



May 28, 2002

775 Summer Street NE, Suite 330
Salem, Oregon 97301-1283
503-986-0039 Fon
503-581-5115 Fax
www.econ.state.or.us/opb

JOHN A. KITZHABER M.D.
Governor
Chair

BRETT WILCOX
Vice Chair

LINDSAY BERRYMAN

NEIL BRYANT

BOBBIE DORE FOSTER

DAVE FROHNMAYER

STEVE HARPER

MICHAEL JORDAN

J. DUKE SHEPARD

DIANE SNYDER

ED WHITELAW

MAX WILLIAMS

MICHAEL GREENFIELD
Ex Officio

HEATHER KAPLINGER
Student Ex Officio

JEFFREY TRYENS
Executive Director

TO: Progress Board Members

FROM: Jeff Tryens
Executive Director

Rita Conrad
Senior Policy Analyst

Katie DeWilde
Intern

SUBJECT: Oregon Progress Board May 21, 2002 Meeting Minutes

Members present were Governor John Kitzhaber, Brett Wilcox, Neil Bryant, Bobbie Dore Foster, Mike Greenfield, Michael Jordan and Max Williams. Lindsay Berryman, Steve Harper and Ed Whitelaw joined the meeting by phone. Staff members present were Jeff Tryens, Rita Conrad and interns Bradley Basson and Katie DeWilde.

Governor Kitzhaber called the meeting to order at 12:30 p.m.

1. Approve Minutes

The minutes from the March meeting were approved.

2. Environmental Benchmark Update

Hal Salwasser, dean of the College of Forestry at Oregon State University (OSU), presented findings from his upcoming report on “ecologically optimal values” (EOVs) for Oregon Benchmarks, co-authored with Logan Norris (OSU) and Jay Nicholas from Oregon Watershed Enhancement Board (OWEB). OSU President Paul Risser originally requested the report.

The report focuses on a subset of Oregon’s 16 environmental benchmarks that have an ecology focus (e.g., native species that are healthy) versus a policy focus (e.g., farm land preservation). These are: #77 wetlands, #78 stream water quality, #79 in-stream water rights, #81 forest land, #82 timber harvest, # 85 native fish, #86 fish at risk, #87 species in protected areas, #88 native plants and animals and #89 invasive species.

Dr. Salwasser’s presentation suggested various changes to make the benchmarks more ecologically meaningful. For example, the word “healthy” (benchmarks #85 and #88) cannot be directly measured and a good substitute might be “not at risk.”

May 21 Minutes, continued

Significant discussion revolved around Dr. Salwasser's suggestion to combine benchmarks #85 through #88 into two groups: native species that are at risk and those that are not at risk, freeing up two more benchmarks for other valuable measures like nutrient concentration in water or carbon storage capacity in wild lands. Ed asked how one would extract all the data that are contained within these combined benchmarks. Dr. Salwasser explained that these benchmarks would just track the number of species, but more detail might be added such as finding out what groups of species are most at risk or not at risk. Agencies should have data in master databases to generate the detailed information. Jeff said that starting out with aggregate measures is the right step, providing useful context for the more detailed measures.

Neil voiced concern about the limitations of benchmark #79, percentage of streams meeting minimum flow rights, questioning what the baseline would be. Dr. Salwasser said there is no good way to reference background conditions. Jeff explained that measurements are taken from 13 sites. These are not the best measurements, but the best we can do.

Neil asked what the definition of forestland was for benchmark #81. Hal Salwasser said the state's definition is used. Twenty percent of cover is his estimate, but he didn't know for sure. The nation uses 10 percent. There is no differentiation in percentage for forests east of the Cascades, just in forest type. He added this benchmark would be amenable to remote sensing technology to show patterns of land use change.

In the future Jeff hopes to use EOVs to engage Oregonians and show where we could be ecologically. He stressed that EOVs are not targets. Bob Doppelt, director for the Center for Watershed and Community Health, explained that EOVs are a way of determining if we are headed in the right direction. They help predict possible outcomes for our actions.

Jay Nicholas noted that because there is no science for what the environment should be, they used pre-development conditions to derive EOVs. Dr. Salwasser said that it is important to pick a reference point and explain rationale, whether pre-development or later. It might be better to pick reference points from where we have data.

Neil said the term "ecologically optimum value" would not grab 90 percent of people. The term needs to be catchier and shorter. Governor Kitzhaber agreed. The Board was not asked to take any action in regards to the EOVs. They are still being developed. Ed asked for a white paper laying out various sides to these various phrases and terms.

3. Board action on environmental benchmarks

Jeff presented proposed environmental benchmark changes and asked the board to take action on each one.

Benchmark #77, Wetlands.

Because we don't know what the wetlands base was historically, the new language focuses on wetlands change (gain/loss) per year. Brett was concerned that this would not measure unauthorized (non-permit) activity and would, therefore, not adequately reflect wetlands loss. John Lilly, Division of State Lands, (DSL) explained that this benchmark does in fact track non-permit activity. Michael Jordan asked about the

quality of mitigated wetlands. In response to his question about whether this would generally indicate more replacement than loss, John Lilly replied that the mitigation program adds wetlands acreage since the prescribed ratio is greater than one, but that not every mitigation works. Dr. Salwasser added that zero is different from “no net loss” – which do you want? Governor Kitzhaber said “no net loss.” BOARD ACTION: Governor Kitzhaber moved to approve this benchmark language and targets with caveats expressed in the record. Michael Jordan seconded. Board adopted.

Benchmark #78, Stream water quality

BOARD ACTION: adopted new part c: decreasing trends in water quality and new target.

Benchmark #79, Instream water rights

The new wording is based on the Department of Water Resource’s (DWR) recommendation. Jeff noted that the targets are very low. Neil agreed to accept with the caveat that some flows have never been reached. BOARD ACTION: new wording and targets adopted.

Benchmark #80, Agricultural lands

BOARD ACTION: adopted new wording. Targets are still to be determined and reviewed by Department of Land Conservation & Development (DLCD), Oregon Department of Agriculture (ODA) and Progress Board staff.

Benchmark # 81, Forest lands

Dr. Salwasser recommended stratifying this benchmark by eco-region. BOARD ACTION: proposed target was accepted, but staff will continue to work on the benchmark.

Benchmark #82, Timber harvest

BOARD ACTION: adopted new wording and target ranges.

Benchmark #85, Salmon and steelhead

We only have one data point (1995). Dr. Salwasser said that from a scientific standpoint, the data point is not meaningful. It is the best guess of one person. There was general agreement that the benchmark is important and that it is critical to have good data. Brett suggested leaving the page blank with the hope that it will spur action. BOARD ACTION: rejected the single data point for this benchmark, but kept the benchmark. Staff will continue to work with partners to improve this measure.

Benchmark #86, Marine species at risk

New language is specific to nonsalmonid marine fish or shellfish species. Jay Nicholas explained the data are good, but some scientists disagree with the positive message it sends. Only a few species may be at risk, but they may be huge with significant impact. Dr. Salwasser noted that only 100 species are measured, and if the species get too rare to measure, they are dropped. Jay Nicholas added that the method mixes species that are harvested at vastly different rates. Brett thinks the graph does

not present a rosy picture. Jay Nicholas argued that 92 percent not at risk is too rosy. Dr. Salwasser said that this needs more work. He recommended that the board adopt, but look into stratification by species if possible. BOARD ACTION: adopted new language, but staff will continue looking into stratifying the benchmark.

Benchmark #87, Native fish and wildlife

New language with the word “populations” was approved earlier. The proposed targets were reviewed with the natural resources cabinet. Dr. Salwasser said that the current benchmark is not a meaningful indicator because a lot of species are not in conservation areas. The current recommended change is okay in the short run. Staff will continue to work on the benchmark. BOARD ACTION: new language and targets approved.

Benchmark #88, Native animal and plant species

Neil asked why is EOY at 98 percent (not 100 percent)? Jeff explained that some species are inherently at risk. Dr. Salwasser added it’s hard to say what the percent should be – some say 10 percent are naturally at-risk. Scientists generally accept one-two percent are naturally at-risk per century. Part of the ongoing task is to reconcile assumptions. Jeff noted significant progress - now scientists are involved and individuals and/or groups “own” the benchmarks. BOARD ACTION: new language and targets were approved.

Benchmark #89, Nuisance species

The new state Invasive Species Council will identify the 100 most threatening species that are not currently in or contained in Oregon. The proposed new language measures how well we keep those 100 out of Oregon. Data points and targets will be cumulative based on 2000 base year. Dan Hilburn, ODA, emphasized exclusion. If you want to measure how well the state does, exclusion is where you get the biggest bang for the buck. For example, trying to eradicate existing knapweed is not cost-effective. This is a policy versus ecological indicator. Exclusion is what Oregon can do something about. BOARD ACTION: adopted new wording and title.

4. Remaining benchmarks

Benchmark # 5, Professional services

Staff recommended using the new, more narrow classification system combining eight four-digit SIC codes instead of eight two-digit SIC codes. This benchmark will be reviewed during *Oregon Shines III (OSIII)* planning process. BOARD ACTION: new data source and targets adopted.

Benchmark #30, Volunteerism

Staff suggested adopting 55percent as the target for 2005. BOARD ACTION: adopted new language and 2005 target.

Benchmark # 31, Voting

Jeff introduced a letter from Denis White, who urged the Board to consider adding the absolute percentage of voters participating in presidential elections in addition to

ranking. It would be two separate measures under one heading. Staff recommended rank only. BOARD ACTION: adopted the staff recommendation and rejected the new wording

Benchmark #47, Affordable child care

Child Care Researchers' Roundtable came up with the targets (2005- 45 percent, 2010- 65 percent). Jeff suggested that the 2010 target was too ambitious and recommended to either ask Researchers' Roundtable to clarify or leave the 2010 target blank. Michael Jordan is on a finance taskforce for child care issues and agreed to hold off on the 2010 target until we have more data because a large amount of funding is needed to reach such high numbers. BOARD ACTION: approved 2005 target and decided to wait on 2010 target until *Oregon Shines* update process.

Benchmark #51, Elder abuse

Staff recommended waiting on targets until there is a recommendation from Department of Human Services. There were no objections. BOARD ACTION: approved new wording and waiting on targets.

Benchmark # 57, Hunger

Jeff explained the stratification of the benchmark and then presented the targets from the Hunger Taskforce. Neil said that we will be fortunate to hold numbers we have right now and thinks the numbers are more than ambitious. Bobbie thought it would be better to set an ambitious goal and not meet it because hunger is an intolerable situation. Jeff suggested comparing numbers to the U.S. then choosing one of the better states rate to aim for. Max asked why Oregon is so high. Jeff said we don't do a good job of explaining why this number is so high, but there are a couple of arguments. One is the dramatic increase in housing costs – housing versus food. The other is that immigrants are leaving support systems and are hungry temporarily till they get established. We know for sure that Oregon is worse than average, but we don't know how much because the margin of error is so wide and sample size and data points are so low.

Brett asked Jeff Tryens to look at national data and come up with ambitious but realistic target. Max suggested talking about it at another Board meeting and looking at how they come up with numbers. It was agreed that hunger is worthy of another discussion on targets. Staff will put together a panel of people to talk at the next meeting, recommend where the money is going to come from and explain the size of the problem in terms that can be understood.

Benchmark # 67, Emergency preparedness

Oregon Emergency Management has not yet proposed a response or a mitigation number. American Red Cross will come up with a developmental benchmark for household readiness to present to the Board. They will also add questions to the Oregon Population Survey on household readiness.

May 21 Minutes, continued

Benchmark # 68, Traffic congestion and #71, Vehicle miles traveled

ODOT is working on data, but will not have numbers until September. It will probably be on the September meeting agenda.

Benchmark #73, Owner occupied households

Tom Cusack will come to next meeting to talk about the home ownership measure.

Brett moved to approve everything that was agreed to.

Bobbie distributed an article from *The Skanner* about home ownership that was generated from the last Progress Board meeting.

5. Race, gender and ethnicity of Oregon's officials

Progress Board intern, Bradley Basson, presented a report on how Oregon's state and local officials mirror the population in terms of race, ethnicity and gender. His presentation included weighted and unweighted averages. Jeff asked the Board whether the weighted averages should be reported separately from the race and ethnicity report. Weighted might be too complicated. Bobbie said reporters would have to understand it, but it should be included because it is interesting and important. Michael Jordan agreed that it should be released. It was requested that in the future, Board members receive this information sooner.

6. Executive Director's Report

The Progress Board was given the Innovations in American Government award by Harvard's Kennedy School in April 2002.

Jeff recently completed a trip to China as part of a delegation to help them with the issue of sustainability.

Jeff updated the Board on performance measure training that he and Rita have been doing with state agencies. It is one of the most successful efforts the Progress Board has done with state agencies. Rita stressed the importance of educating the legislature to not think of benchmarks as agency performance measures. Max suggested briefing Legislative Fiscal Office staff before the next legislative session. Jeff said Mike Greenfield is very supportive of the performance measure process.

Jeff presented the Oregon Business Council (OBC) project. It is very similar to a possible *Oregon Shines* update process, looking through a business lens. OBC wants to link to with the *Oregon Shines* update process.. Staff will be doing a lot of work on this. The Board will talk about this at the next meeting. Jeff said the update is not due until 2005, but the Board needs to complete it as soon as possible with the new governor.

Neil asked about Senate Bill 555, coordinated comprehensive local planning for children and families. Jeff reported steady, but slow progress. Rita mentioned an executive order being developed for the Governor to sign that will encourage state partners to move forward and stay on target through the upcoming change of administrations.

Meeting adjourned 3:07 p.m.