



# Oregon

John A. Kitzhaber, M.D., Governor

**Department of Land Conservation and Development**

635 Capitol Street NE, Suite 150

Salem, Oregon 97301-2540

Phone: (503) 373-0050

Fax: (503) 378-5518

[www.oregon.gov/LCD](http://www.oregon.gov/LCD)



October 6, 2011

TO: Land Conservation and Development Commission

FROM: Michael Morrissey, Policy Analyst  
Teddy Leland, Operations Services Division Manager

SUBJECT: **Agenda Item 8, October 6-7, 2011, LCDC Meeting**

## **Summary of 2011 Annual Performance Progress Report (APPR) Key Performance Measures**

### **I. AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY & RECOMMENDATION**

This item includes a staff presentation of key performance measures (KPMs) in a table format, that will be included in the department's 2011 Annual Performance Progress Report (APPR). Portions of the full APPR are still under review by the department. The entire APPR will be submitted to the Department of Administrative Services, Budget and Management Division later in the fall.

For more information about this agenda item, contact either Michael Morrissey at (503) 373-0050 ext. 320, [Michael.Morrissey@state.or.us](mailto:Michael.Morrissey@state.or.us) or Teddy Leland at (503) 373-0050 ext. 237, [Teddy.Leland@state.or.us](mailto:Teddy.Leland@state.or.us).

### **II. SUMMARY OF 2011 ANNUAL PERFORMANCE PROGRESS REPORT**

The department is required to submit its Annual Performance Progress Report to the Department of Administrative Services (DAS), Budget and Management Division in the fall of each year. The APPR is legislatively required, and is an important component of the department's budget package. Individual performance measures are legislatively approved; some of them originated with (were identified by) the legislature itself, while most originated with the department. The 19 2011 key performance measures are identical to those used in 2010, with the exception of performance measure #19, relating to Measure 49, which was eliminated by the 2011 legislature.

The structure of the 2011 APPR report package will remain identical with the 2010 report. Part I is an Executive Summary, which functions as an overview and ties the performance measures into the state benchmark program. Part II, Key Measure Analysis, contains information on

individual benchmarks. Part III, Using Performance Data, gives some background on how the performance measures are used operationally and communicated to the public. An Agency Management Report, a snapshot of each performance measure in terms of its actual performance, and a contextual comment, will continue as well.

On the whole, the key performance measures reflect positive outcomes across a spectrum of objectives reflected in the statewide land use program. Several benchmark results are at, or above their targets, and have been so for several years. The color coding on the chart for these KPMs is green. Five benchmarks are indicated with a “red” status meaning they were more than 15% below the target: #1 Employment Land Supply, #2 Housing Land Supply, #4 Certified Industrial Sites, #9 Natural Resource Inventories, and #12 UGB Expansion. The challenge in each case is to accurately predict what local jurisdictions or agency partners will be able to accomplish at a future date.

### **III. COMMISSION OPTIONS**

Staff requests that the commission review and comment on the summary KPM document.

**DLCD 2011 Key Performance Measure Summary**

		'08	'09	'10	'11		
1	Employment Land: % of cities that have an adequate supply of employment land for industrial and other employment uses.	Tar	76	81	79	79	Results dropped in '09 because the department changed its method to rely only on information from its data base, and no longer infer that a city was OK based on less reliable data.  Results improved in 2010 and 2011, as funds were made available to a limited # of cities each year for economic opportunities analysis.
		Act	63	29	39	48	
2	Housing Land Supply: % of cities that have an adequate supply of buildable residential land to meet housing need.	Tar	92	67	70	84	Measured results increased slightly, but lag by 18% compared to rising target numbers.
		Act	95	97	65	66	
3	Public Facilities Plan: % of cities that have updated the local plan to include reasonable cost estimates and funding plans for sewer and water systems.	Tar	42	43	44	43	Continued improvement for this measure.
		Act	41	42	42	50	
4	Certified Industrial Sites: Number of sites certified as project-ready <u>added</u> each year.	Tar	12	12	6	6	Five sites totaling 463 acres have been certified in 2010-11, reflecting applications processed since last year. Cities gaining such sites were Prineville (3 sites), The Dalles, Ontario. DLCD shares this KPM with the Regional Solutions Team, Department of Transportation Department of Environmental Quality and the Business Development Department.
		Act	14	5	1	5	
5	Transit Supportive Land Use: % of urban areas with a population greater than 25,000 that have adopted transit supportive land use regulations.	Tar	76	80	86	88	Continued improvement as local governments continue to adopt transit supportive land development regulations. The focus on remaining jurisdictions is on MPO areas.
		Act	80	83	86	88	

6	Transportation Facilities: % of urban areas that have updated the local plan to include reasonable cost estimates and funding plans for transportation facilities.		'08	'09	'10	'11	
		Tar	58	62	69	77	
		Act	83	86	87	88	
7	ERT: % of local participants who rank DLCD involvement in the ERT process as good to excellent.		'08	'09	'10	'11	Results reflect a biennial survey. The most recent survey was 2010.
		Tar	66	66	66	66	
		Act	70	70	65	65	
8	Coastal Development Zoning: % of estuarine areas designated as "development management units" in 2000 that retain that designation.		'08	'09	'10	'11	
		Tar	100	100	100	100	
		Act	100	100	100	100	
9	Natural Resource Areas: % of urban areas that have updated buildable lands inventories to account for natural resource & hazardous areas.		'08	'09	'10	'11	The target and actual #'s reflect an <u>annual accounting</u> . Given that there are two components, Goal 5 (wetlands, riparian areas and wildlife habitat) & Goal 7 (floodways, floodplains and landslide hazard areas, reporting on a 10-year rolling basis, like some other KPMs, would yield a more satisfactory 66%.
		Tar	10	11	6	6	
		Act	13	5	3	3	
10	Farm Land: % of farmland outside UGBs zoned for EFU in 1987 that retain that zoning.		'07	'08	'09	'10	The results for this KPM are reported on a calendar year basis.
		Tar	99.93	99.92	99.92	99.92	
		Act	99.91	99.90	99.89	99.88	

11	Forest Land: % of forest land outside UGBs zoned in 1987 for forest or missed farm/forest use that remains zoned for those uses.		'07	'08	'09	'10	
		Tar	99.95	99.95	99.94	99.94	
		Act	99.94	99.94	99.92	99.92	
12	<b>UGB Expansion:</b> % of land added to UGBs that is not farm or forest lands.		'07	'08	'09	'10	58 acres were added to urban growth boundaries last year. Of that only 33% or 19 acres were non-resource.
		Tar	55	55	55	55	
		Act	78	63	20	33	
13	<b>Periodic Review Remands:</b> % of Periodic Review work tasks that are returned to local jurisdictions for further action.		'08	'09	'10	'11	Nine work tasks were submitted. None were returned for further work.
		Tar	<15	<15	<15	<15	
		Act	0.0	11	11	0.0	
14	<b>Timely Comments:</b> % of DLCD concerns or recommendations regarding local plan amendments that are provided to local governments within the statutory deadline for such comments.		'08	'09	'10	'11	
		Tar	100	100	100	100	
		Act	100	100	100	100	

15	<b>Grant Awards:</b> % of local grants awarded to local governments within 2 months of receiving an application.		'08	'09	'10	'11	161 grants were awarded to local governments.
		Tar	90	90	90	90	
		Act	76	86	94	100	
16	<b>Land Use Appeals:</b> % of agency appeal of local land use decisions that were upheld by LUBA and the courts.		'08	'09	'10	'11	One LUBA appeal for 2010-11 related to a City of Banks urban growth boundary expansion was stayed at LUBA, allowing the parties to seek a settlement. This situation does not meet the KPM definition of an appeal at this time. Therefore calculation is 0/0 = 100%.
		Tar	100	100	100	100	
		Act	100	100	100	100	
17	<b>Customer Service:</b> % of customers rating their satisfaction with the agency's customer service as "good" or "excellent."		'06	'08	'10	'11	This result is based on last year's survey results, since the survey is performed every other year. There are 6 measures. This example shows the "Overall Quality of Service at DLCD" measure, and is the example used in the KPM Management Report. Other measures don't fare so well, such as "Helpfulness of DLCD Employees", which has a target of 83% and a result of 69%.
		Tar	80	80	83	83	
		Act	77	70.3	71	71	
18	<b>Task Review:</b> % of periodic review work tasks under review at DLCD for no longer than four months.		'08	'09	'10	'11	Results reflect review of nine work tasks.
		Tar	95	95	95	'95	
		Act	100	100	100	100	
19	<b>Measure 49:</b> % of Measure 49 claims assigned to the agency that are processed within 180 days.		'08	'09	'10	'11	Eliminated by 2011 legislature.
		Tar	100	100	100		
		Act	100	100	100	N.A.	
20	<b>Best Practices:</b> % of Best Practices met by the commission.		'08	'09	'10	'11	All 15 practices received approvals by LCDC. One measure, "training" received 1 "no" vote.
		Tar	100	100	100	100	
		Act	100	94	100	99	