

# Agency Management Report

## KPMs for Reporting Year 2016

Published: 12/15/2016 12:29:04 PM

### Land Conservation and Development Department

Performance Summary	Green	Yellow	Red
	= Target to -5%	= Target -6% to -15%	= Target > -15%
<b>Summary Stats:</b>	66.67%	8.33%	25%

### Detailed Report:

KPM	Metrics	Actual	Target	Status	Management Comments
1. EMPLOYMENT LAND SUPPLY - Percent of cities that have an adequate supply of land for industrial and other employment needs to implement their local economic development plan.		28%	75%	Red	The reporting cycle is Oregon's fiscal year. The progress under this measure is counted if, during the past ten years, a city evaluates the adequacy of its industrial and other employment lands and provides sites for the established need. Cities are only counted if a query in the tracking database results in a "hit." Data coding may limit the accuracy of the results, but the method results can be replicated in an audit. The difference in performance between 2015 and prior reporting periods reflects a methodology change to only counting cities over 10,000.
2. HOUSING LAND SUPPLY - Percent of cities that have an adequate supply of		79%	90%	Yellow	The target for this measure was not met for the seventh year. Performance has remained relatively consistent for the years prior to 2015, suggesting common factors that

KPM	Metrics	Actual	Target	Status	Management Comments
buildable residential land to meet housing needs.					<p>may include a lagging economy and insufficient funds available for cities to update their comprehensive plans. In addition to these factors, the target was increased significantly for 2011 and 2012. This increase contributed to the gap between target and results prior to 2014. The targets for 2011 and 2012 were increased based on an estimate, in 2008, of the number of periodic review work tasks that cities were expected to begin. Since that time, fewer cities have started periodic review due to budget constraints. Performance is generally improving since 2014 for two reasons. First, the great recession ended and economic recovery began and cities soon are realizing housing markets have come under great stress due to increased housing demand and different types of housing demand. As a result they have begun to conduct housing needs analyses and residential land inventories (e.g. Hood River, Sandy, Grants Pass, Lafayette and other who are in progress such as Bend, Medford, Salem, Eugene, and Corvallis. Second, the difference in performance between 2015 and prior reporting periods reflects a methodology change to only counting cities over 10,000 as a result of changes in state law.</p>
3. PUBLIC FACILITIES PLANS - Percent of cities that have updated the local plan to include reasonable cost estimates and funding plans for sewer and water systems.		83%	70%	Green	<p>Results for this measure were consistently decreasing for the past three years. In 2015 and 2016, the performance increased and is now over target. 40 out of 48 cities with a population over 10,000 completed a public facility plan or plan update with any of the following elements: water, waste-water, and storm-water. The methodology allows a positive outcome when city plan updates for sewer, water</p>

KPM	Metrics	Actual	Target	Status	Management Comments
					<p>or storm-water take place in a single year, rather than requiring that all three take place simultaneously.</p> <p>As with other key performance measures that measure progress of cities in updating their comprehensive plans, this measure's results are can be volatile and changing as a result when there is an uncertain economy and insufficient funds for cities to adequately plan for their future.</p>
<p>4. CERTIFIED INDUSTRIAL SITES - Number of industrial sites certified as “project-ready” added each fiscal year.</p>		1	5	Red	<p>Certifying industrial sites as “shovel ready” has become increasingly difficult and expensive due to the level of need at sites in the certification queue. As such, OBDD is moving forward with an internal strategic planning effort to determine where existing funding programs (Brownfields, Special Public Works Fund, etc.) may be utilized to assist with certifications. Once complete, the program concepts will be socialized amongst various stakeholder groups and a final program will be developed. Absent any new infusion of funding to certify sites, OBDD will continue to seek innovative solutions that assist local communities develop an ample supply of “shovel ready” industrial sites.</p>
<p>5. TRANSIT SUPPORTIVE LAND USE - Percent of urban areas with a population greater than 25,000 that have adopted transit supportive land use regulations.</p>		86%	90%	Green	<p>This performance measure is unchanged. Because of the method of data collection, as with some other performance measures, the degree of success may be slightly under reported.</p>
<p>6. TRANSPORTATION FACILITIES - Percent of urban areas that have updated the local plan to include reasonable cost estimates and funding plans for transportation facilities.</p>		91%	92%	Green	<p>In 2016, the performance on this measure missed its target by 1 percent. The decrease reflects a general trend in the slowing of the rate of adoption. This slowing is not surprising since there are fewer cities that have not adopted their transportation system plans.</p>

KPM	Metrics	Actual	Target	Status	Management Comments
7. FARM LAND - Percent of farm land outside urban growth boundaries zoned for exclusive farm use in 1987 that retains that zoning.		99.80%	99.95%	Green	This measure produced positive results. In <i>Protecting Working Farm and Forest Landscapes: How do Oregon &amp; Washington Compare?</i> , the net average annual conversion of farm and forest land before and after the implementation of state land use plans dropped by 70 percent for Oregon but only 3 percent for Washington. The department continues to consider ways to capture more detailed data that could make this measure more valuable. Department examples of these ways include: tracking whether agricultural land rezoned was high value, and tracking the type and level of development allowed when agricultural land is rezoned. The department is also proposing a change of calculating performance, in other words, a change of methodology, for this measure.
8. FOREST LAND - Percent of forest land outside urban growth boundaries zoned in 1987 for forest or mixed farm/forest use that remains zoned for those uses.		99.93%	99.95%	Green	This measure continues a stable and positive trend. It has added value to the department because there is an emerging concern about the conversion of commercial forest lands to other uses, especially outside of the Willamette Valley. The department is exploring ways to refine data relative to this measure. The measure is not being proposed for deletion. The department is proposing a change of calculating performance, in other words, a change of methodology, for this measure.
9. URBAN GROWTH BOUNDARY EXPANSION - Percent of land added to urban growth boundaries that is not farm or forest land.		92%	55%	Green	The outcomes for this measure can be highly variable depending on the location of the urban growth boundary under consideration for expansion. This year's results are based on 1,029 acres of UGB expansion. These figures may not reflect results over a longer period of time involving smaller acreages.

KPM	Metrics	Actual	Target	Status	Management Comments
10. GRANT AWARDS - Percent of local grants awarded to local governments within two months after receiving application.		73%	100%	Red	The ability of the department to award grants in a timely manner continues to receive heightened staff attention. This attention has been reflected in the results for the last two fiscal years. However, as noted in the report, the department took additional time this biennium partly due to scarcity of funds and partly due to lack of urgency on the part of applicants to negotiate changes to the project.
11. CUSTOMER SERVICE - Percent of customers rating their satisfaction with the agency's customer service as "good" or "excellent": overall customer service, timeliness, accuracy, helpfulness, expertise and availability of information.	Timeliness	89.82%	83%	Green	The results for this measure reflect a biennial customer service survey performed in October 2016. The 2016 survey results reflect 88.17 percent overall for the six items measured. This rate reflects a 15.17 percent increase in overall satisfaction as compared the 73 percent received in 2012 and 2014.
	Accuracy	88.56%	83%	Green	
	Availability of Information	82.31%	83%	Green	
	Overall	88.17%	83%	Green	
	Helpfulness	89.94%	83%	Green	
	Expertise	95.83%	83%	Green	
12. BEST PRACTICES - Percent of total best practices met by the Board.		100%	100%	Green	The commission continues to operate as a working board, with a heavy workload of work tasks identified for the 2015-17 biennium.

This report provides high-level performance information which may not be sufficient to fully explain the complexities associated with some of the reported measurement results. Please reference the agency's most recent Annual Performance Progress Report to better understand a measure's intent, performance history, factors impacting performance and data gather and calculation methodology.

# Land Conservation and Development Department

Annual Performance Progress Report

Reporting Year 2016

Published: 12/15/2016 12:46:11 PM

<b>KPM #</b>	<b>Approved Key Performance Measures (KPMs)</b>
1	EMPLOYMENT LAND SUPPLY - Percent of cities that have an adequate supply of land for industrial and other employment needs to implement their local economic development plan.
2	HOUSING LAND SUPPLY - Percent of cities that have an adequate supply of buildable residential land to meet housing needs.
3	PUBLIC FACILITIES PLANS - Percent of cities that have updated the local plan to include reasonable cost estimates and funding plans for sewer and water systems.
4	CERTIFIED INDUSTRIAL SITES - Number of industrial sites certified as "project-ready" added each fiscal year.
5	TRANSIT SUPPORTIVE LAND USE - Percent of urban areas with a population greater than 25,000 that have adopted transit supportive land use regulations.
6	TRANSPORTATION FACILITIES - Percent of urban areas that have updated the local plan to include reasonable cost estimates and funding plans for transportation facilities.
7	FARM LAND - Percent of farm land outside urban growth boundaries zoned for exclusive farm use in 1987 that retains that zoning.
8	FOREST LAND - Percent of forest land outside urban growth boundaries zoned in 1987 for forest or mixed farm/forest use that remains zoned for those uses.
9	URBAN GROWTH BOUNDARY EXPANSION - Percent of land added to urban growth boundaries that is not farm or forest land.
10	GRANT AWARDS - Percent of local grants awarded to local governments within two months after receiving application.

<b>KPM #</b>	<b>Approved Key Performance Measures (KPMs)</b>
11	CUSTOMER SERVICE - Percent of customers rating their satisfaction with the agency's customer service as "good" or "excellent": overall customer service, timeliness, accuracy, helpfulness, expertise and availability of information.
12	BEST PRACTICES - Percent of total best practices met by the Board.

<b>Performance Summary</b>	<b>Green</b>	<b>Yellow</b>	<b>Red</b>
	= Target to -5%	= Target -6% to -15%	= Target > -15%
<b>Summary Stats:</b>	66.67%	8.33%	25%

KPM #1	EMPLOYMENT LAND SUPPLY - Percent of cities that have an adequate supply of land for industrial and other employment needs to implement their local economic development plan.				
	Data Collection Period: Jul 01 - Jun 30				
<b>Report Year</b>	<b>2012</b>	<b>2013</b>	<b>2014</b>	<b>2015</b>	<b>2016</b>
<b>EMPLOYMENT LAND SUPPLY</b>					
Actual	49%	49%	49%	34%	28%
Target	75%	75%	75%	75%	75%

### How Are We Doing

This measure tracks the percentage of cities with a population over 10,000 that have completed an update to their land use plans (within the last 10 years) in order to provide a 20 year supply of land for employment related uses. This measure was adopted when all cities over 2,500 populations were required to periodically review and update their plans. In 2007, the legislature removed this requirement for cities with a population of less than 10,000. Planning and zoning a sufficient amount of land, based on up to date economic opportunities analyses helps ensure enough land is available for development to new employment uses in a community. The department provides technical and financial assistance to local governments for evaluations of the supply of industrial and other employment lands.

The target of 75 percent has not been met for this reporting period. There are continued difficulties in funding and completing the needed updates at the state and local level. This has frustrated progress on this measure.

## Factors Affecting Results

Legislation in 2007 eliminated the requirement for cities with a population less than 10,000 outside metropolitan planning organization boundaries to periodically review and update the comprehensive plan. Continued municipal budget deficiencies have led to continued underfunding of planning departments where planning for employment land would be completed. This is compounded by DLCDC's grant fund being insufficient to fulfill the need, despite economic development having been the highest priority use of grant funds for a decade. While the department awarded grants to four cities to adopt new economic opportunities analyses for the 2015-2017 biennium, only one of these "Lincoln City" will affect performance regarding this measure because the other grantees were cities that are no longer required to complete periodic review. Consequently, unless a city chooses to update its plan, and it has the resources to self-fund, then its supply of land for industrial and other employment uses may remain unaddressed.

KPM #2	HOUSING LAND SUPPLY - Percent of cities that have an adequate supply of buildable residential land to meet housing needs.				
	Data Collection Period: Jul 01 - Jun 30				
<b>Report Year</b>	<b>2012</b>	<b>2013</b>	<b>2014</b>	<b>2015</b>	<b>2016</b>
<b>HOUSING LAND SUPPLY</b>					
Actual	65%	65%	56%	81%	79%
Target	90%	90%	90%	90%	90%

## How Are We Doing

This measure tracks the percentage of cities with a population over 10,000 that have completed a major update of their local land use plans in the past 10 years, in order to provide a 20-year supply of buildable residential land within the city's urban growth

boundary (UGB). This measure was adopted when all cities over 2,500 population were required to periodically review and update their plans. In 2007 the legislature removed this requirement for cities with a population of less than 10,000. Planning and zoning a sufficient amount of land, based on an up-to-date housing needs analysis, helps assure that enough land is available for construction of new housing at various price ranges and rent levels in these communities. An increasing percentage of lower- and middle- income households pay more for housing costs than is considered reasonable. This emphasizes the importance of the department's work with state agencies and local governments to assure an adequate supply of residential land in UGBs. Residential land supply is one factor that directly affects a city's ability to provide for affordable housing needs. The department provides technical and financial assistance to local governments for evaluation of the supply of residential lands.

The target has not been met for this reporting period. The result at 79 percent is 11 percentage points below the target of 90 percent (38 of 48 cities). The result is slightly lower than the 2015 measurement, which found 81 percent of target cities meeting the standard (39 of 48 cities). Several cities are in the midst of large-scale multi-year reviews of residential land supply issues, such as Bend, Salem, Corvallis, Medford, and Eugene, but have not yet finished these projects. Other cities have expressed no discernable interest in updating or reviewing housing supply issues. Cities within the Portland Metro Urban Growth Boundary are in compliance with this target because of the efforts of Metro, which adopted a revised urban growth report as required by Oregon law in November 2015.

### **Factors Affecting Results**

Factors supporting a positive outcome include: 1.) A city is in periodic review (required for cities with populations over 10,000), and its periodic review work program includes a task to complete or update a residential land needs analysis, and/or a UGB evaluation; 2.) State grant funds are available for local buildable land inventories, residential land needs analyses, and UGB evaluations, either during periodic review or otherwise; 3.) A city in periodic review is on schedule to complete its work program; 4.) A city updates its buildable land inventory and residential land needs analysis at least every 10 years; and 5.) Department staff resources are available to provide local governments with technical assistance. Barriers to a positive outcome include: 1.) Historically, state grant

funds have not covered all qualified and needed land supply planning projects, and the department's ability to provide financial assistance to cities decreases each biennium; 2.) Cities face financial and resource issues, which may lead them to choose other projects for limited resources other than studies and actions needed to assure a 20-year residential land supply; and 3.) Cities may have hesitated to conduct buildable lands inventories, residential land needs analyses, and UGB evaluations due to the cost, time delays, and litigiousness that have surrounded such efforts during the past decade in certain cities (e.g. Scappoose, Woodburn), especially in light of the streamlining effort that should make the process more streamlined and cost effective.

KPM #3	PUBLIC FACILITIES PLANS - Percent of cities that have updated the local plan to include reasonable cost estimates and funding plans for sewer and water systems.				
	Data Collection Period: Jul 01 - Jun 30				
<b>Report Year</b>	<b>2012</b>	<b>2013</b>	<b>2014</b>	<b>2015</b>	<b>2016</b>
<b>PUBLIC FACILITIES PLANS</b>					
Actual	46%	43%	52%	75%	83%
Target	70%	70%	70%	70%	70%

### How Are We Doing

Planning for the timely provision of public facilities is a prerequisite for urban development, affordable housing, and market-ready industrial sites. This measure tracks the percentage of cities with a population over 10,000 that have completed an update within the last 10 years of their local plans for water and sewer system facilities needed to serve future land development within the urban growth boundary (UGB), including cost estimates and funding plans.

The number of jurisdictions meeting the standard was 40, or 83 percent of the 48 jurisdictions in the dataset. Performance was 13

percentage points above the target, which is 70 percent of all jurisdictions. Many cities have independent revenue sources from rates derived from their water and sewer utilities to complete various facilities master plans, and public facilities planning is less likely to be a focus of public controversy and discord. The increase in performance was a result of four additional cities that had adopted public facility plans prior to the current reporting period and should have been reported in 2015. The department performed additional steps beyond review of the Post-Acknowledgment Plan Amendment database to determine precisely which cities met this measure since some of the adopted public facilities plans are adopted as “supporting documents” and do not need to be reported to the state as Post-Acknowledgment Plan Amendments. As a result of this review, additional cities were found in compliance.

### **Factors Affecting Results**

Factors leading to a positive outcome include:

1.) A city is in periodic review (required for cities with populations over 10,000), and its periodic review work program includes a task to do or update a public facilities plan; 2.) State grant funds are available for public facilities plans, either during periodic review or otherwise. For example, the department gave a technical assistance grant to the city of Tigard during this reporting period to devise a public facilities financing plan for an underutilized industrial site. The city and the property owner devised an innovative plan and an employer is in the process of breaking ground on the site; 3.) A city in periodic review is on schedule to complete its work program; 4.) A city updates its public facilities plan or a portion of that plan dealing with sewer, water, or storm drainage at least every ten years; 5.) Water and sewer master plans often have independent funding sources derived from utility rates that allow for preparation and adoption of these plans; 6.) Stormwater master plans are mandated in order to meet federal clean water standards, and thus cities have strong incentives to prepare and adopt such plans; and 5.) Public facilities master plans are often adopted as "supporting documents" to a city's comprehensive plan, which does not require going through a comprehensive plan amendment process and subjecting the adopted plan to legal challenge as a land use decision.

Barriers to a positive outcome include: 1.) Historically, state grant funds have not covered all qualified and needed local projects, and the department's ability to provide financial assistance to cities does not increase or actually decreases each biennium; and 2.) Some cities receive utility services from special districts or regional service providers, and thus have less incentive to complete public facilities plans for the area within the city boundaries.

KPM #4	CERTIFIED INDUSTRIAL SITES - Number of industrial sites certified as “project-ready” added each fiscal year.				
	Data Collection Period: Jul 01 - Jun 30				
<b>Report Year</b>	<b>2012</b>	<b>2013</b>	<b>2014</b>	<b>2015</b>	<b>2016</b>
<b>CERTIFIED INDUSTRIAL SITES</b>					
Actual	2	2	9	6	1
Target	6	6	6	6	5

### How Are We Doing

According to information from Oregon Business Development Department (ODBDD), this fiscal year, OBDD certified one new “shovel ready” industrial site for 60 acres. However, this did not meet the target of 5. The program accomplished the following this fiscal year: the department streamlined its program and launched July 1, 2015; had one Certification in La Grande - 60 acres; one Pre-Certification in Forest Grove - 25 acres; 29 Sites Re-Certified - 1,890 acres; three intakes in process from the Metro Regional Solutions Team - Certification Reports due October 2016; and a third party program review is underway and due September 2016.

## Factors Affecting Results

The current sites in the OBDD certification process are more constrained by physical, transportation, land use and market factors making them more difficult to meet certification requirements. Limited options for funding and financing public infrastructure improvements remains a challenge for many of these sites and has delayed certification. Over sixty sites remain in the intake phase of the program for this reason.

KPM #5	TRANSIT SUPPORTIVE LAND USE - Percent of urban areas with a population greater than 25,000 that have adopted transit supportive land use regulations.				
	Data Collection Period: Jul 01 - Jun 30				
<b>Report Year</b>	<b>2012</b>	<b>2013</b>	<b>2014</b>	<b>2015</b>	<b>2016</b>
<b>TRANSIT SUPPORTIVE LAND USE</b>					
Actual	89%	85%	88%	86%	86%
Target	88%	90%	90%	90%	90%

## How Are We Doing

This performance measure demonstrates whether local communities have adopted land development regulations that assure land use and public transit systems are integrated and mutually supportive. Transit-supportive land use regulations are necessary to allow development at densities adequate to support transit service and to ensure that pedestrian and transit facilities are provided as part of new developments. The combination of adequate intensity of uses along a transit line with safe and convenient access for pedestrians is important to enable transit systems to operate efficiently.

The department assists local governments in adopting land development regulations intended to improve local transportation options and enhance the efficiency of public transportation systems. Government partners include local governments, transit districts, and the Oregon Department of Transportation through the Transportation and Growth Management program. Other partners include property owners, developers, and realtors who participate in planning and outreach efforts to promote transportation-efficient land use patterns.

The targets have largely been achieved up to this time because local governments have adopted transit-supportive land development regulations. Moving forward the targets will become increasingly difficult to meet as there are fewer jurisdictions remaining where improvements are needed. As the compliance rate approaches 100 percent, the remaining cities often provide the most difficult challenge. The department has been focusing effort on the remaining jurisdictions.

### **Factors Affecting Results**

Factors that have improved results in recent years include increased concerns about housing affordability, demographic changes, and the desire to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. Roughly half of cities that have not fully adopted transit supportive land use regulations are smaller cities (less than 10,000 population) that are included in KPM 5 because they are within a larger metropolitan area. For example Eagle Point (population 8,695) is within the Rogue Valley metropolitan area, and Jefferson (population 3,165) is within the Albany metropolitan area. These smaller cities often have less funding and local staff to address the complexities of planning for transit supportive land uses, and may not have local support for allowing higher densities of land uses.

KPM #6	TRANSPORTATION FACILITIES - Percent of urban areas that have updated the local plan to include reasonable cost estimates and funding plans for transportation facilities.				
	Data Collection Period: Jul 01 - Jun 30				
<b>Report Year</b>	<b>2012</b>	<b>2013</b>	<b>2014</b>	<b>2015</b>	<b>2016</b>
<b>TRANSPORTATION FACILITIES</b>					
Actual	89%	90%	90%	91%	91%
Target	88%	90%	91%	92%	92%

### How Are We Doing

This measure indicates the percentage of cities with a population over 2,500 that have an acknowledged Transportation System Plan (TSP), as required by LCDC's Transportation Planning Rule (OAR 660, division 12) and Statewide Planning Goal 12. These TSPs address streets and highways, pedestrian and bicycle facilities, mass transit for large cities, and air, rail, and other freight facilities, and are intended to assist local and state efforts to improve transportation facilities. These plans are coordinated at the city, county and state level. They contain lists of major transportation projects which are needed to support compact, urban development for the next 20 years. The department assists local governments in adopting TSPs and related land developments regulations. Government partners include local governments, transit districts and the Oregon Department of Transportation through the Transportation and Growth Management program. Other partners include property owners, developers, and realtors who participate in planning and outreach efforts to promote efficient transportation systems and supportive land use patterns.

Progress continues as local governments adopt TSPs, but not as fast as anticipated in the targets. The general trend shows a slowing of the rate of adoption since about 2007. This slowing in local TSP adoption occurred because there are fewer cities that have not already completed their TSP. Most cities tracked by this KPM have completed their first TSP, and TSP updates will be more common in the future.

## Factors Affecting Results

The slow rate of completion in recent years is not surprising because there are very few cities that have not already adopted a TSP. Most of the remaining cities are small, with less than 4,000 in population. For these cities, the barriers are a lack of funding and a lack of staff for the complex process of transportation planning. One example of a larger city without a TSP is Damascus, which also never adopted a comprehensive plan. Damascus disincorporated shortly after the data collection period, and will not be included in the next report.

KPM #7	FARM LAND - Percent of farm land outside urban growth boundaries zoned for exclusive farm use in 1987 that retains that zoning.				
	Data Collection Period: Jan 01 - Dec 31				
<b>Report Year</b>	<b>2012</b>	<b>2013</b>	<b>2014</b>	<b>2015</b>	<b>2016</b>
<b>FARMLAND</b>					
Actual	99.85%	99.86%	99.90%	99.80%	99.80%
Target	99.88%	99.87%	99.95%	99.95%	99.95%

## How Are We Doing

One of the goals of Oregon's planning program (Statewide Planning Goal 3) is to conserve agricultural land for farm uses, consistent with legislative policies in ORS 215.243 and 215.700. The Department of Land Conservation and Development seeks to achieve this goal through acknowledgment of local comprehensive land use plans and exclusive farm use zoning. This measure tracks the percentage of agricultural land outside UGBs that remains zoned exclusive farm use (EFU) over time, as compared to the acres zoned EFU in 1987. The less farmland rezoned for rural or urban development relative to the total amount zoned EFU in 1987, the greater the indication that local plans and ordinances are working to protect farmland for agriculture.

The results for calendar year 2015 show that the state's land use planning program continues to work well to maintain agricultural lands for farm use. In 2015, 1,502 acres of EFU land were rezoned: 1,219 acres for rural development, 79 acres for urban uses and 204 acres for forest or mixed farm-forest use. In 2015, eight acres were rezoned from other uses to EFU. From a base of 16.1 million acres of EFU-zoned land in 1987, a total of 32,399 net acres have been rezoned to other urban and rural uses in the 28-year period through 2015. This means that 99.8 percent of land zoned EFU in 1987 was still zoned EFU in 2015, thus not quite meeting the 2015 target of 99.9 percent protection.

### **Factors Affecting Results**

Rezoning of farmland occurs through local government decisions in response to applications to change EFU zoning and through expansions of urban growth boundaries. Such applications are subject to goals, rules and state land use statutes. While this performance measure provides a good overall assessment of the longevity of EFU zoning over time, the modest amount of land rezoned out of EFU compared to the very large base of current EFU zoning is so small as to not register on the farmland performance graph. This measure offers only a partial assessment of the type or level of development and land division activity that may occur on lands zoned out of EFU. It does not measure land use conversion based on permitted development that take place within EFU zones or authorized Measure 49 development. Estimates are that several times as much acreage is converted within EFU zones as is rezoned out of EFU zones each year.

KPM #8	FOREST LAND - Percent of forest land outside urban growth boundaries zoned in 1987 for forest or mixed farm/forest use that remains zoned for those uses.				
	Data Collection Period: Jan 01 - Dec 31				
<b>Report Year</b>	<b>2012</b>	<b>2013</b>	<b>2014</b>	<b>2015</b>	<b>2016</b>
<b>FORESTLAND</b>					
Actual	99.93%	99.92%	99.92%	99.92%	99.93%
Target	99.93%	99.93%	99.95%	99.95%	99.95%

### How Are We Doing

This measure tracks the percent of forest land that remains zoned for forest or mixed farm-forest use over time, as compared to the acreage zoned for forest or mixed farm-forest uses in 1987. The less forest land rezoned for urban and rural development relative to the amount zoned forest or mixed farm-forest in 1987, the greater the indication that local plans and ordinances are working to protect forest land for commercial and other forest uses.

The results for calendar year 2015, reported in the 2016 column, show that the state's land use program continues to work well to maintain forest lands for commercial forest and other forest uses. In 2015, 362 acres of forest lands were rezoned: 361 acres to rural development and one acre to urban development. 204 acres were rezoned from other zones to forest or mixed-farm forest use. From a 1987 base of nearly 11.8 million acres of forest and mixed farm-forest zoned land, a net total of 9,911 acres have been rezoned from forest and mixed farm-forest to other rural and urban uses in the 28-year period through 2015. This means that 99.92 percent of land zoned forest in 1987 was still zoned forest or mixed farm-forest in 2015, thus nearly meeting the 2015 target of 99.93 percent protection.

### Factors Affecting Results

Rezoning of forest land occurs through local government decisions, in response to applications by property owners to change forest or mixed farm-forest zoning, and through UGB expansions. The approval of such applications is governed by goals, rules and state

land use statutes. While this performance measure provides a good overall assessment of the longevity of forest and mixed farm-forest zoning over time, the modest amount of land rezoned out of forest use compared to the very large base of current forest and mixed farm-forest zoning is so small as to not register on the Forest Land KPM graph. This measure offers only a partial assessment of the type or level of development and land division activity that may occur on lands zoned out of forest and mixed farm-forest zones. It does not measure land use conversion based on permitted development that take place within forest and mixed farm-forest zones or authorized Measure 49 development. Estimates are that several times as much acreage is converted within forest and mixed farm-forest zones as is rezoned out of forest and mixed farm-forest zones each year.

KPM #9	URBAN GROWTH BOUNDARY EXPANSION - Percent of land added to urban growth boundaries that is not farm or forest land.				
	Data Collection Period: Jan 01 - Dec 31				
<b>Report Year</b>	<b>2012</b>	<b>2013</b>	<b>2014</b>	<b>2015</b>	<b>2016</b>
<b>URBAN GROWTH BOUNDARY EXPANSION</b>					
Actual	59%	38%	14%	14%	92%
Target	55%	55%	55%	55%	55%

### How Are We Doing

Statewide Planning Goal 14 requires establishment of an urban growth boundary around each urban area to separate urban land from rural farm and forest land, and assure that urban areas have sufficient land for long-term growth while providing for an orderly and efficient transition from rural to urban land use. Land included in a UGB must be selected consistent with priorities set forth in ORS 197.298 and Goal 14 intended to conserve farm and forest land as much as possible. Those priorities require that farm or forest lands are the last priority for UGB expansions.

In 2015, 1,029 acres were added to UGBs statewide. Of this, 79 acres (8 percent) were previously zoned EFU, one acre (less than one percent) was zoned forest and 949 acres (92 percent) were zoned for a variety of rural uses other than farming and forestry. Therefore, the target of 55 percent of lands added to UGBs being previously zoned for non-resource uses was met.

### Factors Affecting Results

The total number of amendments and acreage added to UGBs is highly variable from year to year. Many UGB amendments occur in areas surrounded by farm or forest-zoned lands. In some areas, non-resource zoned lands are unavailable, so cities have no choice but to include farm or forest land as the urban area expands. Local governments select the type of land added to UGBs through plan amendments approved by the city and county. LCDC has some authority to disallow UGB amendments that do not follow statutory priorities regarding farm and forest land, but this ability will not improve performance where local governments have no other options for urban expansion. During this reporting period, the single largest UGB amendment was completed by Grants Pass, which added 822 acres to its boundary without converting any farm or forest land. No other UGB amendment in the state during this period included over 50 acres, so the acreage of farm or forest land included in each was small.

KPM #10	GRANT AWARDS - Percent of local grants awarded to local governments within two months after receiving application.				
	Data Collection Period: Jul 01 - Jun 30				
<b>Report Year</b>	<b>2012</b>	<b>2013</b>	<b>2014</b>	<b>2015</b>	<b>2016</b>
<b>GRANT AWARDS</b>					
Actual	100%	100%	90%	90%	73%
Target	90%	100%	100%	100%	100%

## **How Are We Doing**

In order to provide local governments with the maximum time to utilize planning grant resources within the biennium, DLCD minimizes application and processing time.

DLCD failed to meet the KPM target during this reporting period. The performance management category was “green.” Those grant applications that rated the highest received an award notification within the target period of 60 days.

Decisions that qualified for an award according to the ratings criteria but were not highest priority projects “took longer” because (1) the department negotiated the scope of work with the applicant in order to focus the project for the purpose of raising its rating or lowering the grant amount, or both; or (2) coordination with other sources of funds slowed down the review process.

For example, the city of Prineville applied for a grant to update its water master plan. This was a mid-priority project that was potentially eligible for funding through other sources. The department and city investigated other opportunities and when they didn’t materialize the technical assistance grant was awarded - 71 days after the application was received.

## **Factors Affecting Results**

While we endeavor to make quick decisions, it is more important that we make good decisions. Some portion of the applications each biennium take longer than we would like due partly to scarcity of funds (many priority projects do not get funded, making decisions on the margins difficult) and partly to lack of urgency on the part of the applicants to negotiate changes to the project. The performance management target takes this into account while the KPM target does not.

KPM #11	CUSTOMER SERVICE - Percent of customers rating their satisfaction with the agency's customer service as "good" or "excellent": overall customer service, timeliness, accuracy, helpfulness, expertise and availability of information.				
	Data Collection Period: Jul 01 - Jun 30				
<b>Report Year</b>	<b>2012</b>	<b>2013</b>	<b>2014</b>	<b>2015</b>	<b>2016</b>
<b>Timeliness</b>					
Actual	70.90%	70.90%	73.96%	73.96%	89.82%
Target	83%	83%	83%	83%	83%
<b>Accuracy</b>					
Actual	71.21%	71.21%	72.82%	72.82%	88.56%
Target	83%	83%	83%	83%	83%
<b>Availability of Information</b>					
Actual	66.92%	66.92%	73.69%	73.69%	82.31%
Target	83%	83%	83%	83%	83%
<b>Overall</b>					
Actual	73.33%	73.33%	72.63%	72.63%	88.17%
Target	83%	83%	83%	83%	83%
<b>Helpfulness</b>					
Actual	81.49%	81.49%	77.08%	77.08%	89.94%
Target	83%	83%	83%	83%	83%
<b>Expertise</b>					
Actual	88.06%	88.06%	85.41%	85.41%	95.83%
Target	83%	83%	83%	83%	83%

## **How Are We Doing**

The 2005 Legislature approved Statewide Customer Service Performance Measures and required all state agencies to survey and report on customer satisfaction. The survey is conducted biennially. The department conducted its sixth survey in October 2016. Previous surveys were conducted by the Oregon Progress Board in 2006 and 2008. A survey did not occur in fiscal year 2015.

2016 is the fourth department biennial survey conducted online, rather than by telephone. All categories increased in performance. All but one category, availability of information met target. The results of this survey reflect continued efforts of the department in improving communication with local jurisdictions by notifying jurisdictions of department actions in a timely manner and providing training for local jurisdictions through planners' network meetings.

## **Factors Affecting Results**

DLCD prepared its fourth online census survey using an online survey tool called Survey Monkey. This year, the department elected to expand upon the questions required by the state in an effort to collect more comprehensive and useful data for department use. The newly added, complimenting questions gave survey respondents the option to provide additional qualitative and quantitative information about: their department interactions, areas of interest, demographics, and ideas for improved service.

The survey response rate increased by over 183 percent. There were 295 respondents out of a sample population of 860. As a result of the higher response rate, there is a decrease in the margin of error.

To an open ended question that asked "What could DLCD do to provide better service to you or your organization?" 12 of 59 respondents specifically noted that an increase in grant funding available through the agency would be their first choice for adding capacity to the agency, 5 others considered additional staffing to be a priority. 12 respondents indicated that information availability was top concern for increasing overall service levels at DLCD (including online information availability, training for local planning staff and planning commissioners, providing up to date information on changed/changing land use laws, and availability for needs

as technical as Endangered Species Act case law and as basic as general land use overviews). And finally, 11 of the 59 thought DLCD was already doing a good job and expressed appreciation.

KPM #12	BEST PRACTICES - Percent of total best practices met by the Board.				
	Data Collection Period: Jul 01 - Jun 30				
<b>Report Year</b>	<b>2012</b>	<b>2013</b>	<b>2014</b>	<b>2015</b>	<b>2016</b>
<b>BEST PRACTICES</b>					
Actual	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

### How Are We Doing

The 2007 Legislature approved a Statewide Best Practices Measure and required certain boards and commissions to report on their ability to meet established criteria. Implementation of this performance measure for affected boards and commissions includes an annual commission self -assessment of the state best practices criteria. To meet this requirement, the LCDC defined how it will meet the established criteria. Each member of LCDC rates the commission against 15 best practices criteria established by the Department of Administrative Services and the Legislative Fiscal Office. The commission completed its best practices scorecard for fiscal year 2016 at its November 17-18, 2016, LCDC meeting.

### Factors Affecting Results

The commission has proven to operate efficiently for some time. The success of this measure is largely due to the commission itself, although staff resources and support also play a role.