

**GOVERNING BOARD MEETING MINUTES
OREGON DEPARTMENT OF GEOLOGY AND MINERAL INDUSTRIES**

Monday, September 15, 2025

8:30 a.m.

Hybrid Public Meeting

1) Call to Order: (Linda Kozlowski, Board Chair)

Chair Kozlowski called the meeting to order at 8:32 a.m.

2) Introductions: (Linda Kozlowski, Board Chair, and Staff)

Chair Linda Kozlowski, Vice-Chair Anne MacDonald, Board Members Diane Teeman, and Ruth Dittrich were all in attendance in-person. Board Member Tiffany Thomas was in attendance via Zoom.

Department of Geology and Mineral Industries (DOGAMI) Staff in attendance:

Ruarri Day-Stirrat – Director/State Geologist

Lori Calarruda, Recording Secretary/Executive Assistant

Alex Lopez, Public Affairs Coordinator

Sarah Lewis, MLRR Program Manager

Steve Dahlberg, Chief Financial Officer (CFO)

Jason McClaughry, GS&S Program Manager

Christina Appleby, Legislative Coordinator and Geologist

Laura Gabel, KPM Coordinator and Coastal Field Geologist

Others in attendance:

Diane Lloyd, Department of Justice (DOJ)

3) Review Minutes of June 24, 2025 Board Meeting:

Chair Kozlowski asked if there were any changes to the minutes as presented. No changes.

Board Action: **MacDonald moved to approve the minutes of June 24, 2025 Board Meeting as submitted. Teeman seconded. Yes Votes: Kozlowski; MacDonald; Teeman; Thomas; Dittrich. Motion carried.**

4) Financial Report:

Steve Dahlberg, Chief Financial Officer, presented the DOGAMI FY2025 Budget Status Report, as of June 30, 2025, end of the 2023-25 Biennium results for the Geological Survey and Services (GS&S) and Mineral Land Regulation & Reclamation (MLRR) programs. He also reviewed high-level charts of the new 2025-27 Legislatively Approved Budget (LAB). The Board Packet contained the financial actuals, graphs, and projections.

Dahlberg stated for the 2023-25 Biennium, the Agency had a good budget by doing what it said it would do, and is reverting approximately \$150,000 of the \$7.8M General Fund back to the State. Other Funds and Federal Funds have an Expenditure Limitation, which means those budgets are

18 actually for capacity versus what is actually done. The Lidar Program fell off a little bit, therefore the
19 actuals came in substantially lower. This is not a problem because the work the Agency does is on a
20 reimbursement schedule. Due to expected higher expenses, MLRR increased their Expenditure
21 Limitation budget by \$750,000 to nearly \$5.9M, and spent just over \$5.8M, leaving approximately
22 \$100,000 under the budget limitation. The Program is fee based, which means it needs to earn its
23 revenues, and with the additional expenses that brought down the amount of the operating reserve
24 balance, it missed the 6-month balance target that was set over 1.5 years ago. In the next biennium,
25 the operating reserve balance is being revised to \$1M based on the fee increase negotiations with
26 industry.

27
28 Dahlberg reviewed the 2023-25 General Fund Utilized Budget, which represents the burn rate of
29 General Fund dollars. The Agency is reverting back about \$150,000, but the end of year and
30 biennium formally close in December, so there may be a few more adjustments that happen. The
31 new biennium replenished the Agency with a new budget and it plans to continue to make good
32 choices and investments with the General Fund money. He will work with Leadership on
33 placeholders for new expenditures.

34
35 Dahlberg briefly reviewed the 2019-2029 GS&S Grants chart, stating the Agency is in a good position.
36 The grants are made up of mostly Federal Funds, but includes Other Funds. He explained that worst
37 case scenario, if the Agency did not receive any new grants it would be okay through the biennium.
38 There are several grants in the pipeline, but with the Federal situation there is a little hesitancy about
39 the award amount for each of them, so they were not included in the chart.

40
41 Dittrich asked if there is more uncertainty on the federal grants compared to June, and if it is the
42 strategy to not include them in the projects to be on the safe side. Day-Stirrat stated there are a
43 bunch of knowns and unknowns. There has been some more clarity where grants have been
44 awarded and are in the process of being contracted through the Federal system. There are a number
45 of grants with Notice of Intent to Award received in December and January that have not been
46 released yet. There are future opportunities being put out on Grants.gov, so there is some clarity
47 around projects

48
49 Dahlberg said MLRR had one-time costs last biennium that will not happen again this biennium. The
50 ePermitting General Fund will have more staff time charged to it instead of operations. The
51 ePermitting Project is rolling and has started making traction. The POP for the ePermitting General
52 Fund will rollover \$1.8M for this new biennium and it should carry through, but the Agency may need
53 to ask for additional money towards the end.

54
55 Chair Kozlowski asked if there will be a problem shifting staff out of operations. Day-Stirrat replied
56 the Agency knew it was coming and allocated staff time to advance the project. It is his job to
57 communicate it to industry that there may be a small slowdown, but at the same time the Program
58 will be hiring positions under the new funding.

59
60 Dahlberg reviewed two slides for the 2025-27 biennium. The graphs were biennium comparisons
61 displaying the actual results for 6 Biennia starting with 2015-2017. They reflected a strong upward
62 swing for DOGAMI due in part to the five POPs approved by the Legislature, which included MLRR's
63 fee increase and headcount growth. The Lidar Program has tapered off from the expected grant
64 funding, but it is still a positive outlook for the Agency. It has gone from a poster child of what not to
65 be, to one that is successful.

Chair Kozlowski said it has been a dramatic change and she is thrilled.

Board Action: **Teeman moved to accept the Budget Status Report as presented. Dittrich seconded. Yes Votes: Kozlowski; MacDonald; Teeman; Thomas; Dittrich. Motion carried.**

5) Budget Timeline and Process:

Ruarri Day-Stirrat, Director & State Geologist, reviewed the Budget Timeline and Process.

Day-Stirrat said he was responding to a request from the Board for clarity on how the State Budget gets built. He said the State Budget Cycle is a 2-year process with effectively 18 months of work, then discussed the timeline and emphasized where the Board interacts with the budget build. He used the Budget Cycle Development diagram from the last guidance to demonstrate.

The Agency is currently in the Budget Execution Cycle. The Agency's Request Budget (ARB) process starts again in the January/February timeframe, with a Board meeting in March to start discussing Phase 1 of the budget build. The June Board meeting will provide substantive details of what the Agency is moving forward with, and where the Board will have its final say before the Special Board Meeting in July to sign off on the finalized Agency Budget. DOGAMI is an early submittal agency with its budget submission due by August 1st, and larger agencies submit by September 1st. The next phase is the Governor's Recommended Budget (GRB), where the Agency responds to the Governor's Office (GO) and CFO requests around the ARB. The next long/full Legislative Session starts in 2027, with the Governor's Recommended Budget. The next budget will be signed off at the end of June or early July of 2027.

The Agency will start doing some early budget discussions with the Board around Key Performance Measures (KPMs), therefore the conversations need to start now about what are the appropriate mechanisms to track Agency productivity.

Budget Phase 1 – ARB

January

- Agencies send list of proposed LCs and POPs to their GO advisor, CFO analyst, and legislative team.
- GO/CFO/Agency start monthly budget development meetings.

February-March

- Agencies start partner/constituency outreach as planned with GO, schedule board & commission approvals, if applicable. Start developing/building out your LCs.
- GO/CFO/Agency budget staff continue regular budget development check-ins.
- March Board Meeting

Budget Phase 2 – ARB

April - June

- Agencies work together to develop CSL budget
- April: Agencies submit LCs and POPs to DAS

May-June 27th: First round review of LCs & POPs

5/29: June Revenue Forecast released

- GO/CFO continue to meet with agency budget staff to develop ARB and finalize which POPs to include
- June Board Meeting
- 6/28: All CSL information due to CFO
- 6/28: DAS submits LCs to Legislative Counsel

July – August

- Second round review of LCs and POPs Finalize pricing details for POPs, GO/CFO review final budget and POP narratives
- GO/Agencies review LCs, problem solve as needed
- Agencies continue partner/constituency outreach
- July Special Board Meeting
- 7/31: Deadline to finalize placeholder language with LC, Final POP detail pricing due to CFO for audit
- 7/31: ARB narrative due to CFO and final ARB documents published by 9/1

Budget Phase 3 & 4 GRB

September – October

- Budget briefing materials are developed to inform and advise final budget decisions
- **October:** LC stops drafting, LCs returned

November – December

- GO/CFO/Agencies do final LC review meetings – confirm policy and POPs align before mid-November
- Final drafting of GRB budget books for GRB release, inclusive of final budget decisions
- **12/1:** GRB release
- **12/13:** Bill filing deadline

There are a number of intersection points during the Budget Cycle. During this meeting potential Key Performance Measures (KPMs) will be discussed, with the plan to have them more firmed up at the next Board Meeting, so the March meeting will be more financial in scope than measure based.

Kozlowski asked for all slides to be put in the Board Packet for the next meeting.

Chair Kozlowski clarified that DOGAMI is using the Strategic Plan to do the basic planning and that it drives the Agency's Key Performance Measures and how it measures that success, which is in partnership with the Governor and their needs. Day-Stirrat confirmed her statement.

Briefing: **No Board Action Required.**

6) Review DOGAMI Governing Board Key Performance Measure (KPM) 6 Guidance Document:

Laura Gabel, KPM Coordinator and Coastal Field Geologist, reviewed the DOGAMI Governing Board Key Performance Measure (KPM) 6 Guidance Document.

Gabel stated the Guidance Document was developed by her and Lori Calarruda, and based on the topic of gaining clarity on the metrics used in the KPM 6 assessment discussed during the May 2025 Special Governing Board Meeting. She reviewed the Guidance Document criteria one by one and verified if any changes or updates were needed.

Question 3 – The agency’s mission and high-level goals are current and applicable: Vice-Chair MacDonald asked if Directives or Executive Orders from the Governor’s Office will affect long term goals. Day-Stirrat said it is a possibility. Document Update: Add bullet - Update as necessary for Executive Orders or policy priorities by the Governor’s Office.

Question 6 – The Board is appropriately involved in policy-making activities: Vice-Chair MacDonald asked if other designated authorities included strategic directions. Day-Stirrat said it is related to all the authorities the Board has, such as the Oil and Gas Commission.

Question 9 – The Board periodically reviews key financial information and audit findings: Document Update: The Board will be informed of any external audits and the findings of the audits.

Question 10 – The Board is appropriately accounting for resources: Chair Kozlowski asked if it makes sense to list a specific person. Document Update: The Agency’s budget is comprised of people and expenditures. Appropriately accounting for those resources means ensuring that the Agency has adequate staffing to do the job and can maintain operating expenses.

Question 11 – The agency adheres to accounting rules and other relevant financial controls: Document Update: Change the third bulled to read - The Board will be informed of any external audits and the findings of the audits.

Question 13 – The Board coordinates with others where responsibilities and interests overlap: Vice-Chair MacDonald asked to have it changed to other local, State and Federal agencies. Document Update: Consider “others” as stakeholders, other local, State, and Federal agencies, elected representatives, etc.

Question 14 – The Board members identify and attend appropriate training sessions: Vice-Chair MacDonald asked if they should consider topical Board training. A lengthy discussion took place. Document Update: Add verbiage about annual training and information sessions.

The requested document changes will be completed and brought back to the next meeting for final review and vote.

No Board Action taken.

7) Agency Key Performance Measures (KPMs) Annual Update:

Laura Gabel, KPM Coordinator and Coastal Field Geologist, reviewed the Agency’s Performance Progress Report, also known as the Annual Key Performance Measures (KPMs), that will be submitted to DAS. The Board completed their Annual Assessment by answering the required 15 questions.

Dittrich asked what the pie chart colors meant on the KPM Summary Page. Day-Stirrat explained green is when the Agency is within 5% of target, yellow is 5%-15% of the target, and red is greater than 15% of the target. This is a DAS generated report and the current summary does not include KPM 6, the Governing Board’s Annual Assessment, which will change the overall percentages.

KPM 1 – Hazard and Risk Assessment Completion:

The Agency has been consistently meeting target. This year's target was 72% and reached 74.2%. Dittrich asked if the percentages change based on any events that happen. Gabel replied these assessments are separate from any specific geologic event that happens. Vice-Chair MacDonald asked if the map shows where additional work will take place or is it based on which UGBs comes with their checkbook. Day-Stirrat explained that each county has at least one hazard assessment completed and not all counties will have the same risks. It is not entirely based on the checkbook or where the Agency needs to go, but some are based on Federal funding and what will be successful. McClaughry clarified that some of the assessments are guided by community engagement or done when communities come to the Agency with issues/concerns/needs and the staff develop particular proposals to seek out funding sources.

KPM 2 – Detailed Geologic Mapping Completion:

The target was 68% and reached 63.8%.

KPM 3 – Lidar Data Completion:

The target was 60% and reached 91.6% of the State covered with Lidar, through a combination of efforts from different agencies. Vice-Chair MacDonald asked if DAS looks at the deviation above the target as not being green. Day-Stirrat said that will need to be looked at. He stated it is not possible to reach 100%, so there is a need to define what is complete Lidar coverage.

KPM 4 – Mine Site Inspections:

The target was 25% and reached 18%. Chair Kozlowski asked if the changes at MLRR will help address meeting the KPM. Day-Stirrat replied the Fee Bill with the addition of two positions will allow the Program to meet and potentially exceed the KPM. Lewis said she was not sure how the target was set at 25% for 2025, it should be 20%. She stated the Program will meet the 20% KPM for 2026. Teeman asked how it is determined what sites will be inspected. Lewis replied the inspections have been based on new applications and complaints that rise to the level of potential environmental harm; in 2025 68 inspections were completed that met those criteria, and 12 reviews of aerial photography that determined activity. The Audit Implementation Plan will determine what the new Field Inspectors will be doing going forward.

KPM 5 – Customer Service:

The total number of survey respondents is down from the previous year; GS&S received 35 responses, compared to 54 last year, and MLRR received 0, compared to over 100 last year. MLRR did not send out a Customer Service Survey due to the survey sent out for the MLRR Process Audit. Day-Stirrat clarified there was an extensive process audit done on the MLRR program, where the industry had ample opportunity to comment on the Program. The Agency will need to look at finding creative ways to get more feedback. Lopez added he is hearing that people are suffering from survey fatigue, which maybe causing the low numbers. Dittrich asked if there is a way to include the audit responses for this survey. Day-Stirrat said it was different and not applicable to this survey. MLRR will be included next year in the survey. Vice-Chair MacDonald does not think a 95% Customer Satisfaction rate is realistic. Day-Stirrat concurred.

Board Action: **MacDonald moved to approve the revisions to the 2025 Annual Progress Performance Report as presented. Dittrich seconded. Yes Votes: Kozlowski; MacDonald; Teeman; Thomas; Dittrich. Motion carried.**

8) Agency Key Performance Measures (KPMs) Changes:

Ruarri Day-Stirrat, Director & State Geologist, discussed the Agency's Annual Key Performance Measures (KPMs) Changes.

Day-Stirrat said in the previous Budget Cycle the Agency changed the MLRR program Key Performance Measure to be reflective of the work the Program is able to do. The Legislature has asked the Agency to develop new KPMs for the MLRR program. The GS&S program needs to start looking at new KPMs due to multiple factors. Since Lidar is approaching full coverage, it needs an appropriate KPM. Several of the other KPMs are predicated on Federal funding driving the Agency's ability to deliver on them. The KPMs need to be brought into alignment with the Legislatively Adopted and Appropriated Budget and not on the ability to raise Federal funds. This is an opening conversation on KPMs, not a definitive one, to solicit Board feedback and direction.

Proposal: MLRR KPM for Application Processing

Lewis briefly explained how KPM 4 was developed using SMART goals: Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Relevant, Timebound. Other questions to consider are how are the KPM targets set and who is responsible for any changes to them over the course of the KPM's life. For Package 101 MLRR ePermitting, the Legislature requested a minimum of one new KPM regarding permit application processing against regulatory timelines.

There is also a Budget Note (HB 5010) in DOGAMI's Budget around the MLRR Process Audit, requiring the Agency/Program to report to the Natural Resources Subcommittee of the Joint Committee on Ways and Means at the beginning of the next session on the following: 1) the status of audit findings implemented; 2) progress made on the permit backlog; 3) anticipated completion date [of backlog]; 4) the average number of days for completing a Permit Application by application type; 5) the projected cost and related fee increase necessary to fully implement the process audit findings.

Lewis stated that when trying to put a timeline to the Permit Application process steps, the measuring is actually attainable, something that can be measured, and what the Program has control over. She reviewed the generalized outline for the surface mining Operating Permit Application process, that contains about 7-8 steps the Program goes through. The ideal timeline the Program would like to meet to turnaround a permit is 4-6 months, currently it is in excess of a year. Some of the phases have a regulatory timeline requirement, for example Circulation is standard 35 days no matter what type of permit. There is no strict regulatory timeline for how long a permit issuance needs to take.

Lewis reviewed the MLRR regulatory timelines associated with specific steps in the application process for the different permit types that are based on statute and/or rule. These are the standards the Program has when looking at a new KPM. Chair Kozlowski asked if the timelines are all internal and not external. Lewis said the review of application is internal, but the circulation of permit to reviewing agencies is for external comments on the permits, but not from applicants. If the Program does not receive information from the external parties, it has to move the application forward. With the issue or denial of the final permit, it does include response from the applicant. The way statute is written, it just says after circulation, the Department has 90 days, but that does not take into consideration the reconciliation of comments or the submission of a reclamation security, which is one of the final steps and something the applicant has to do. It is difficult for the Program to be fully in control of that final permit decision. Vice-Chair MacDonald said she wanted to reiterate that if an applicant is dragging their feet, the Agency should not be penalized and held to timelines outside

their control, so when the KPM is written, it needs to focus on the Agency's response, not from applicants.

Lewis showed the DOGAMI Mining Permit Application Process and Workload status report reflecting on where applications are in the process, that is part of the quarterly updates provided to the Board. It focuses a little on what is measurable and shows what is in DOGAMI court and what is in the applicants court, pointed out by Vice-Chair MacDonald. Lewis is confident the Department does have the information needed to be able to track an application through the process, and ePermitting will allow more transparency around that process.

KPM Concept – Application Processing:

Lewis stated the KPM she is proposing is the percent of complete permit applications receiving technical review within that designated regulatory timeline. After administrative completeness, the second piece is technical review, which is where the Program does not have capacity to pick up a complete application when it comes through the front door and it sits for months. This is why additional staff was requested to spread the workload. This timeline is very specific, and one aspect of the permit process where she believes they have the capacity to improve. It is also measurable, and provided an example.

Percent of complete permit applications receiving technical review within the designated regulatory timeline:

Lewis explained the KPM would be measured as the number of complete applications received in the previous 12 months, divided by the number of applications where the initial technical review was actually performed within that timeframe. The Program has a way to define the date of completeness. It will be different for each permit type. Teeman said for federal agency permitting on expansive projects they get funding from the project proponent to hire additional staff to help facilitate getting the work done, and asked if there is a corollary in the State this has happened or could happen. Lewis explained this is the model for the Division 37 process with Grassy Mountain and there is a mechanism within the Division 35 process, which is non-aggregate, to allow for the State Geologist to set an extraordinary fee that would cover the cost of processing the application. The majority of the applications under Division 30 are processed under a set fee, which was the Fee Bill discussion, and the Agency does not have the ability to charge extra money to get the job done or faster under that mechanism. She asked Diane Lloyd to weigh in about the authorities the Program has around fee setting and the inconsistencies between the different divisions. Lloyd stated it would need to be addressed through a legislative fix and direct statutory authority is required. Day-Stirrat added this discussion is related more to surface mining, where the permit fee does not cover the actual cost of permitting and briefly explained previous conversations with industry on the matter.

Vice-Chair MacDonald noted she had done work for the BLM and they only do it for large projects, not small ones. Day-Stirrat added the Program has been under-resourced for some time, and the last session was the Agency's attempt to change the resourcing to bring down the permitting timeline and meet the mine site inspection KPM. As discussed in the Process Audit, it is not an overnight fix and will take years to do, due to the backlog. The Program has to balance the resources for permitting, inspections, and complaints. Chair Kozlowski asked if the Program setup a way to triage requests to determine prioritization based on environmental impact, costs and other criteria. Day-Stirrat said complaints are looked at quickly to determine what is going on and dealt with accordingly. As for permitting, he explained the Program has always dealt with them in the order they are received, so a complete application may get held up. The Program is looking at solutions

that are balanced around fairness and the ability to help permittees, with the resource constraint it has.

Lewis reviewed an example of the Time from Application Complete to Technical Review (Actuals). She stated there are different types and categories of permits that could be reported similar to the Customer Service KPM. Operating Permits can be broken down to new, transfer, and amendment. She said transfers were a larger number of applications, approximately 30%, and suggested tracking them individually. Vice-Chair MacDonald said the Program may want to look at using median instead of mean as the measure of central tendency to make sure very problematic applications do not skew the results being communicated to the public and the Legislature. Thomas agreed with Vice-Chair MacDonald and asked if there is way to flag the outliers and provide context to the summaries. Lewis said yes by defining the pool being counted. She does not want to remove data just to have a positive outcome, and pointed out this example is based on when the application is complete to when a staff member sends out a deficiency letter. This is something within the Program's control and influenced by the workload they have, and not by the application itself. She stated certain types of applications have a longer 180-day timeline, compared to the standard 90-day. They are currently lumped in and can be split out to get better specificity around the numbers.

KPM Concept – Application Processing

Proposed: Percent of complete permit applications receiving technical review within the designated regulatory timeline

Next Steps: Determine appropriate target(s) for 2027-29

- The delay in initial technical review for Operating Permit applications is because the program lacks sufficient FTE for application workload.
- The Program did not receive adequate FTE to meet the regulatory timelines for Operating Permits without compromising other functions
- Triage or prioritization strategies could be considered

Lewis said she does not want to pick one thing just to meet the KPM and have it look like the Program is meeting that KPM, when in reality there is too much work. She thinks she can come back to the next meeting with some targets and more ideas, and have more information around some of the trade-offs. Chair Kozlowski said it looks like Lewis is going in the right direction, making it much more realistic, and using SMART Goals are the way to go to have real, measurable, and honest data to review.

Vice-Chair MacDonald asked Lewis if she would be able to report on this data next year for the Board to help set appropriate targets for the 2027-29 biennium on this. Day-Stirrat stated the Agency has to propose a KPM in its budget that is signed off by the Board by July 31st. He said he hopes the Board understood the Program's difficulty in coming up with a KPM that defines its work. There are many things in permitting outside of DOGAMI's control and he recognizes industry's frustration on the extended timelines. He explained the issue with the Program being overloaded, substantive complaints requiring action drawing resources away from permitting, and dealing with a lot of different things inside its regulatory authority without the full staffing needed to meet everyone's expectations.

Chair Kozlowski asked if there is a point in the future where the backlog will be reasonable. Day-Stirrat stated the calculations of when the Program will get through the backlog has to be taken back to the

Legislature at the beginning of next session, which the answer is years due to it being under-resourced. He explained there are ways of making the process more efficient, but the outreach portion was not included in the budget. Lewis said the problem is when she started, every individual was a generalist and did a little bit of everything. As the Program grows into specialization to be more efficient and use resources wisely, it is frustrating for everyone because the permittees want to talk to one person to answer everything. As for outreach, everyone has an aspect of it in their job, but it has been sacrificed for permit processing.

Vice-Chair MacDonald said it might be a good idea to just focus on having one KPM this first round, as the Program reduces the backlog. Day-Stirrat agreed it is sensible, and additional KPMs can be brought in down the road.

GS&S KPMs

McClaughry said there are three KPMs that are being considered for changes, based on the complications with the Federal funding scenario since January 2025. He discussed some of the issues and some directions the Agency might take with staff discussions for each one.

KPM #1 Hazard and Risk Assessment Completion: Nearly 100% of the hazard studies are federally funded with additional funding from Other Funds. McClaughry said the KPM only captures work done within the Urban Growth Boundaries (UGB), so a lot of the Program's priorities and work are not set within the UGB and are not included in the success rate. He provided three examples: hazard studies and reports in the North Coast and Ecola State Park; post-fire debris flows and landslides in the Gorge; and in Baker City, the map reflects 75-99% completion, but the reports either need to be updated, or if new information is collected the updated reports do not get counted in the KPM, so the data is skewed. Four things the Program does have control over are publications, public outreach, community engagements, and building partnerships with other agencies. The need is to take a real assessment of if Federal funding went away, what types of things could the Program produce with General Fund. The Hazard Team will meet to decide appropriate targets and what do they want to do given the current issues and priorities within the State of Oregon.

Vice-Chair MacDonald suggested adding the FEMA required natural hazard mitigation plans that cities and counties might do, in addition to the DLCD Goal 7 to go beyond UGBs as the target. Chair Kozlowski asked what the current percentage breakdown is for State and Federal funding for landslides in burn areas. McClaughry replied almost exclusively the funding for post-fire debris flow is through the U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) and some collaboration with the National Science Foundation. In 2017 and 2020 there was no General Fund available for the work, which is the reason for concern about Federal funding. The other concern is a large number of debris flow events do not happen in UGBs but in rural parts of Oregon and have a significant impact on those populations.

KPM #2 Detailed Geologic Map Completion: Was designed around population centers in Oregon and emphasized mapping in those areas with the greatest concentration of population. The polygons on the map were drawn based on concentration of water wells drilled in an area and used as a proxy for population, based on information obtained from Oregon Water Resources. The main problem with the KPM is the Program's priorities have changed since it was created. The main part of the Mapping Program is driven by groundwater resources and supporting research studies by the Oregon Water Resources Department (OWRD), who regulates the water resources. He explained the Agency creates maps across hydrologic basins and tells OWRD what the bathtub is, what shape it is, and potentially how big it is. Oftentimes, the bathtub is bigger than the populated area or UGB, so the

issue is only getting credit for the UGB portion not the entire mapping area. The Agency is now interested in critical minerals, geothermal potential, and potentially hydrogen resources around that State, but there are few UGBs that intersect in those areas and most are in Southeast Oregon. Federal funds pay for part of the geologic maps, and the STATEMAP Program funds most of it, but it a one-to-one match using General Fund. McClaughry said with the changing priorities and the need to map outside the urbanized areas, the idea is to change the KPM to what can be mapped in a year funded with General Fund, and any Federal Funds that produce additional maps is added success to the set target.

Dittrich asked how it is decided on what is mapped next, if not using population centers. McClaughry explained it is done through the Oregon Geologic Mapping Advisory Committee (OGMAC), which is a panel of about 40 scientific professionals from Federal geologic agencies, State agencies that have geologists or an interest in geology, private industry, and academia that meets annually as part of the STATEMAP Program requirement. In legislation the State Geologist sets the mapping priorities for the State, and DOGAMI needs to get their input, feedback and consent on the geologic mapping. The priorities are set around certain criteria. Day-Stirrat added that for the Earth MRI Program, mapping needs to include areas with critical minerals, which is not in all parts of the State. The STATEMAP Program has been focused on water scarcity in eastern Oregon and will likely stay in that vein for years to come. It does not meet the metric, but it does impact the community who might be in watersheds.

KPM #3 Lidar Data Completion: The current KPM says 100% completion of USGS Quality 2 Lidar or better. The Agency will only meet approximately 98% of the target, as there are some lands that are excluded from showing the Lidar publicly. The KPM as written is coming to a conclusion, but GS&S still wants to keep Lidar front and center in the Program. There will not likely be significant new Lidar collections in the future, so the goal is to align the new KPM to meet public expectations around data delivery, make the information more publicly accessible, and tie it to the Strategic Plan. A new web map will be reimagined and built for easier accessibility.

Chair Kozlowski said outreach needs to be a big part of the Lidar changes. McClaughry said the Agency will certainly be reaching out to the communities to let them know what data is available. Vice-Chair MacDonald asked if there was a way to take credit for the degree in which DOGAMI supports other State agencies. Day-Stirrat said the challenge with Lidar is the funding has always been spikey, and the Agency has no control over that funding. Teeman asked what is precluding the Lidar work from happening. McClaughry said some of the white areas are in the process of being collected, but some has been collected within the Warm Springs Reservation boundary, but will not be shown publicly.

Briefing: **No Board Action Required.**

9) MLRR Process Audit Report Update:

Sarah Lewis, MLRR Program Manager, provided the MLRR Process Audit Report Implementation Update.

Lewis stated the Process Audit Report was reviewed at the last Board Meeting, so there will be no Board Action at this time. Based on DOGAMI's Legislatively Approved Budget (LAB), the Program's goals are still to decrease permitting timelines, increase site inspections, improve response time for

complaints and general public inquiries, and targeted outreach to applicants, permittees, and permitting partners. The Implementation Plan was included in the June Board Packet, which included 22 recommendations outlined under 13 different categories that were broken out into four priority levels: critical, high, medium, and low.

Lewis outlined three clear initiatives for the 2025-27 Budget Cycle.

MLRR Initiatives for 2025-27

A) Fee increase (effective January 2026)

- Audit recommendation 5, 8a.
- Implementation Plan includes target messaging to all permittees (October 2025 – January 2026), inclusion in newsletter (beginning October 2025) and banners and information on website (phased rollout).
- Internal work includes updating forms, financial coding, and related processes to support changes in fee structure.

B) ePermitting System (ongoing – complete early 2027)

- Audit recommendations 1a, 2a, 4a, 6b, 7, 12.
- Phased to go-live in late 2026 for exploration and aggregate permits, early 2027 for drilling and consolidated permits.
- Vendor coordination and funding availability necessitates strict timeline, ~6 staff will prioritize ePermitting for 18 months over permitting work. *This effort will impact permit processing in the short term for long term gain.*
- Project Update to Legislature required in January 2026.

Lewis suggested the Board request an update on ePermitting as an agenda item at a future meeting to receive a roll-through of what the system will look like. Chair Kozlowski said Day-Stirrat and Lewis will need to work it into the agenda as possible.

C) Recruitment, Hiring and Onboarding of 7 new positions (ongoing – complete March 2026)

- Audit recommendations 1a, 5, 9, 10a
- MLRR IT Support Specialist (recruitment in progress)
- 2 Drilling Positions (Fall 2025)
- 2 Geologists/Reclamationists (Fall 2025)
- 2 Field Specialists (Winter 2025/26)

Other non-routine things happening in the Program

Consolidated Permit for Chemical Process Mining

- Permit decision anticipated early 2026
- Continued multi-agency coordination prior to the project start
- Ongoing monitoring & reporting throughout life of project
- Review of lessons learned, potential rulemaking in advance of future applications

Regulatory Pathway for Geologic Carbon Sequestration

- Permitting of information Hole/Stratigraphic Wells
- Potential development of Cass VI UIC primacy with DEQ

Rule review / rulemaking to align with / implement changes in statute

- Updates to fees in rule, housekeeping

Proposed Operational Priorities

Phase 1: September 2025 – April 2026: Maintain & Prepare

- Maintain routine function to the maximum extent possible, while supporting 18-month transition to ePermitting and onboarding 7 new staff
- Continue ongoing process improvements (Audit recommendations 2a, 4a, 4b, 7, 12)
- Develop new KPM for application tracking against regulatory timelines (due early Spring 2026; Audit recommendation 1b)
- Develop Legislative Concepts and Policy Option Packages for 2027-29 ARB (due late Spring 2026; Audit recommendation 8b)
- Identify additional resources needed to meet audit recommendations (report to Legislature, January 2027; Audit recommendations 2b, 3a, 3b, 5, 6a, 6c, 8a, 8b, 9, 10b, 13a, 13b).

Phase 2: June 2026 – June 2027: Incremental Improvement

- Decrease Operating Permit Application timelines (new resources – 2.5 permit writers/SMEs)
 - Fewer applications per permit writer reduces delays and improves response times
 - Implement conditional transfer
 - Monitor changes application backlog (number and length of delay)
- Increase site inspections (new resources – 2 field specialists)
 - Meet KPM 4 for 2027 (20% active mine sites inspected)
 - Develop annual inspection plan for 2027 and beyond

Phase 2: June 2026 – June 2027: Incremental improvement, cont.

- Improve customer service timelines (new resources – 1.0 public service representative)
- Continue process improvements and expands to include audit observation topics 3a, 6b, 6c, 11 if possible.
- Targeted outreach to applicants & education to public & partners (no new resources; audit recommendation 13)
- Go-Live for ePermitting (November 2026-February 2027)

Chair Kozlowski asked Lewis if the Program planned on putting tutorials out on YouTube. Lewis said yes, it would require time to develop the materials and script to make them digestible, but that is what she had in mind for the Outreach position that was not funded.

Briefing: **No Board Action Required.**

10) Legislative Update:

Christina Appleby, Legislative Coordinator and Geologist, provided a Legislative Update.

Appleby stated there is an ongoing Special Session happening. For awareness and education, Oregon's annual legislative session ended in late June 2025, there were more than 3,000 bills introduced, and 640 passed. One bill that did not pass was HB 2025, known as the transportation funding package. The ODOT biennial budget is roughly \$6-\$7B and they were short about \$1B in the

2023-25 biennium. An audit of the program was done and it was determined they had been relying on projected revenues and not done a necessary comparison to the historical actual revenues. Without a solution at the end of session, there has been a looming staff layoff of about 10%. A Special Session convened at the end of August and HB 3991 passed in the House, but the session was paused due to a Senator being excused for medical reasons. The Special Session is scheduled to restart this week and is expected to pass the Senate. There will be normally scheduled Legislative Days at the end of September and throughout the fall, but DOGAMI does not anticipate any Agency presentations at this time.

Appleby stated Director Day-Stirrat has been meeting with legislators throughout the summer and fall, in-person when possible, to develop relationships, understand their goals, and share what the Agency is already doing and it can do in the future.

DOGAMI's Leadership Team is busy implementing the recently signed bills, and already looking toward the Short Session next year and the next biennium budget.

Briefing: **No Board Action Required.**

11) MLRR Update:

Sarah Lewis, MLRR Program Manager, provided the MLRR program update.

Lewis stated the permit application load is still high but staff are steadily issuing permits, and new applications are still being received. With new staff coming on, she expects the issued permit numbers to go up slight and have an impact on the backlog. The Board Packet contains the list of permit applications received and decisions issued since the last update. Compliance has not appreciably changed, and work continues on bringing the Civil Penalties to completion with negotiations going on behind the scenes. The Program is looking into legal options for collecting the penalties for the site in Tillamook County.

Lewis briefly reviewed the ePermitting update stating the Program is excited to have certainty around the project and the path it is on. For the Grassy Mountain Project, she does anticipate the draft permits coming out this fall. There will be a public comment period on the draft permits and a public hearing held in late November or early December. All project updates are available on the project website.

Thomas asked what the legal options are for collecting payment on the site in Tillamook County. Lewis verified it was the Eckroth Quarry, where the Final Order is complete and issued, but the Program has not received payment, or a viable proposal from the respondent for moving forward with addressing the needed reclamation on the site. She stated the options are the Department of Revenue (DOR) or the Department of Justice (DOJ), MLRR has chosen DOJ. Lloyd said there is a division at DOJ called Civil Enforcement. It is in the initial stage but has not been assigned to an attorney yet. They will provide the Agency advice on the range of options available, which could include putting liens on properties.

Briefing: **No Board Action Required.**

12) GS&S Update:

Jason McClaughry, GS&S Program Manager, provided the GS&S program update.

McClaughry said the Program has released 10 publications since January, with 15 more expected to be completed by the end of the year, which would be 25 for the year. There is a new series coming out called DOGAMI Desktop Imagery Series. It has a variety of 25 images from around the state that show some of the spectacular geologic features and geomorphology of the State, that can be downloaded and refreshes every 30 minutes. This is to make DOGAMI's scientific data more publicly available to help engage the public in what the Agency does with more interest.

GS&S Focus Area – Geologic Mapping: The Geologic Mapping team was recently awarded a federal award of \$669,385 for the USGS STATEMAP Program. With DOGAMI's match of \$673,405, the total project value is \$1,342,790. This award constitutes the largest award ever received by DOGAMI in its program participation since 1992. He shared a map showing the five separate project areas to be focused on.

McClaughry said one opportunity this year is to fund a new Quaternary Fault and Fold Database for Oregon. He shared a compilation map showing all recognized active faults in Oregon. He stated the USGS catalog for the state has not been updated since 2002. There are some significant edge match issues around the state boundaries where other states have mapped structures differently. The importance of the map is it is one of the fundamental data sets used in all of the Department of Energy for energy facility siting reviews related to wind and solar facilities projected to go in. One key components is how those are engineered and built to structural code and seismic safety. A secondary use is looking at geothermal potential and engaging in partnerships and potential funding opportunities with nearby state surveys. It also adds to the understanding of statewide earthquake hazards.

GS&S Focus Area – Landslide Hazard Mapping: Recent released paper on "The influence of wildfire on debris flows in a landscape of persistent disequilibrium: Columbia River Gorge, OR, USA", that was largely based on mapping that Bill Burns and Nancy Calhoun published this year as Special Paper 55 within the Agency. He showed maps from the publications. This is an example of a study not captured in the Agency's Key Performance Measure but still critical and important to the people of Oregon. It is also allowing researchers to start looking at the correlation between fire and debris flows in the wet environment of Western Oregon.

GS&S Focus Area – Tsunami Mapping and Coastal Research: Jon Allan, tsunami research team lead on the coast and coastal geomorphologist, has been recognized for his work and has been invited to serve a 3-year term on the Tsunami Science & Technology Advisory Panel (TSTAP) of NOAA. It is a national panel established to address tsunami related issues independent of the NTHMP. He added having experts on DOGAMI's team allows the Agency to quickly respond and release public information related to events as part of its outreach work.

Chair Kozlowski said it was an excellent report and the Board congratulates Jon Allan on his committee role.

Briefing: **No Board Action Required.**

13) Director's Report:

674 Ruarri Day-Stirrat, Director & State Geologist, provided an Agency Update.

675
676 Day-Stirrat provided a brief update on an objective in the Agency's Strategic Plan, which is partner
677 across disciplines, state and federal agencies, Tribes, and stakeholders to identify innovative
678 opportunities for Oregon, and the specific initiative is to seek out external committee roles for staff
679 and leadership and proactively identify innovation, technology, and solutions for Oregon. He stated
680 Jon Allan's committee role is an example of this as well as Bill Burns is a member of the USGS
681 National Landslide Hazard Reduction Program Advisory Committee on Landslides. Day-Stirrat added
682 he has taken on the role of President-elect for the Association of American State Geologists (AASG).

683
684 Briefing: **No Board Action Required.**

685
686 **14) Confirm Time and Date for Next Quarterly Meeting:**

687 Chair Kozlowski stated the next DOGAMI Board is currently scheduled for Friday, November 21, 2025
688 at 8:30 a.m. – 1:00 p.m. in Portland or via Zoom. She confirmed this date is still acceptable for the
689 Board and will be done via Zoom.

690
691 **15) Public Comment:**

692 Only written comments received prior to or by 12:30 p.m. on the day of the meeting were to be
693 accepted. Chair Kozlowski asked for any written public comments. No public comments.

694
695 **16) Board Adjourn:**

696 Chair Kozlowski adjourned the meeting at 12:17 p.m.

697
698 APPROVED

699
700
701 
702 Linda Kozlowski, Chair
703