

Compliance Audit of Measure 66 for 2001-03 Biennium



Secretary of State Audit Report

Summary

PURPOSE

The purpose of this audit was to fulfill the constitutional requirement that an independent audit be performed of the agencies receiving and expending Measure 66 funds. Measure 66 dedicated a portion of lottery fund proceeds for parks, beaches, and habitat and watershed restoration. The audit objectives include steps to measure the financial integrity, effectiveness and performance of these agencies. We perform an audit of Measure 66 expenditures at the end of each biennium.

BACKGROUND

Of the constitutionally dedicated Measure 66 funds, 50 percent is to be distributed for the public purpose of financing the protection, repair, operation, creation and development of state parks, ocean shore and public beach access area, historic sites and recreation areas (Parks Subaccount). The remaining 50 percent is for the restoration and protection of native salmonid populations, watersheds, fish and wildlife habitat and water quality in Oregon (Restoration and Protection Subaccount), with at least 65 percent of this subaccount being used for capital expenditures. Interest earned on balances in the Restoration and Protection Subaccount is maintained in the Restoration and Protection Research Fund; at least 65 percent of expenditures from this fund must be capital in nature.

RESULTS IN BRIEF

State agencies spent approximately \$99 million in Measure 66 funds between July 1, 2001, and June 30, 2003. For the Parks Subaccount and the Restoration and Protection Subaccount, the agencies substantially complied with the intended uses of those funds as stated in the *Oregon Constitution and Oregon Revised Statutes* and based on Department of Justice opinions. Expenditures from the Restoration and Protection Research Fund did not substantially comply because, currently, only 20 percent of the funds expended were capital in nature. Final compliance with the requirement that at least 65 percent be capital expenditures will not be determined until the year 2014.

We also found that agencies have developed performance measures related to Measure 66. However, we concluded there is no overall performance measure to determine if restoration

and protection of wild salmonid populations, watersheds, fish and wildlife habitats and water quality has or will occur. As a result, we will not be able to conclude on the overall effectiveness of the expenditure of Measure 66 funds due to the mixture of funds used for these programs and the multitude of factors that impact the ultimate outcomes.

RECOMMENDATIONS

We recommend that:

- Agencies follow advice received from the Department of Justice when charging Measure 66 costs as capital expenditures.
- Oregon Water Enhancement Board continue monitoring to ensure that at least 65 percent of the expenditures in the Restoration and Protection Research Fund are capital expenditures.
- Agencies receiving funds from the Restoration and Protection Subaccount work together and with the Oregon State Legislature to develop performance measures that will provide the information wanted by the Legislature and the people of the State of Oregon in the year 2014 in order to make a determination related to the performance of these funds.

AGENCIES' RESPONSES

The Oregon Parks and Recreation Department generally agrees with the audit findings as they relate to the Parks Subaccount of the Parks and Natural Resources Fund.

On behalf of the agencies receiving funds from the Restoration and Protection Subaccount, the Oregon Watershed Enhancement Board (OWEB) generally agrees with the recommendations.

- All agencies agree to follow advice received from the Department of Justice when charging Measure 66 costs as capital expenditures.
- OWEB agrees to continue to monitor that at least 65 percent of the expenditures in the Restoration and Protection Research Fund are capital expenditures.
- All agencies agree to work together and with the Oregon State Legislature to develop performance measures that will provide information wanted by the Legislature and the people of the State of Oregon in the year 2014.

Introduction

In November 1998, the voters of Oregon passed ballot Measure 66, which amended Section 4, Article XV of the Constitution of the State of Oregon for the purpose of dedicating a portion of state lottery proceeds for parks, beaches, and habitat and watershed restoration. In 2014, voters will decide whether to continue dedicating funds for this purpose.

Among the provisions of the measure was the requirement that any state agency receiving this money secure an independent audit to measure the financial integrity, effectiveness and performance of the agency.

Background

Section 4, Article XV of the Constitution of the State of Oregon dedicates 15 percent of the net proceeds from the state lottery funds to a parks and natural resources fund. Of these constitutionally dedicated funds, 50 percent is to be distributed for the public purpose of financing the protection, repair, operation, creation and development of state parks, ocean shore and public beach access area, historic sites and recreation areas (Parks Subaccount). The remaining 50 percent is for the restoration and protection of native salmonid populations, watersheds, fish and wildlife habitat and water quality in Oregon (Restoration and Protection Subaccount).

Expenditures from the Parks Subaccount were limited to:

- Maintaining, constructing, improving, developing, managing and operating state park and recreation facilities, programs and areas;
- Acquiring real property, or interest therein, deemed necessary for the creation and operation of state parks, ocean

shores public beach areas, recreation and historic sites or because of natural, scenic, cultural, historic and recreational values; and

- Operating grant programs for local government entities deemed necessary to accomplish the public purposes of the parks and natural resources fund established under Section 4 of Article XV of the Oregon Constitution.

Expenditures from the Restoration and Protection Subaccount were limited to:

- Restoring and protecting watersheds, fish and wildlife, and riparian and other native species; and habitat conservation activities including, but not limited to, planning, coordinating, assessment, implementation, restoration, inventory, information management and monitoring activities;
- Watershed and riparian education efforts;
- Developing and implementing watershed and water quality enhancement plans;
- Entering into agreements to obtain from willing owners determinate interests in lands and waters that protect watershed resources, including but not limited to, fee simple interests in land, leases of land or conservation easements; and
- Enforcing fish and wildlife and habitat protection laws and regulations.

A further restriction on the expenditures from the Restoration and Protection Subaccount is that at least 65 percent of the money must be used for “capital expenditures.” According to Oregon Revised Statute 547.351(4), “Capital expenditures” means direct expenses related to:

- (a.) Personal property of a nonexpendable nature including items that are not consumed in the normal course of operations, can normally be used more than once, have a useful life of more than two years and are for use in the enforcement of fish and wildlife and habitat protection laws and regulations; or
- (b.) Projects that restore, enhance or protect fish and wildlife habitat, watershed functions, native salmonid populations or water quality, including but not limited to:
 - Expenses of assessment, research, design or other technical requirements for the implementation of a project;
 - The acquisition of determinate interests, including fee and less than fee interests, in land or water in order to protect watershed resources, including appraisal costs and other costs directly related to such acquisitions;
 - Development, construction or implementation of a project to restore, enhance or protect water quality, a watershed, fish or wildlife, or riparian or other habitat;
 - Technical support directly related to the implementation of a project; and
 - Monitoring or evaluation activities necessary to determine the actual effectiveness of a project.

During the 2001-03 biennium, the Legislature provided the Oregon Watershed Enhancement Board with a six-year limitation to expend funds allocated for Measure 66 capital expenditures.

Further, since the passage of Measure 66 in 1998, we have received clarification from the

Department of Justice on the intent of the ballot measure and on the following associated audit issues:

- The clarification of what projects, activities, and expenditure types should be considered "capital expenditures" for the purposes of meeting the 65 percent requirement; and
- The character of interest earned on money appropriated to the Restoration and Protection Subaccount as directed by the Legislature to the Restoration and Protection Research Fund, and the effect on the 65 percent capital expenditure requirement.

Audit Results

Parks Subaccount Expenditures

The funds in the Parks Subaccount are appropriated to the Oregon Parks and Recreation Department (OPRD). The funds were allocated between administration, operations, land acquisition, local park grants, and facility repair and maintenance. According to the Legislatively Adopted Budget for the 2001-03 biennium, Measure 66 funds were 35 percent of OPRD's total budget.

For the 2001-03 biennium, Measure 66 expenditures in the Parks Subaccount totaled \$48.2 million. All expenditures of the OPRD are allowable under the requirements for Measure 66 funds. Therefore, we did not test expenditures for compliance.

Restoration and Protection Subaccount—Overview of the Use of Measure 66 Funds

In the 2001-03 biennium, the Oregon State Legislature allocated Measure 66 funds to the following five agencies: Oregon Watershed Enhancement Board, Oregon State

Police, Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife, Oregon Department of Agriculture, and the Oregon Department of Environmental Quality. These agencies' uses of Measure 66 funds are as follows:

The Oregon Watershed Enhancement Board (OWEB) promotes and implements programs to restore, maintain, and enhance watersheds in the State of Oregon. OWEB uses Measure 66 operational funds to support OWEB's administration and operations and uses Measure 66 capital funds to support projects and grants to restore, maintain and enhance watersheds. According to the Legislatively Adopted Budget for the 2001-03 biennium, Measure 66 funds were 69 percent of OWEB's budget.

The Oregon State Police (OSP) uses Measure 66 funds for the enforcement of fish and wildlife and habitat protection laws. The capital funds are used to purchase fish and wildlife support enforcement vehicles and boats. The operational Measure 66 funds are used to fund 25 staff positions each biennium for fish and wildlife enforcement. According to the Legislatively Adopted Budget for the 2001-03 biennium, Measure 66 funds were 1 percent of OSP's budget.

The Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife's (ODFW) Measure 66 capital funds are used for new construction, replacement, or major repair of fish screens and diversion passages along designated streams and waterways. ODFW's Measure 66 operations funds are used to provide monitoring and evaluation of Oregon's native fish populations and habitat along with technical assistance and outreach to watershed councils and private landowners. According to the Legislatively Adopted Budget for the 2001-03 biennium, Measure 66

funds were about 5 percent of ODFW's budget.

The Oregon Department of Agriculture (ODA) uses Measure 66 funds to support the operating costs of ODA's Soil and Water Conservation Districts, Healthy Streams, and Confined Animal Feeding Operations. The Soil and Water Conservation program grants funds to Soil and Water Conservation Districts for conservation programs for water quality improvements and watershed management. As part of the Healthy Streams program, ODA works with landowners to develop agricultural water quality management plans to meet state water quality standards in basins where agricultural nonpoint source pollution is a major factor. In conjunction with this effort, ODA also works with Confined Animal Feeding Operations to improve the level of compliance with water quality regulations. ODA uses Measure 66 capital funds to control noxious weeds as published by the Oregon State Weed Board through approval of various grants. Until the 2001-03 biennium, Healthy Streams and Confined Animal Feeding Operations were not funded with Measure 66 funds. According to the Legislatively Adopted Budget for the 2001-03 biennium, Measure 66 funds were about 5 percent of ODA's budget.

The Oregon Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) receives Measure 66 operational funds, which are used for water quality monitoring activities that support watershed restoration. According to the Legislatively Adopted Budget for the 2001-03 biennium, Measure 66 funds were less than 1 percent of DEQ's budget.

Restoration and Protection Subaccount Expenditures Compliance with Constitutional Requirements

We reviewed the Restoration and Protection Subaccount expenditures for all five agencies discussed above. See the following table for the Measure 66 expenditures incurred during the 2001-03 biennium and cumulative total since Measure 66 was implemented in the 1999-01 biennium.

We found that the agencies' Measure 66 expenditures between July 1, 2001, and June 30, 2003, were substantially in compliance with the intended use of the funds. In order to test compliance, we selected samples of expenditures from each agency. Our sample dollars totaled approximately \$2.5 million and we identified less than 1 percent of questioned Measure 66 expenditures. In our sample of expenditures, we identified \$305 of operating costs

requirement that at least 65 percent of the Restoration and Protection Subaccount money must be used for capital expenditures will be made in 2014, when voters will decide whether to continue dedicating funds for parks, beaches, and habitat and watershed restoration. Currently through the 2001-03 biennium, the Oregon State Legislature budgeted the funds such that 65 percent were to be used for capital expenditures. Of the \$77.4 million Measure 66 expenditures incurred through June 30, 2003, capital expenditures represented 57 percent and operating costs represented 43 percent. However, an additional \$15.3 million of capital funds have not been spent. If spent as such, capital expenditures will represent 64.2 percent of the total expenditures and the State of Oregon will be less than 1 percent out of compliance.

In October 2004, the Department of Justice provided OWEB with an opinion that education and outreach

As of June 30, 2003, the State of Oregon is substantially in compliance with the intended purposes of Measure 66. Final determination of compliance with Measure 66 will be made in 2014.

We recommend that agencies follow advice received from the Department of Justice when charging Measure 66 costs as capital expenditures.

Agency's Response:

All agencies agree to follow advice received from the Department of Justice when charging Measure 66 costs as capital expenditures.

Restoration and Protection Research Fund

The monies in this fund are the interest earned on monies in the Restoration and Protection Subaccount. The monies in this fund are for the purpose of funding research and other activities related to the restoration and protection of native salmonid populations, watersheds, fish and wildlife habitats and water quality, including but not limited to research, monitoring, evaluation, and assessment related to the Oregon Plan.

Based on advice received from the Department of Justice, at least 65 percent of these monies must be used for capital expenditures.

During the 2001-03 biennium, the Emergency Board approved \$772,340 for expenditure. As of June 30, 2003, OWEB spent \$438,531, 20 percent for capital expenditures and 80 percent for operating costs.

We recommend that OWEB continue monitoring to ensure that at least 65 percent of the expenditures in the Restoration and Protection Research Fund are capital expenditures.

Restoration and Protection Subaccount Measure 66 Expenditures

Agency	Capital Expenditures 2001-03 (in Millions)	Operating Expenditures 2001-03 (in Millions)	Capital Expenditures To Date (in Millions)	Operating Expenditures To Date (in Millions)
OWEB	\$ 25.4	\$ 6.0	\$33.6	\$11.1
ODFW	\$ 5.3	\$ 2.9	\$ 7.2	\$ 6.7
OSP	\$ 0.7	\$ 3.7	\$ 1.2	\$ 6.5
ODA	\$ 1.2	\$ 3.2	\$ 2.2	\$ 6.0
DEQ	\$ 0.0	\$ 2.2	\$ 0.0	\$ 2.5
ODF*	\$ 0.0	\$ 0.0	\$ 0.0	\$ 0.4
Total	\$32.6	\$18.0	\$44.2	\$33.2

* Oregon Department of Forestry

that did not appear to be related to Measure 66 and \$7,397 classified as capital expenditures that did not meet the definition for capital expenditures as outlined in statute and Department of Justice advice.

Final determination on whether the State complied with the

activities associated with specific restoration projects could not be charged to Measure 66 as capital expenditures. Prior to this opinion, OWEB had allowed these costs to be charged to Measure 66 as capital expenditures.

Agency's Response:

OWEB agrees to continue to monitor that at least 65 percent of the expenditures in the Restoration and Protection Research Fund are capital expenditures.

Performance Measures

Part of the constitutional audit requirement is to measure the effectiveness and performance of the agency receiving Measure 66 funds. In order to measure effectiveness and performance, each agency receiving Measure 66 funds has established individual performance measures. However, for the Restoration and Protection Subaccount, there is no overall measure to determine if restoration and protection of wild salmonid populations, watersheds, fish and wildlife habitats and water quality has or will occur. We will not be able to conclude on the overall effectiveness of the expenditure of Measure 66 funds due to the mixture of funds used for these programs and the multitude of factors that impact the ultimate outcomes.

See Appendix A for a listing of each agency's performance measures, data available to date, and the source of the data. We did not verify the data, nor did we determine if the measures were appropriate for each of the agencies.

We recommend that the agencies receiving funds from the Restoration and Protection Subaccount work together and with the Oregon State Legislature to develop performance measures that will provide information wanted by the Legislature and the people of the State of Oregon in the year 2014 in order to make a determination related to the performance of these funds.

Agency's Response:

All agencies agree to work together and with the Oregon State

Legislature to develop performance measures that will provide information wanted by the Legislature and the people of the State of Oregon in the year 2014.

Objectives, Scope and Methodology

The objectives of our audit were to determine whether:

- Agencies receiving Measure 66 funds spent them as the constitution intended and reported expenditures accurately; and
- Agencies have established performance measures and are gathering the necessary Measure 66 data relevant to those performance measures.

The scope of our review included six agencies receiving and expending Measure 66 dedicated funds during the 2001-03 biennium. These agencies included the Oregon Parks and Recreation Department, Oregon State Police, Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife, Oregon Department of Agriculture, Oregon Department of Environmental Quality, and Oregon Watershed Enhancement Board. Our audit period covered Measure 66 expenditures incurred from July 1, 2001, to June 30, 2003.

In performing this audit, we reviewed applicable sections of the Oregon Constitution, statutes, and ballot measure summaries. We also reviewed prior audit work related to the 1999-01 Measure 66 audit (Report No. 2002-46).

We interviewed responsible agency officials and program staff, and consulted with the Department of Justice.

To assess compliance with the requirement that a percentage of Measure 66 funds needed to be used for capital expenditures, we selected a sample of expenditures for each agency and evaluated

controls over those expenditures. We reviewed the agencies supporting documentation for the expenditures selected and concluded on compliance with relevant constitutional and legislative requirements.

We interviewed program staff and management to identify the performance measures developed related to Measure 66 and to identify the data collected to date.

We conducted this audit in accordance with generally accepted government auditing standards. Agency management letters related to this audit report were issued to agencies that had expenditures for the 2001-03 biennium for the Restoration and Protection Subaccount.

Appendix A: Measure 66 Performance Measures

UNAUDITED

Oregon State Police Measure 66 Performance Measures								
Key Performance Measure		1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	Data Source	Year Measure Effective
1. Percent of anglers contacted who are angling in compliance with rules and laws associated with salmon and steelhead bag limits, licensing/tagging, means of take and species	Target	84.0%	84.0%	84.0%	84.0%	84.0%	BrosLund Report	1999
	Data	88.4%	89.1%	89.5%	89.2%	88.4%		

Oregon Department of Environmental Quality Measure 66 Performance Measures								
Key Performance Measure		1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	Data Source	Year Measure Effective
1. Cumulative percentage of waterbody segments with approved TMDL's	Target	N/A*	N/A*	N/A*	N/A*	N/A	Water Quality Program Database	2001
	Data	N/A	6%	23%	29%	34%		
2. Undertake monitoring activities in coordination with other state agencies and consistent with the Oregon Plan Monitoring Strategy** by doing the following:								
(A) Establish and monitor approximately 10 reference sites and 50 randomly selected monitoring site locations per year for the monitoring study.	Target	60	60	60	60	60	Biomonitoring Database	2001
	Data	71	68	78	71	76***		
(B) Complete sample analysis, enter data into Biomonitoring database, and verify data entry within six months of final data collection	Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	Biomonitoring Database	2001
	Data	100%	100%	100%	75%	60%		

*A Consent Decree issued in 2000 established the target of 1153 approved TMDLs by 2010. The first interim target set by DEQ is for 2004 (27%). This target has been met.

**DEQ and ODFW developed a coordinated monitoring program in 1997 and implemented it starting in 1998. This program assesses the biological, chemical and habitat condition of small streams and rivers in western Oregon.

***Due to budget constraints in 2003, not all parameters were measured at all sites. Approximately 80 percent of the sites had a reduced level of habitat data collection.

Appendix A: Measure 66 Performance Measures (continued)

UNAUDITED

Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife Measure 66 Performance Measures								
Key Performance Measure		1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	Data Source	Year Measure Effective
1. Natural fish population monitored annually per FTE	Target		1.01	1.02	1.03	1.04	Fish and Human Resources Divisions	1997
	Data	1.11	1.01	0.94	1.05			
2. Number of unscreened priority water diversions	Target		2,975	2,879	2,726	2,565	Fish Screen and Passage Program Database	1997
	Data	3,040	2,975	2,879	2,541			

Note: Data for 2003 was not available at the time this information was gathered.

Oregon Department of Agriculture Soil and Water Conservation Districts (SWCD) Measure 66 Performance Measures								
Key Performance Measure		1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	Data Source	Year Measure Effective
1. Number of workshops performed	Target	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	SWCD	2001
	Data	NA	NA	90	141	506		
2. Number of meetings held	Target	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	SWCD	2001
	Data	NA	NA	423	663	887		
3. Number of meetings attended	Target	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	SWCD	2002
	Data	NA	NA	NA	6799	7930		
4. Number of tours conducted	Target	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	SWCD	2001
	Data	NA	NA	90	136	161		
5. Number of displays prepared and staffed	Target	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	SWCD	2001
	Data	NA	NA	75	113	216		
6. Number of demonstrations	Target	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	SWCD	2001
	Data	NA	NA	32	237	78		

Appendix A: Measure 66 Performance Measures (continued)

UNAUDITED

Oregon Department of Agriculture Soil and Water Conservation Districts (SWCD) Measure 66 Performance Measures (continued)								
Key Performance Measure		1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	Data Source	Year Measure Effective
7. Number of news articles written	Target	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	SWCD	2001
	Data	NA	NA	116	346	496		
8. Number of newsletters written	Target	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	SWCD	2001
	Data	NA	NA	37	214	285		
9. Number of conservation plans completed	Target	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	SWCD	2000
	Data	NA	137	88	177	217		
10. Number of conservation plans in progress	Target	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	SWCD	2000
	Data	NA	137	575	651	1637		

Oregon Department of Agriculture Healthy Streams Measure 66 Performance Measures								
Key Performance Measure		1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	Data Source	Year Measure Effective
1. Percent of plans and rules completed and adopted	Target	20%	50%	75%	90%	100%	ODA records	1999
	Data	10%	18%	38%	54%	82%		
2. Outreach is conducted to inform affected individuals of this program and means to comply with the relevant State and Federal laws as measured by intergovernmental agreements with Soil and Water Conservation Districts.	Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	Local Management Agency (select SWCDs)	1999
	Data	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%		
3. Annual rate of soil and rill erosion on cultivated cropland (tons/acre/year)*	Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service National Resources Inventory	1996
	Data	N/A	3	N/A	N/A	N/A		
4. Percent decrease in soil erosion by water (sheet or rill erosion) on Oregon croplands*	Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service National Resources Inventory	2002
	Data	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		

* This data is obtained from USDA-NRCS Natural Resources Inventory, which is conducted every five years. The next scheduled date for reporting this information is 2005.

Appendix A: Measure 66 Performance Measures (continued)

UNAUDITED

Oregon Department of Agriculture Confined Animal Feeding Operations Measure 66 Performance Measures								
Key Performance Measure		1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	Data Source	Year Measure Effective
1. Percent of permitted operations in compliance with their CAFO permit	Target	50%	50%	75%	75%	75%	Inspector Reports	1999
	Data	26%	30%	59%	55%	55%		

Oregon Department of Agriculture Weed Control Program Measure 66 Performance Measures								
Key Performance Measure		1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	Data Source	Year Measure Effective
1. Outreach, meetings attended by staff	Target	200	200	200	200	200	Activities Database	2001
	Data			254	296	312		
2. Reporting and data management hours	Target	1000	1000	1000	1000	800	Activities Database	2001
	Data			1321	1806	863		
3. Training and presentation hours by staff	Target	200	200	200	200	200	Activities Database	2001
	Data			94	281	273		
4. Total of treatments using integrated control methods	Target	*	*	*	*	*	Activities Database	2000
	Data		778	1216	1006	1027		
5. Biological control release sites	Target	*	*	*	*	*	Activities Database	2001
	Data			53	301	212		
6. Monitored Biological control sites	Target	*	*	*	*	*	Activities Database	2001
	Data			91	344	194		
7. Survey hours	Target	*	*	*	*	*	Activities Database	2001
	Data			1415	1250	1440		
8. Sites Surveyed	Target	*	*	*	*	*	Activities Database	2001
	Data			189	181	212		
9. Planning and consultation hours	Target	100	250	250	250	250	Activities Database	2001
	Data			141	270	248		
10. Oregon State Weed Board Grant awarded amount	Target	**	**	**	**	**	Grant Database	2000
	Data		626,427	638,312	464,416	509,147		

Appendix A: Measure 66 Performance Measures (continued)

UNAUDITED

Oregon Department of Agriculture Weed Control Program Measure 66 Performance Measures (continued)								
Key Performance Measure		1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	Data Source	Year Measure Effective
11. Number of grants funded	Target	**	**	**	**	**	Grant Database	2000
	Data		66	57	45	45		
12. Amount of leveraging from OSWB grants	Target	3:1	3:1	3:1	3:1	3:1	Grant Database	2001
	Data			1,506,276	***	1,351,131		
13. Percentage of grants monitored by ODA staff	Target	NA	NA	15%	15%	15%	Grant Monitoring Database	2001
	Data			42%	37%	7%		

* "It is not reasonable to establish targets for these measures as these are tracked on a demand basis."

** "Target cannot be placed on award amounts as the are based on the biennium budget allotment."

*** "Data currently unavailable" (Data is in paper files and will be re-entered into database)

Oregon Watershed Enhancement Board Measure 66 Performance Measures								
Key "Proposed" Performance Measure		1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	Data Source	Year Measure Effective
1. The percentage of total funding used in agency operations.	Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	OWEB Legislatively Approved Budget and OWEB Fiscal Database.	
	Data	N/A	N/A	5.80%	5.80%	6.30%		
2. The percentage of funding from other sources resulting from OWEB's grant awards.	Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Actual funds leveraged by OWEB grant awards per grantees final reports and OWEB Fiscal Database.	
	Data	N/A	N/A	200%	200%	200%		
3. The percentage of OWEB watershed restoration investments that address established basin and watershed restoration priorities.	Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	OWEB grant applications, grantee final reports, watershed action plans, and OWEB Basin Restoration Priorities (in development through 12/2005).	
	Data	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		

Appendix A: Measure 66 Performance Measures (continued)

UNAUDITED

Oregon Watershed Enhancement Board Measure 66 Performance Measures (continued)								
Key "Proposed" Performance Measure		1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	Data Source	Year Measure Effective
4. The percentage of complete grant payment requests paid within 30 days.	Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Internal OWEB Fiscal Department tracking system and periodic independent audits.	
	Data	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		
5. The trend in monitored native fish populations in key OWEB investment areas.	Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Oregon Plan Monitoring Data, and data collected by state and federal fish management agencies, and non-governmental partners.	
	Data	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		
6. The trend in monitored native riparian plant communities in key OWEB investment areas.	Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Oregon Plan Monitoring Data, and data collected by state and federal natural resource agencies, and non-governmental partners.	
	Data	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		
7. The percentage of monitored stream miles within key OWEB investment areas showing improved water quality.	Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Oregon Plan Monitoring Data, and data collected by state and federal water quality management agencies, and non-governmental partners.	
	Data	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		
8. The extent to which watershed councils funded by OWEB accomplish their work plans each biennium.	Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	OWEB Watershed Council Support grant applications, OWEB grantee final reports, OWEB Regional Program Representative Reports, and OWEB Watershed Council Support Advisory Committee Reports.	
	Data	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		
9. The percentage of reporting areas containing native fish listed under the federal or state Endangered Species Act where monitoring information about listed fish species is considered adequate to meet the goals of the Oregon Plan Monitoring Strategy.	Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	The Oregon Plan Monitoring Strategy, Oregon Plan Monitoring Data, and analysis by the Oregon Plan Monitoring Team.	
	Data	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		

Appendix A: Measure 66 Performance Measures (continued)

UNAUDITED

Oregon Watershed Enhancement Board Measure 66 Performance Measures (continued)								
Key "Proposed" Performance Measure		1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	Data Source	Year Measure Effective
10. The percentage of species listed as threatened or endangered under the Federal Endangered Species Act that have been delisted in the last year.	Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	The U.S Fish and Wildlife Endangered Species Office.	
	Data	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		
11. DAS Customer Service Performance Measure Placeholder.	Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Placeholder - data source to be determined.	
	Data	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		

Note: OWEB was asked to develop new, ambitious performance measures to drive more comprehensive monitoring to measure trends in water quality, at risk salmon populations, and native vegetation in representative areas in which OWEB is investing significant state and federal funding. These measures were developed and approved with the understanding that there is not currently data to support the measures, and that it may take 1-2 years to design the monitoring protocols and begin collecting data to support the measures.

Oregon Parks and Recreation Department Measure 66 Performance Measures								
Key Performance Measure		1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	Data Source	Year Measure Effective
1. Total investment in outdoor recreation opportunities leveraged through OPRD grant awards (includes local match)	Target	\$3,099,780	\$3,828,702	\$12,867,475	\$12,206,529	\$19,925,341	Financial reports on total grant expenditures	1999
	Data	\$3,099,780	\$3,828,702	\$12,867,475	\$8,685,341	\$15,222,886		
2. Percent of Oregonians saying that Oregon is doing a "Very or Somewhat Good" job of providing parks and open spaces	Target	86%	91%	NA	94%	NA	Progress Board's biennial Population Survey	See ** below
	Data	86%	90%	NA	93%	NA		
3. Number of visitors to Oregon State Parks	Target	37,945,722	39,494,884	39,679,758	40,373,869	40,991,000	Financial Management System (FMS)	2002
	Data	37,945,722	39,494,884	39,679,758	39,439,000	39,244,000		
4. Kilowatt hours consumed per camper basis	Target	N/A	5.1	4.7	4.6	4.4	Financial Management System (FMS)	2002
	Data	N/A	5.1	N/A	4.3	See * below		
5. Total investments in preserving Oregon's cultural resources through OPRD grant awards	Target	\$644,754	\$1,113,919	\$1,079,793	\$1,243,547	\$794,375	Financial reports on total grant expenditures for heritage conservation	1999
	Data	\$644,754	\$1,116,919	\$1,079,793	\$1,268,502	\$1,370,110		
6. Acres of land added to the state parks system using prioritized criteria	Target	1,992	420	689	250	250	Property Database	1999
	Data	1,992	420	689	629	289		

Appendix A: Measure 66 Performance Measures (continued)

UNAUDITED

Oregon Parks and Recreation Department Measure 66 Performance Measures (continued)

Key Performance Measure		1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	Data Source	Year Measure Effective
7. Percent of parks that achieved designated level of service as prescribed in Interpretive Master Plan (Data not yet available)	Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	OPRD Interpretive Database	2002 (see *** below)
	Data	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		
8. Total investment grants awarded for construction and improvements on the State's systems of trails and waterways (all figures include matching funds)	Target	\$1,121,852	\$3,163,450	\$4,034,831	\$3,776,538	\$8,045,189	Financial reports on total grant expenditures for trails and waterways projects	2002
	Data	\$1,121,852	\$3,163,450	\$4,034,831	\$5,037,883	\$6,150,979		
9. Number of new beach and river access sites added to the state parks system	Target	5	2	1	7	3	Property Database	2002
	Data	5	2	1	5	3		
10. Miles of new trail added to the state parks system (Data not tracked prior to 2002)	Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	6	2	Property Database	2002
	Data	N/A	N/A	N/A	2	3		
11. Percent of alternative camping opportunities per total campsites available	Target	3.5%	3.9%	4.3%	4.4%	4.5%	Facilities Database	2002
	Data	3.5%	3.9%	4.3%	4.3%	4.4%		
12. Percent reduction in facilities backlog since 1999 (the data is biennial)	Target	NA	NA	13.6%	NA	20.9%	Facility Investment Program Database	1999
	Data	NA	NA	13.6%	NA	32.0%		
13. Percent of department budget funded by the General Fund	Target	0.08%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	Budget and financial records	1999
	Data	0.08%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%		

* 2003 Data for Performance Measure 4 is not available because of transition to new data system.

** A request to modify PM No. 2 was submitted 6/2004. The modified measure (shown above) would pull from the Progress Board's biennial Population Survey.

*** Actual data for PM No. 7 is available beginning in FY 2004.



**Secretary of State
Audits Division**

**255 Capitol St. NE, Suite 500
Salem, OR 97310**

**Auditing to Protect the
Public Interest and Improve
Oregon Government**

AUDIT MANAGER: *Kelly L. Olson, CPA*

AUDIT STAFF: *Michelle L. Rock, CPA
Debbie A. Ferguson
Ron H. Forehand, CPA
Katrina B. Dummer, MBA
Edward P. Angle, MBA
Tony Koehn, MBA*

DEPUTY STATE AUDITOR: *Mary E. Wenger, CPA*

The courtesies and cooperation extended by the officials and staffs of the Oregon Parks and Recreation Department, Oregon State Police, Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife, Oregon Department of Agriculture, Department of Environmental Quality, and Oregon Watershed Enhancement Board were commendable and much appreciated.

This report, a public record, is intended to promote the best possible management of public resources. Copies may be obtained from our website on the internet at:

<http://www.sos.state.or.us/audits/audithp.htm>

by phone at 503-986-2255

or by mail from:

*Oregon Audits Division
255 Capitol Street NE, Suite 500
Salem, OR 97310*