6.3(b): Percent of resolved violations in Klickitat County that were resolved cooperatively in the last year.

Rationale for Proposed Revision or Change in Status: APM 6.3(a): Staff recommends revising the proxy measure and approving it as a final measure. The Executive Committee recommends revising the time frame from 2 weeks to 30 days. The revisions clarify the measure targets responsiveness in initiating investigations of reported alleged violations. This measure would include alleged violations in all six Gorge counties. It is a relevant measure of the Commission's performance relative to its role in gorge-wide enforcement.

New APM 6.3(b) measures the Gorge Commission's ability to resolve violations through voluntary compliance, for its direct enforcement responsibilities in Klickitat County. This is an important orientation of the Commission's enforcement approach in plan administration in Klickitat County, and one that is also common to other Scenic Area counties' enforcement efforts. Voluntary compliance is sought as long as it doesn't increase the risk of adverse effects to resources.

B. MANAGEMENT-RELATED

1. Proposed Key Strategies and Related Performance Measures

S 7.1: Improve customer/ stakeholder satisfaction with Commission services/ by focusing on their perceptions of service quality/ through periodic surveys.

APM 7.1: Percent of Gorge Commission customers who rate Commission services and actions as 'good' or 'very good' for: a. timeliness, b. accuracy, c. helpfulness, d. expertise, e. information, f. availability, and g. overall quality. (*Per Oregon state government guidance.*)

S 7.2: Improve service quality to customers and stakeholders/ by providing mandated services in a timely manner/ through close monitoring of the review process.

APM 7.2: Percent of development reviews that are issued within the required timeframe.

S 7.3: Assure that the intent of the National Scenic Act is upheld/ by issuing decisions and regulations/ that are defensible in a court of law.

APM 7.3: Percent of Commission decisions and regulations appealed to court since 1994 that are affirmed.

LIST OF PROPOSED FINAL AGENCY PERFORMANCE MEASURES

APM 1.1: Percent and number of approved and built developments under the Management Plan that are visually subordinate, where required, from key viewing areas.

APM 2.1: Percent and number of applications submitted in the vicinity of sensitive natural resources where plans were modified to avoid sensitive areas.

APM 3.2(a): Percent and number of farm dwellings approved since the Management Plan that are on farms with current agriculture use at a level that meets the agriculture income test in the Management Plan.

APM 3.2(b): Percent and number of decisions for new dwellings approved on Small Woodlands that properly applied requirements for enrollment in tax deferral programs.

APM 4.1: Percent and number of applications submitted on sites with identified cultural resources where plans were modified to avoid significant cultural resources.

APM 6.1(a): 1) Percent and number of county decisions where Gorge Commission comments were addressed in the decision: a) fully; b) partially.

APM 6.1(b): Percent and number of approved, built developments for Gorge Commission-issued decisions that comply with conditions of approval.

APM 6.3(a): Percent and number of reported alleged violations with investigation initiated within 30 days.

APM 6.3(b): Percent of resolved violations in Klickitat County that were resolved cooperatively in the last year.

APM 7.1: Percent of Gorge Commission customers who rate Commission services and actions as 'good' or 'very good' for: a. timeliness, b. accuracy, c. helpfulness, d. expertise, e. information, f. availability, and g. overall quality. (Per Oregon state government guidance.)

APM 7.2: Percent of development reviews that are issued within the required timeframe.

APM 7.3: Percent of Commission decisions and regulations appealed to court since 1994 that are affirmed.