

Economy Benchmarks

Benchmark Update Survey Analysis

Shaded areas = staff recommendations

Rank is for the "Delete to Keep" ratio.

10. ON-TIME PERMITS Percent of permits issued within the target time period or less: a. air contaminant discharge b. wastewater discharge

Source: Oregon Department of Environmental Quality

54th

Consider more representative measure of regulatory streamlining.

Survey II	
Keep	31
Modify	7
Replace	0
Delete	5

Comments	Summary
Positive	Survey I: good, you have to balance the cost of obtaining info with the value of the info. Survey II: Supports the regulatory streamlining process
Negative	Survey I: This should not be a benchmark. It should be an administrative function. Survey II: Target time can be variable; number becomes meaningless. These do not mean anything the way they are reported.
Comments/?'s	Survey I: Needs improvement! If there is a way to make the process help manage itself and time limits put it in place. Time periods should be consistent with other agencies'. Survey II: How many permit categories do we have and who determines target time?
Suggestions	Survey I: Should be expanded to cover local land use permits (ii), federal permitting processes (i), building code permits (ii), and just more permits/agencies in general (iii); should be ranking length of application time against other states; cover rate at which companies decrease their environmental discharge; evaluate time it takes to implement Governor's executive orders. Survey II: Consider other permits. Benchmark against other governments.

11. PER CAPITA INCOME Per capita personal income as a percent of the U.S.

per capita income: a. metropolitan as a percent of metropolitan U.S. b. non-metropolitan as a percent of non-metropolitan U.S.

Source: Oregon Employment Department

17th

Leave alone.

Survey II	
Keep	40
Modify	2
Replace	0
Delete	3

Comments	Summary
Positive	Survey I: Most respondents like this benchmark; "most important" benchmark (ii); "gotta have it"; "critical".
Negative	None.
Comments/?'s	Survey I: Useful if weighted against cost of living; other comments on need to improve per capita income in Oregon.
Suggestions	Survey I: Add another category that is a weighted average of a. and b.; show measurements both before and after taxes; do something to compensate for outliers (median income, or some measure of income distribution); regionalize the data. Survey II: Oregon's per CAPITA income does not necessarily need to reach the national average as long as the standard of living is comparable with all things considered (cost of housing, wages, transportation costs, energy costs, etc). It would more appropriate to track overall livability with income as one of several "livability" components.

Economy Benchmarks

Benchmark Update Survey Analysis

Shaded areas = staff recommendations

Rank is for the "Delete to Keep" ratio.

12. PAY PER WORKER Average annual payroll per covered worker all industries 1995 dollars overall and: a. urban b. rural
 Source: Oregon Employment Department

19th

Define covered (by unemployment insurance). Update to more current dollars.

Survey II	
Keep	39
Modify	3
Replace	1
Delete	3

Comments	Summary
Positive	Survey I: Worker income is the most important measure. If I was looking for a place to invest my business I would look to a state that is growing in personal income.
Negative	Survey I: I think the per capita income measure covers this.
Comments/?'s	Survey I: Some think the data is from 1995; Some comment on what Oregon needs to do. No comments on the benchmark itself.
Suggestions	Survey I: This should be combined with the per capita income; benefits should be taken into account; outliers should be taken into account (income distribution model is better); term 'covered worker' needs explanation; needs to be relative to cost of living; should include average hours worked as well. Survey II: Add more detail. Include per-worker costs of government taxes, fees, and mandates. Include per-worker costs of excessive costs tied to the UGB.

13. INCOME DISPARITY Comparison of average incomes of top 5th families to lowest 5th families: a. ratio b. national rank
 Source: Economic Policy Institute and CFED's Development Report Card

62nd

Evaluate whether a few high incomes skew the data.

Survey II	
Keep	35
Modify	3
Replace	1
Delete	6

Comments	Summary
Positive	Survey I: Good measure Survey II: I think this is a good report to have but the graph is difficult to understand.
Negative	Survey I: Worthless measure because we know bottom 5% are free-riders; doesn't relate to anything, skewed by a few high incomes; don't see the purpose of this benchmark.
Comments/?'s	Survey I: Tax structure and "paucity of major company headquarters" strongly influence results; it should include those on welfare.
Suggestions	Survey I: Needs to take into account number of wage earners per family and number of hours those wage earners work; should also break out top and bottom 10%; compare racial/ethnic composition of top and bottom 5%. Survey II: Details! Give us also education levels and family situation (single parent households etc.) which drive income.

Economy Benchmarks

Benchmark Update Survey Analysis

Shaded areas = staff recommendations

Rank is for the "Delete to Keep" ratio.

14. WORKERS AT 150% OR MORE OF POVERTY Percent of covered Oregon workers with earnings of 150% or more of the poverty level for a family of four
 Source: Oregon Employment Department

55th

Evaluate whether 150% adequate.

Survey II	
Keep	31
Modify	9
Replace	0
Delete	5

Comments	Summary
Positive	Survey I: Good measure. Survey II: Critical
Negative	Survey I: Per capita income measure covers this; 150% of poverty is still poverty, should use living wage or self-sufficiency measures. Survey II: This means nothing because the definition of poverty is a constantly moving target.
Comments/?'s	Survey I: Oregon workers with health insurance coverage may be an indicator. Survey II: Is 150% enough? What about workers with insurance cover and other benefits? % of part time and not eligible for benefits?
Suggestions	Survey I: Use living wage or self-sufficiency measure instead; include info for 100%-150% of FPL; raise the bar to 200% FPL, 150% is still low; revisit the benchmark "in light of new data systems that allow analysis of wages by age group and hours of work." young people (dependents) and part time (voluntary) workers may pull this number down (skewing the data). Survey II: Consider pegging the FPL comparison to the 185% used in OHP. Consider what wages are required to support a family in Oregon. "Workers at poverty" is more helpful.

Economy Benchmarks

Benchmark Update Survey Analysis

Shaded areas = staff recommendations

Rank is for the "Delete to Keep" ratio.

15. UNEMPLOYMENT RATE Oregon unemployment rate as a percent of U.S. unemployment rate

Source: Oregon Employment Department

63rd

Leave alone.

Survey II	
Keep	29
Modify	9
Replace	2
Delete	5

Comments	Summary
Positive	Survey I: Not particularly useful for long-term but important to know.
Negative	Survey I: It doesn't allow for counting for those not on unemployment or underemployed.
Comments/?'s	Survey I: Non-urbanized employment rate is similar to California and Washington; does this include those who dropped off the unemployment rolls?; what about people who were Unemployed and then become Underemployed in desperation? Survey II: Is this figure an accurate portrayal of the true unemployment in Oregon? Did you change the order of responses?
Suggestions	Survey I: Total employment is probably more important. Breakup by racial/ethnic group compared to US rate for same groups; other categories: underemployed workers, workers who have given up the search, workers that have been transplanted in and out of Oregon to retain employment; breakup by county; factor in growth; take into account reemployment and end of eligibility for benefits. Survey II: Correct order of choices to match others. Show by county and economic sector. Track job losses related to government overregulation.

16. EXPORTS Exports to non-primary partners as a percentage of total exports

Source: Global Trade Information Service (U.S. Census)

56th

Clarify wording.

Survey II	
Keep	31
Modify	4
Replace	1
Delete	5

Comments	Summary
Positive	Survey I: Good measure.
Negative	Survey II: Hard to understand; vague.
Comments/?'s	Survey I: What is a non-primary partner/confusing wording; why non-primary? Shouldn't it just be total exports?
Suggestions	Survey I: Add another benchmark related to loss of jobs to Mexico as a result of NAFTA broken down by county or area; Add a category tracking reliance on imports; change to use a dollar value.

Economy Benchmarks

Benchmark Update Survey Analysis

Shaded areas = staff recommendations

Rank is for the "Delete to Keep" ratio.

17. FOREIGN LANGUAGE SKILLS Percent of Oregonians who speak a language in addition to English

Source: Oregon Population Survey

86th

Consider renaming "International Orientation."

Survey II	
Keep	28
Modify	4
Replace	1
Delete	12

Comments	Summary
Positive	Survey I: Important for future trends.
Negative	Survey I: Language skills do not equate to economic or quality of life; not an economic factor. Survey II: What does this benchmark get us? Transient populations skew this. Meaningless.
Comments/?'s	Survey I: Does not take into account non-native English speakers or non-English speakers; how frequently do they update the survey? is the purpose of this to evaluate students taking advantage of educational possibilities or immigrant households?
Suggestions	Survey I: Consider what language is spoken at home; Add an item on percent of Oregonians who do not speak English; take into account number of children who speak other languages in addition to English; breakdown into which languages are spoken along with which one is primary; measure percent who do not speak English well enough to communicate. Survey II: Track languages other than Spanish and English. Target Japanese, Chinese. Track how many schools offer a foreign language, how many graduate HS with proficiency and how many college programs require a foreign language for graduation.

Education Benchmarks

Benchmark Update Survey Analysis

Shaded areas = staff recommendations
Rank is for the "Delete to Keep" ratio.

18. READY TO LEARN Percent of children entering school ready-to-learn

Source: Oregon Department of Education

71st
Leave alone.

Survey II	
Keep	38
Modify	2
Replace	0
Delete	8

Comments	Summary
Positive	Survey I: Critical benchmark Survey II: Foundational to a vibrant economy and a healthy community.
Negative	Survey I: Not a good indicator because of ambiguity in measurement; seemingly meaningless considering immigration. Survey II: Needs better quality data. Current data should not be used for comparative purposes (e.g. county rankings)
Comments/?'s	Survey I: Questions about quality of data and definition of ready-to-learn. It's very subjective); who verifies the information? Every child entering school is ready to learn; focuses on parenting skills. Survey II: How do you define "ready to learn"? How is the % calculated of the children entering school who are ready to learn?
Suggestions	Survey I: Track racial/ethnic breakdowns; kindergarten/preschool/no preparation breakdown. Survey II: A better measure might be parental understanding of the education system and reinforcement of positive messages about the importance of learning and education. Add a benchmark on % of children eligible for HeadStart. Analyze by regions. Define terms.

19. THIRD GRADE READING AND MATH Percent of 3rd graders who achieve established skill levels: a. reading, b. math

Source: Oregon Department of Education

1st
Leave alone.

Survey II	
Keep	43
Modify	2
Replace	0
Delete	1

Comments	Summary (parentheses indicate number of comments)
Positive	Survey I: Overwhelmingly positive response. Survey II: Very important
Negative	None
Comments/?'s	Survey I: These are not the only skills necessary in life, measurement of high school graduation rate is more important. Survey II: What are Oregon's established levels or national standards? What is the achievement goal and what is available for those who don't achieve it? Is this by school or school district?
Suggestions	Survey I: Compare this statistic with the % entering school unready to learn; an improvement here is important; racial/ethnic breakdown useful. Survey II: Match to federal standards. Analyze by regions.

Education Benchmarks

Benchmark Update Survey Analysis

Shaded areas = staff recommendations
Rank is for the "Delete to Keep" ratio.

20. EIGHTH GRADE READING AND MATH

Percent of 8th graders who achieve established skill levels: a. reading b. math

Source: Oregon Department of Education

2nd

Leave alone.

Survey II	
Keep	42
Modify	3
Replace	0
Delete	1

Comments	Summary
Positive	Survey I: Accountability is vital in our schools Survey II: Very Important
Negative	Survey I: Less important than other education indicators.
Comments/?'s	Survey I: High school graduation rates are more important. Survey II: What established the skill levels and what follow through is there for those who do not achieve?
Suggestions	Survey I: Racial/ethnic breakdown useful; measure children who entered school unready-to-learn have fared; add a benchmark which measures performance drop-off in high school. Survey II: Match to federal standards. Measure % of 8th graders to exhibit socially undesirable characteristics. Analyze by regions.

21. CERTIFICATE OF INITIAL MASTERY

Percent of high school graduates who attain a Certificate of Initial Mastery

Source: Oregon Department of Education

89th

Revisit

Survey II	
Keep	28
Modify	2
Replace	1
Delete	17

Comments	Summary
Positive	Survey I: Great! Survey II: This is extremely important to track so we can see if the new teaching system is working.
Negative	Survey I: Irrelevant because CIM is meaningless; cannot be measured against other states; associates Oregon Benchmarks with bad Federal policy. Survey II: Do not believe this is a valid measure. Meaningless. The CIM is worse than useless.
Comments/?'s	Survey I: CIM is obsolete (ii); is CIM an adequate measure of life skills? Survey II: What is the goal percentage of high school graduates to achieve the Certificates of Initial Mastery and what is done to help those that do not?
Suggestions	Survey I: Racial/ethnic breakdown useful; include graduation rates of students who received the CIM vs. those who did not (ii); Measure actual life achievements rather than "initial mastery"; use 10th grade assessment rather than CIM. Survey II: Analyze by regions. Measure % of high school graduates who are accepted to post-secondary education programs and successfully complete one year of study.

Education Benchmarks

Benchmark Update Survey Analysis

Shaded areas = staff recommendations

Rank is for the "Delete to Keep" ratio.

22. HIGH SCHOOL DROPOUT RATE High school dropout rate

Source: Oregon Department of Education

20th

Leave alone.

Keep	38
Modify	7
Replace	0
Delete	3

Comments	Summary
Positive	<p>Survey I: This is an excellent measure with historical significance.</p> <p>Survey II: This is important to track to determine if the new cell teaching systems are working.</p>
Negative	<p>Survey II: This measure always seems to be argued about. Rate does not reflect transition back and forth of private education and CC transfers. This is unfounded. Oregon cooks its dropout numbers.</p>
Comments/?'s	<p>Survey I: Need to deal with data issues; drop outs go to alternative school, need to evaluate that GED success rate, etc.; stat is skewed purposefully so that schools look good</p> <p>Survey II: Have school districts standardized the way they tally this? Is this by school or school district? What is being done as far as consistent follow through to identify reasons for dropouts and what solutions are being followed through to assist in eliminating the problem?</p>
Suggestions	<p>Survey I: Racial/ethnic breakdown useful; require alternative schools to report GED success rates, etc. and include that data here; go back to the early leaver study of 1990 or something like that; rank dropout rate vs. other states; include data on why students dropped out (some drop out for better education in Washington); redefine as a positive: high.</p> <p>Survey II: Identify dropouts, including those who still attend classes. Combine with #25. Analyze by regions according to race and gender. Look at those who drop out for academic reasons. Track alternative school kids separately.</p>

Education Benchmarks

Benchmark Update Survey Analysis

Shaded areas = staff recommendations

Rank is for the "Delete to Keep" ratio.

23. HIGH SCHOOL COMPLETION Percent of Oregon adults (25+) who have completed high school or equivalent

Source: Oregon Population Survey

32nd

Leave alone.

Survey II	
Keep	38
Modify	4
Replace	0
Delete	4

Comments	Summary
Positive	Survey I: very important we should look at this more than drop out rate. Survey II: I love it. Track real vs. GED income and other relevant measures.
Negative	Survey I: Schools report misleading data: invalidates benchmark; immigration renders benchmark meaningless. Survey II: Information is inaccurate.
Comments/?'s	Survey I: This is only as good as honesty of those surveyed. Survey II: Completed with what level of competency? 8th grade reading level? What assistance is being done to assist single parents who have not completed high school to help them achieve an equivalent source and what benefits are guaranteed for those who achieve such i.e. value recognition?
Suggestions	Survey I: 22 and 23 should be combined; compare with other states; find better sources (colleges and universities); benchmark job training in high school; breakup by those with diploma and those with equivalent. Survey II: Measure the # of high school graduates who are gainfully employed. Track by race and age. Analyze by regions.

Education Benchmarks

Benchmark Update Survey Analysis

Shaded areas = staff recommendations
Rank is for the "Delete to Keep" ratio.

24. SOME COLLEGE COMPLETION

Percent of Oregon adults (25+) who have completed some college

Source: Oregon Population Survey

72nd

Consider deleting. Who uses it?

Survey II	
Keep	37
Modify	3
Replace	0
Delete	8

Comments	Summary
Positive	Survey I: Good measure Survey II: Excellent
Negative	Survey I: Lots of people take a course or two: probably ruins the data; not important; how good is some college? Why measure it?
Comments/?'s	Survey I: What level of college? Survey II: We continue to rely on other states to provide a significant number of our college grads immigrating from outside Oregon.
Suggestions	Survey I: Compare with other states. Find better sources (colleges and universities); Break out adults with technical or vocational training. Survey II: Use associates degree and up. Make it achievement based. Look at number who graduate from college. Analyze by region. Track number of years according to college prestige.

25. POSTSECONDARY CREDENTIALS

Percent of Oregon adults (25+) who have postsecondary professional-technical credentials

Source: Oregon Population Survey

43rd

Simplify language: "... Associate's degree or other occupation-related credential."

Survey II	
Keep	38
Modify	3
Replace	1
Delete	5

Comments	Summary
Positive	Survey I: Much more relevant than previous measures. Survey II: Excellent measure.
Negative	Survey I: This is a measure of industry of employment, not students, why measure it? Survey II: Too many benchmarks covering similar stuff. Don't report dissimilar degrees as comparable.
Comments/?'s	Survey I: Need to define professional-technical credential.
Suggestions	Survey I: Clearly define professional-technical credential; compare with other states; find a better source (colleges and universities); create a new benchmark measuring career satisfaction, that is a better measure; breakup by place of k-12 education. Survey II: Separate profession and define from technical. Analyze by regions. Reflect numbers that use skills on job. Place more emphasis on providing opportunities for young people to choose a school

Education Benchmarks

Benchmark Update Survey Analysis

Shaded areas = staff recommendations

Rank is for the "Delete to Keep" ratio.

26. COLLEGE COMPLETION Percent of Oregon adults (25+) who have completed: a. Bachelor's Degree b. Advanced Degree

Source: Oregon Population Survey

77th

Leave alone.

Survey II	
Keep	31
Modify	6
Replace	3
Delete	8

Comments	Summary
Positive	Survey I: This is most important. The only way a student will obtain the career they desire is through college completion. Survey II: Excellent measure.
Negative	
Comments/?'s	Survey I: Higher ed. Should have this data; not all degrees are equally valuable; does this differentiate between degrees "made in Oregon" and those that come from elsewhere? what advanced degree?; why age 25? Survey II: Are there sources available that provide information as to the employment market in Oregon to assist individuals in making career choices i.e. trade schools versus college?
Suggestions	Survey I: Include associate's degree: very useful degree not included and data would be good; compare other states; add a measure of efficiency: % of first-time freshmen who get a bachelor's degree in < 6years; breakdown by county of k-12 education. Survey II: Separate these into two questions and define advanced e.g. post baccalaureate. Analyze by regions pegged by Oregonian as 9 regions of Oregon.

Education Benchmarks

Benchmark Update Survey Analysis

Shaded areas = staff recommendations

Rank is for the "Delete to Keep" ratio.

27. ADULT LITERACY Percent of adult Oregonians with intermediate literacy skills: a. prose b. document c. quantitative
 Source: Oregon Office of Community Colleges and Workforce Development

48th

Modify based on new survey, if available in time.

Survey II	
Keep	39
Modify	6
Replace	0
Delete	6

Comments	Summary
Positive	Survey I: This should be a high priority for the state. It is only natural for literacy to be a major benchmark and should be included in all education and economic development/jobs recruitment efforts.
Negative	Survey I: Duplicated by previous benchmarks; old data invalidates benchmark. Survey II: Adult literacy or illiteracy is actually a measure of failure. This is difficult to understand.
Comments/?'s	Survey I: Oregon standards are higher than other states so not very useful for interstate comparisons; unsure what is being measured; literacy in English? Survey II: What will this measure be used for? Should valuable and scarce public resources be used to give this segment a second chance at learning when many of the youth are struggling due to lack of funding in their first pass through the system?
Suggestions	Survey I: Need new statewide sample; compare with other states; translate out of bureaucrat into English (define intermediate literacy skills); add information on % of literacy among high school graduates of Oregon public schools. Survey II: Use comparable benchmarks. Track scores of people before and after literacy training. Add d. computational e. creativity f. second language. Add more information.

Education Benchmarks

Benchmark Update Survey Analysis

Shaded areas = staff recommendations

Rank is for the "Delete to Keep" ratio.

29. LABOR FORCE SKILLS TRAINING Percent of Oregonians in the labor force who received at least 20 hours of skills training in the past year

Source: Oregon Population Survey

90th

Low ranking, but it is useful and there has been essentially no improvement.

Survey II	
Keep	21
Modify	7
Replace	4
Delete	14

Comments	Summary
Positive	Survey I: Useful to Workforce Investment folks; is business investing in workforce? Survey II:
Negative	Survey I: No meaningful data; duplicative, previous education measures cover this. Survey II: Crude measurement of learning and vague to anyone.
Comments/?'s	Survey I: A lot of skill sessions don't actually train, they just get the hours on the books, this problem needs to be dealt with; the data is pretty subjective. Survey II: This is an area where I believe all employers fail. Providing employees with the skills and tools to perform the job effectively is imperative.
Suggestions	Survey I: Breakup by county; compare with other states; include whether training resulted in higher wages/higher level training. Survey II: Identify only real skill based training. Measure % of Oregonians who received the training they needed to perform their jobs. Work with Workforce Staff. Add skills training or advanced learning pertinent to job. Analyze by regions. Rearrange icons. Sort by industry. Track who provides training.

Civic Engagement Benchmarks

Benchmark Update Survey Analysis

Shaded areas = staff recommendations

Rank is for the "Delete to Keep" ratio.

30. VOLUNTEERING Percent of Oregon adults who volunteer time to civic community or nonprofit activities in the last twelve months

Source: Oregon Population Survey

Survey II	
Keep	38
Modify	6
Replace	0
Delete	6

53rd

Rename "GIVING" and stratify to show charitable donations (CFED) plus volunteering.

Comments	Summary
Positive	Survey I: Shows investment in communities, volunteering needs to improve, very important Survey II: Good measure of commitment to community.
Negative	Survey I: Used infrequently, data is unreliable, doubts about honesty of data, says little about actual quality and quantity (hours) Survey II: This info is for the most part inaccurate.
Comments/?'s	Survey I: How does this information help? Survey II: Does this gather those who volunteer in their children's schools? Seems low compared to WA. Increase opportunities and emphasis on volunteerism. There are not many with the free time available to commit to the 50 hour threshold.
Suggestions	Survey I: Show philanthropic contributions, break down activities and donations by type of giver and recipient, compare with other states, include political campaigns, show employers supporting volunteerism, include youth specifically, reflect quality and quantity of hours Survey II: Add in Academic Libraries. Augment by a tally of the percent of libraries that meet the minimums. Measure web access. Find out how many people actually use a library in their community.

31. VOTING Oregon's national rank in voter turnout for presidential elections

Source: Oregon Secretary of State

Survey II	
Keep	41
Modify	1
Replace	2
Delete	2

6th

Stratify to show both % and rank.

Comments	Summary
Positive	Survey I: Good community indicator, should continue to educate citizens, need to re-engage them. Survey II: One of the best measures of civic responsibility.
Negative	Survey I: Used infrequently. Also, from suggestions: rank not as important as % of eligible. Survey II: I am not sure of this reports significance in the whole scheme of things. I also feel that the numbers should be based on the percentage of registered voters who vote, not all persons of voting age.
Comments/?'s	Survey I: Survey II:
Suggestions	Survey I: Show: % of registered and eligible voters, intervening general and primary elections, break out by age and party. Survey II: By Age, Cohort, and education level, Analyze by 9 regions, Add for voter turnout trends in other elections, Correct for lower registration levels, ratio of non-presidential to presidential voting

Civic Engagement Benchmarks

Benchmark Update Survey Analysis

Shaded areas = staff recommendations

Rank is for the "Delete to Keep" ratio.

32. FEELING OF COMMUNITY Percent of Oregonians who feel they are a part of their community *Source: Oregon Population Survey*

76th

Leave alone.

Survey II	
Keep	33
Modify	4
Replace	2
Delete	8

Comments	Summary
Positive	Survey I: Good but is it actionable?, used biennially, community involvement becoming extinct Survey II: Be more specific, divide by demographic groups, age, race, etc. Expand to include comments about why they feel they are part of the community. Gauge the perception of minorities.
Negative	Survey I: Question validity, get answers from volunteering and voting, too subjective Survey II: This is subjective and tough to measure. It should be made more rigorous or dropped.
Comments/?'s	Survey I: Need to improve this. How is info used? How can you measure this? What is definition of community? Survey II: How do you measure this? What does the word community mean? How can this be accurate?
Suggestions	Survey I: Get more info on why/why not, show which communities e.g. church, neighborhood, regional state, compare with other states, show level of trust in government Survey II: Be more specific, divide by demographic groups, age, race, etc. Expand to include comments about why they feel they are part of the community. Gauge the perception of minorities.

33. UNDERSTANDING THE TAX SYSTEM Percent of Oregonians who understand the Oregon tax system and where tax money is spent

Source: Oregon Population Survey

81st

Clarify language: ...who demonstrate knowledge of main revenue source and main expenditure...

Survey II	
Keep	33
Modify	1
Replace	2
Delete	11

Comments	Summary
Positive	Survey I: VERY important in the present climate of many not associating taxes with commitment to community. Survey II: Need to do more including legislators, publish results more, very important measure.
Negative	Survey I: Joke, not used, no one understands - why ask, too subjective, Pop Survey questions on revenues and expenditures too shallow. Survey II: Very few and so what! It wouldn't affect the way people vote even if they did understand.
Comments/?'s	Survey I: It is always going to be low. Need to do more. Lots of luck! Survey II: Better effort to educate masses so that informed decisions can be made.
Suggestions	Survey I: Data should be based on objective results not self reporting (Note - many readers were not aware that the data is derived from a test of knowledge.); clarify which tax system e.g. property income person; break out responses by income, etc. Survey II: Sort by age and education levels. Analyze by 9 regions of Oregon. Separate into two questions. Test peoples' understanding.

Civic Engagement Benchmarks

Benchmark Update Survey Analysis

Shaded areas = staff recommendations

Rank is for the "Delete to Keep" ratio.

34. TAXES & CHARGES PER \$1000 PERSONAL INCOME National ranking for state and local taxes and charges as a percent of personal income: a. taxes b. charges *Source: Oregon Legislative Revenue Office*

40th

Consider stratifying state vs. local.

Survey II	
Keep	39
Modify	4
Replace	0
Delete	5

Comments	Summary
Positive	Survey I: Important issue - reason taxpayers need to vote, general support Survey II:
Negative	Survey I: Can be punitive for Oregon, not used, comparability to other states is problematic Survey II: National comparisons are subjective and difficult to compare for the quality of service per tax dollar spent.
Comments/?'s	Survey I: Survey II: This type of measure should only compare taxation costs and not try to blend all other revenue sources. Fee based pay-as-you-go/for-what-you-use is the ideal way to pay for govt. services.
Suggestions	Survey I: Show: commercial and residential impact and major components e.g. property income; break out by income percentile (iii), average income tax deductions; portion of property taxes discounted or deferred; chart and break down charges as well as taxes (ii); see POG book by Osborne/Hutchinson; show state only, not just local. Survey II: Tie taxes to good measures of accountability. Sort by age and education level. Analyze by 9 regions of Oregon. Find a way to factor out or separately display enterprise income and growth related charges

Notable comment: Just a note on the data source for this benchmark. The Census Bureau which was annually producing the Census of Governments has switched to producing this report every two years. We will not have the local government data for each year in the future. It is anticipated that the Census of Governments data for 2002 will be published in the summer of 2004. Hopefully that will be soon enough to get this benchmark updated for this publication. Another thought on this benchmark is that we could add another ranking for state (only) taxes and charges because we do still have that ranking each year. It does give clearer trends in the tax burden of Oregon state government. The problem with the ranking of total local and state tax and charge burden is that it is not clear which governments are imposing less taxes and charges and which government is imposing more taxes and charges. Having a ranking of both total (state and local) taxes and charges as well as the state government only taxes and charges might be helpful at illustrating this trend. I don't know if you are constrained in the number of benchmarks you can have in a given report.

Civic Engagement Benchmarks

Benchmark Update Survey Analysis

Shaded areas = staff recommendations

Rank is for the "Delete to Keep" ratio.

35. PUBLIC MANAGEMENT QUALITY

Governing magazine's ranking of public management quality *Source: Governing magazine*

79th

Governing's report is delayed. Research another source.

Survey II	
Keep	30
Modify	4
Replace	2
Delete	8

Comments	Summary
Positive	Survey I: Great goal, important Survey II:
Negative	Survey I: Not used/irrelevant, not scientific/subjective/unreliable, obtuse. Survey II: This is a joke. Governing Magazine is paid by the govt. The source is questionable because many people do not know what Governing Magazine is. The state should improve its act and earn more trust from voters.
Comments/?'s	Survey I: How does this help? Defined by what? Will Gov continue with this ranking? Survey II: What criteria are used to judge this? Why Governing Magazine? Are the factors they use to rank states closely associated with Oregon Benchmarks?
Suggestions	Survey I: Percentage of the population that believes the legislature is doing a good job Survey II: Separate state, city, community. Make sure Governing Magazine is continuing regular rankings

36. S&P BOND RATING

State general obligation bond rating

Source: Standard & Poor's

41st

Leave alone.

Survey II	
Keep	39
Modify	3
Replace	0
Delete	5

Comments	Summary
Positive	Survey I: Great goal, important Survey II: This is a great measure for the direction we are heading as a state, as long as the politicians are never allowed to ignore the bond rating.
Negative	Survey I: Not used Survey II:
Comments/?'s	Survey I: Survey II: Our bond rating is not impacted by the voters. It is impacted by the spenders.
Suggestions	Survey I: Show local government ratings. Survey II: Make sure this is provided along with Oregon's history of ratings over time and other intelligent context.

Social Support Benchmarks

Benchmark Update Survey Analysis

39. TEEN PREGNANCY - Pregnancy rate per 1 000 females: a. 10-14, b. 15-17
 Source: Oregon Department of Human Services

3rd
 Drop part "a" due to small sample size.

Survey II	
Keep	42
Modify	4
Replace	2
Delete	1

Comments	Summary
Positive	Survey I: Extremely important to lower poverty (ii), critical community indicator, should be priority for all Oregonians, only state that measures pregnancy, not birth - keep reports on the web.
Negative	Survey I: Don't understand why it's a benchmark sine DHS cannot control. Not a priority.
Comments/?'s	Survey I: Compare with other states, measure what occurs after pregnancy (abortion, single parenting, etc), show vis-à-vis IQ, show father involvement before and after birth
Suggestions	Survey I: This benchmark has been exceeded. We need to create a new goal. Survey II: Look at minority teen pregnancy rate, race, age. Compare to federal and other data sources. Revisit target in light of dramatic decline. Be sure to provide proper context.

Notable Comments:

- For those of us who use this data we would appreciate data collection where ages are synchronized with federal and other data sources. We often find that this topic is collected up to age 19 in other databases. (Survey II)
- The teen pregnancy rate for 2002 for the state for age 10-14 was 0.8 per 1,000 females aged 10-14. The total count for 2002 was 96 pregnancies; for 2001 it was 122... As you can see the number of pregnant teens aged 10-14 is very small. The Progress Board and CAF (Note - Department of Human Services cluster) may want to consider discussing the need to have a 10-14 teen pregnancy rate. (Jennifer Woodward e-mail)

40. PRENATAL CARE Percent of babies whose mothers received prenatal care beginning in the first trimester Source: Oregon Department of Human Services

46th
 Leave alone.

Survey II	
Keep	41
Modify	3
Replace	0
Delete	6

Comments	Summary
Positive	Survey I: Needed, should be high priority with a goal of 100%, used frequently, objective, very important (iii)
Negative	Survey I: State cannot control, why measure?
Comments/?'s	Survey II: How does this get tracked? Is it only OHP or all hospitals and doctors?
Suggestions	Survey I: Show by ethnic origin, consider OCCF as a better source, compare to other states Survey II: If care is defined explicitly and is the same measure as in other states, keep it. Sort by race and gender.

Social Support Benchmarks

Benchmark Update Survey Analysis

41. INFANT MORTALITY

Infant mortality rate per 1000

Source: Oregon Department of Human Services

5th

Leave alone.

Survey II	
Keep	47
Modify	1
Replace	0
Delete	2

Comments	Summary
Positive	Survey I: Good/keep, used worldwide and for federal grants Survey II: Of course.
Negative	
Comments/?'s	Survey I: Always will be mortality, but "should not be because of lack of prenatal care"
Suggestions	Survey I: Show by ethnic origin and by income/insurance (ii), compare to other states Survey II: Look at subset minority and infant mortality, gender, and race.

42. IMMUNIZATIONS Percent of two-year-olds who are adequately immunized

Source: Oregon Department of Human Services

14th

Leave alone.

Survey II	
Keep	42
Modify	3
Replace	1
Delete	3

Comments	Summary
Positive	Survey I: Good/keep, don't drop!, vitally important
Negative	Survey II: This is one that continues to be difficult to collect and wonder if there is something else. This data was hard to get at the county level.
Comments/?'s	Survey I: Will fall short due to shortage of funds, all should have opportunity to be immunized. State can control this and every child should be immunized.
Suggestions	Survey I: Show by ethnic origin and by income/insurance (ii), compare to other states Survey II: Look at appropriate times for doctor visits, race, gender, and clarify the definition of "adequate." Negative impacts of immunizations that have been increasing over the last 15 years should also be tracked.

Social Support Benchmarks

Benchmark Update Survey Analysis

43. HIV DIAGNOSIS Number of 1st time positive HIV test results among Oregonians age 13 and older *Source: Oregon Department of Human Services*

64th

Change to new definition given below.

Survey II	
Keep	39
Modify	1
Replace	0
Delete	7

Comments	Summary
Positive	Survey I: Good/keep, important but hard to measure by county
Negative	Survey I: Not a priority, not used, hard to measure by county
Comments/?'s	Survey I: Why? What about infants infected in utero? Hard to measure by county. Survey II: Behavior choice. Context, context.
Suggestions	Survey I: Show by gender, ethnicity, income (ii); compare to other states; have goal (target) of zero.

Notable comments:

- “This benchmark should be changed to read: **The number of new HIV diagnoses among Oregonians aged 13 and older.** (DHS's HST Program is changing the data source for this benchmark from our HIV Testing data to our HIV Case Reporting data. The benchmark language should reflect that change.”
- Why 1st time positive? Is the goal to reduce HIV or simply to get people to go earlier for testing? If the latter, this measure is fine; if the former, you won't know whether you have succeeded if the measure decreases -- could simply be that people are getting frequent tests and not necessarily changing behavior.

Social Support Benchmarks

Benchmark Update Survey Analysis

44. ADULT NON-SMOKERS Percent of Oregonians 18 and older who do not smoke cigarettes *Source: Oregon Department of Human Services*

65th

Clarify language: "...who report that they do not currently smoke..."

Survey II	
Keep	39
Modify	4
Replace	0
Delete	7

Comments	Summary
Positive	Survey I: All generally positive Survey II: Good.
Negative	Survey I: Subjective; seems discriminatory/political; not needed, not used; why measure a legal act?
Comments/?'s	Survey I: Should be for smokers, need to ban cigarette ads, use smokeless tobacco, education should be continued Survey II: Questions on definition (past six months or never smoked?). Are there any questions for those under 18? How do you track this and who exactly are you targeting? Behavior choice.
Suggestions	Survey I: Show by gender, ethnicity, income (ii); compare to other states; educate on effects of tobacco, expand to nonusers (?), show other tobacco products, "NOT" wording disconcerting Survey II: Track total smokers by age, race, gender. Kids smoking is a leading indicator of future health problems. Keep emphasis on youth, but programs should address adults.

45. PREMATURE DEATH Years of life lost before age 70 rate per 1000
Source: Oregon Department of Human Services

68th

Change to a measure of longevity.

Survey II	
Keep	36
Modify	3
Replace	1
Delete	7

Comments	Summary
Positive	Survey I: Positive good/keep it
Negative	Survey I: Not needed/used, abstract
Comments/?'s	Survey I: Not sure about relevance. Need better health care and lower prescription costs Survey II: "???????"
Suggestions	Survey I: Show by gender, ethnicity, income (ii); compare to other states; show cause of death including preventable disease (iii) Survey II: Track according to age, race, and gender. Increase age to 75 - "too many young docs too ready to write people off after 70". Adjust for shifting life expectancy.

Social Support Benchmarks

Benchmark Update Survey Analysis

46. PERCEIVED HEALTH STATUS Percent of adults whose self-perceived health status is very good or excellent

Source: Oregon Department of Human Services

87th

Leave alone.

Survey II	
Keep	27
Modify	0
Replace	1
Delete	14

Comments	Summary
Positive	Survey I: Important, yes, and 2 yes/OK but
Negative	Survey I: Not used, selfish/delusional, subjective/unreliable Survey II: Too subjective, how defined, value of self-perceptions questioned. Why are we tracking???
Comments/?'s	Survey I: Relevance/value? (ii) How does it help - really need to know actual, not perceived People deceive themselves.
Suggestions	Survey I: Show by gender, ethnicity, income, insurance coverage (ii); compare to other states; add access indicators and hospital rates for ambulatory care Survey II: Track by age, race, and gender. Document how the question is asked. Fix the question's checkboxes.(Note – Apparently one respondent had trouble answering the questions for this benchmark.)

47. AFFORDABLE HEALTH CHILD CARE

Percent of families with incomes below the state median income for whom child care is affordable Source: Oregon Population Survey

Survey II	
Keep	
Modify	
Replace	
Delete	

useless

Comments	Summary
Positive	Totally screwed up.
Negative	Both surveys erroneously said "AFFORDABLE HEALTH CARE" in the title, but with the correct definition stating child care. Most respondents, therefore, pointed out the typo, but didn't know which one to respond to. Observation: Most respondents who went on to comment assumed the benchmark was about health care, not child care. There was one relevant child-care comment: " Affordable? What is the definition? Many parents of young children are pasting together their childcare with family members working different shifts etc and not really getting quality because these arrangements are what are affordable."
Comments/?'s	
Suggestions	

Social Support Benchmarks

Benchmark Update Survey Analysis

48. AVAILABLE CHILD CARE Number of child care slots available for every 100 children under age 13

Source: *Child Care Research Partnership & Oregon Employment Department*

72nd

Replace with a measure of true demand, if possible.

Survey II	
Keep	35
Modify	3
Replace	2
Delete	8

Comments	Summary
Positive	Survey I: General positive comments, one reference to its importance as an economic development indicator
Negative	Survey I: doesn't mean anything to me Survey II: Family structures are hard to track. This does not include kith and kin care and many home daycare settings.
Comments/?'s	Survey I: Child care needs improvement; state needs to do much better in certification process. What does this measure? Survey II: The Child Care Commission would love to talk to you about how this information is collected.
Suggestions	Survey I: Focus on younger children, compare with other states, measure meaningless without commensurate measure of demand, show child care that meets standards (OR has insufficient standards), show part time/exempt care givers, regional needs - 25 per 100 may be not as good for rural areas as for urban Survey II: Add a benchmark that tracks trained/ certified childcare providers. Differentiate between urban and rural. Measure in a way that is commonly defined across states. Suggested replacement: the number of latch key kids between 8 & 13.

Social Support Benchmarks

Benchmark Update Survey Analysis

49. TEEN SUBSTANCE ABUSE Percent of 8th grade students who report using in the previous month: a. alcohol, b. illicit drugs, c. cigarettes

Source: Oregon Department of Human Services

30th

Leave alone (but there are data quality issues).

Survey II	
Keep	39
Modify	6
Replace	0
Delete	4

Comments	Summary
Positive	Survey I: Frequently used, general positive comments, unreliable but keep it anyway
Negative	Survey I: Not accurate Survey II: Reliability questioned: Even my child did not tell the truth on this survey. Children may skew this as a joke. Most youth will not believe they are anonymous.
Comments/?'s	Survey I: Cigs not substance abuse, suspect puffery and bragging - inflated numbers, too high
Suggestions	Survey I: Show by gender, location, ethnicity, income (ii); compare to other states; publicize in school report card to get supers to require participation in survey; get info for grades 8 10 and 12. Survey II: Sort by urban and rural, race, gender. Clarify definitions. Change to tobacco vs. cigarettes. Measure up to 12th grade. Percent of actual served in age category for AOD vs. self reports would be better.

Notable Comments:

- If all schools don't participate in the survey where this information is derived then the results are so miniscule that it becomes meaningless. Is this data part of the schools report card? Maybe publicizing this data in the report cards would help get the superintendents to be more accountable for the collection of the data and assure their school's participation in the survey.
- We had great concerns about this data for 2002. Counties had been lumped together. When we asked for separate data we weren't sure it was truly reflective of just our county. How many schools (in a county) were surveyed? Our best information was one school in a county with 6 middle schools. That only reflects one community.

Social Support Benchmarks

Benchmark Update Survey Analysis

50. CHILD ABUSE OR NEGLECT Number of children per 1 000 persons under 18 who are: a. neglected/abused, b. at substantial risk of abuse or neglect

Source: Oregon Department of Human Services

15th

Clarify language to show that both "a" and "b" are substantiated.

Survey II	
Keep	42
Modify	4
Replace	0
Delete	3

Comments	Summary
Positive	Survey I: General positives Survey II:
Negative	Survey I: How would state know? Survey II: I don't trust DHS definitions here - OK but only if measured and defined in a common way across all states.
Comments/?'s	Survey I: Greatest challenge, top priority - tied to prison population - early preventive parenting education crucial. Why "at substantial risk" (subjective)? Survey II: The number of cases called in or those they followed up on and said were neglect. I get all the community safety net cases and see the in action for the teenage population.
Suggestions	Survey I: Collect non-founded cases (would get to more people in need), tie to educational measures, show by gender/location/ethnicity/income, compare with other states, make sure data are accurate, show how state handles abusers, don't penalize state agency for increased child abuse! Survey II: Sort by rural and urban and level of crime. Drop "Substantial risk" because it is too subjective. Would rather see founded cases/% reports. Add a category for reported/suspected cases.

Notable Comments:

- This should be a top priority as it is directly tied to (as an endpoint) the prison population and the continuation of the cycle of abuse. Early preventive parenting education (including in the schools) would make a huge difference in this problem. The identification process is in place but not enough. It needs to be prevented...we should not wait until treatment is necessary. Advocacy programs and opportunities for respite care are essential to the success of parents.
- Should we collect the number of non-founded cases as well? This pointed to a huge area of concern for us in our planning efforts because only 11 of 70 cases were founded which meant a lot of people probably in need of some type of services who weren't being served.

Social Support Benchmarks

Benchmark Update Survey Analysis

51. ELDER ABUSE Substantiated elder abuse rate per 1 000 Oregonians age 65 & older *Source: Oregon Department of Human Services*

13th

Leave alone.

Survey II	
Keep	44
Modify	3
Replace	1
Delete	3

Comments	Summary
Positive	Survey I: OKs/yes/need; likes the term substantiated
Negative	
Comments/?'s	Survey I: Elderly should have same protections as children
Suggestions	Survey I: Make sure reporting is accurate, show by gender/location/ethnicity/income, compare with other states Survey II: Rural and urban breakout. Maybe modify to be adult abuse including domestic violence. I don't think we need one just for seniors. List only the crime rate. Same as previous comment - only if measured and defined in a common way across all states.

52. ALCOHOL/TOBACCO DURING PREGNANCY Percent of pregnant women who abstain from using: a. alcohol, b. tobacco
Source: Oregon Department of Human Services

67th

Clarify language to show self reporting: "...who report not using."

Survey II	
Keep	38
Modify	0
Replace	2
Delete	7

Comments	Summary
Positive	Survey I: Generally positive Survey II: Good
Negative	Survey I: 50 years of outreach renders this unnecessary, who would admit to this - subjective Survey II: Here again I believe this data is probably skewed. I think women who believe it is wrong but do it anyway would not be truthful if asked if they are smoking/drinking.
Comments/?'s	Survey I: Education and medical intervention important. Does this means the ones who don't abstain are using?
Suggestions	Survey I: Show by location/ethnicity/education/income, compare with other states Survey II: Probably covered in other measures like mortality. Replace with a measure of toxics in breast milk which would capture these and other environmental risks.

Social Support Benchmarks

Benchmark Update Survey Analysis

53. POVERTY Percent of Oregonians with incomes below 100% of the Federal poverty level: a. 0-17, b. 18-64, c. 65+ Source: *U.S. Census Bureau*

18th
Leave alone.

Survey II	
Keep	40
Modify	3
Replace	0
Delete	3

Comments	Summary
Positive	Survey I: General positives
Negative	
Comments/?'s	Survey I: Education is the ticket, we really fail - need economic development. Why measure 0-17 or are we measuring the parents? Survey II: Using our information we also have the number of those looking for assistance and are turned away for some reason... Yes, but you have to clearly document Oregon's costs for food clothing and shelter. Our UGB caused higher shelter costs drive people into poverty.
Suggestions	Survey I: Fed poverty guidelines do not account for cost of living - Self-Sufficiency numbers do, show by demographics (ii), compare with other states, show % using public transportation as only transportation, show 135%, 185% and 200% as well Survey II: Rural and urban breakout; is 100% enough?

54. HEALTH INSURANCE Percent of Oregonians without health insurance
Source: *Oregon Population Survey*

16th
Leave alone.

Survey II	
Keep	42
Modify	5
Replace	0
Delete	3

Comments	Summary
Positive	Survey I: Very important - general positives
Negative	
Comments/?'s	Survey I: Legislature needs to work with health industry to avoid costly ER visits; good cause but impossible. Not sure if these means state/fed insurance or all. Survey II: Have you seen the health ins questions on these surveys: http://www.dhs.state.or.us/publichealth/chs/survey.cfm ? [Behavior Risk Factor Surveillance System and Oregon Healthy Teens]
Suggestions	Survey I: Focus on elderly and women of childbearing age - young men don't need it as much; show by demographics; compare to other states; show by employed vs. unemployed; show by private vs. publicly funded; % with catastrophic coverage only/extent of coverage; show trends over last 25 years. Survey II: Track % of underinsured Oregonians. Measure voluntary vs. involuntary non-coverage and length of non-coverage. Say "with" instead of "without." Exclude high income and college students.

Social Support Benchmarks

Benchmark Update Survey Analysis

55. HOMELESSNESS Number of Oregonians that are homeless on any given night per 10 000 *Source: Oregon Housing and Community Services Department*

49th

Leave alone.

Survey II	
Keep	39
Modify	3
Replace	0
Delete	6

Comments	Summary
Positive	Survey I: General positives
Negative	Survey I: Unreliable, politically motivated Survey II: The numbers are not accurate and are subjective. The number of those turned away or those who will not go to a shelter are not included in this figure.
Comments/?'s	Survey I: Need to address humanely, benchmark [target] should be zero, secondary to poverty. How do you know this? (ii) Who are homeless? Survey II: How do they get their numbers? Does this include migrant farm workers who may have inadequate housing?
Suggestions	Survey I: Show by demographics, compare with other states, show mentally ill released without adequate resources, data could be more than one night shelter counts e.g. homeless in mental health or drug treatment programs, % of who are veterans. Functional homelessness (can't go home due to drugs or abuse) is not tracked and is prevalent in rural communities. Survey II: Sort by urban, rural, age, and family status. Track how many Oregonians would choose to be in a home but are not. Make sure measuring group does not have a vested interest in the outcome.

Notable Comments:

- I think the data for this should be broader than the one night shelter count. There are other data systems that capture homelessness data. For example in 2002-03, 2793 homeless persons were enrolled in public mental health services and 3970 homeless persons were enrolled in alcohol and drug treatment services. Many are street homeless and not captured in one-night count.

Social Support Benchmarks

Benchmark Update Survey Analysis

56. CHILD SUPPORT Percent of current court ordered child support paid to families *Source: Oregon Department of Justice*

42nd

Department of Justice will request a language change.

Survey II	
Keep	39
Modify	3
Replace	0
Delete	5

Comments	Summary
Positive	Survey I: General positive comments
Negative	Survey I: Secondary measure - remove. Survey II: This is not a useful measure
Comments/?'s	Survey I: All should pay as ordered...2003 total collections = \$226,729,463. Is this a better measure: % of child support that is timely? Survey II: Much of this is a legal issue and many never receive the support.
Suggestions	Survey I: Compare with other states, show by demographics, publish a report on how many fathers are delinquent say over \$10K. Child Support Program wants to "strengthen the text of this measure." Survey II: Track # of children with paternity established, # of court ordered cases are not actually paying the way they are supposed to. Measure extent to which the policies in child support are family friendly.

Notable Comment:

- The Child Support Program/Department of Justice have discovered over the years that this benchmark is written in a way that can be counted and interpreted differently by different entities. We value the benchmark of getting money to children and families as it meets the mission of our Program. We should strengthen the text of this measure in order to be certain it is used/applied uniformly. (Survey I)
- This would be more meaningful if it was the percent of current court ordered child support paid. It is not always forwarded to families. Then combine it with the percent of child support collections paid to families. This is a measure of the extent to which the policies in child support are family friendly. (Survey II)
- The numbers that we report are based on the total of ALL support orders, whether they are court/judicial orders or administrative orders. This is the logic that fits the benchmark and we just want to clarify for you. We may want to talk about whether or not it is worth amending this language slightly - it may just be a matter of semantics and something that you explain in the text of your publications. Let me know what you think. (7/15 Ronelle Shankle email)

Social Support Benchmarks

Benchmark Update Survey Analysis

57. HUNGER Percent of Oregon households that are food insecure as a percentage of the U.S.: a. food insecure with hunger, b. food insecure
 Source: U.S. Census Bureau/U.S. Department of Agriculture

36th

Define "insecure" in the language of the measure.

Survey II	
Keep	41
Modify	1
Replace	0
Delete	5

Comments	Summary
Positive	Survey I: General positive comments.
Negative	Survey I: Too subjective. Survey II: Several comments questioning the definition of "food insecure"; extremely subjective and easy to misreport.
Comments/?'s	Survey I: Basic need - OR should not be known as the hungriest state in the nation. OR's hunger insecurity is a disgrace. Survey II: The system keeps people hungry by only giving them help once a month.
Suggestions	Survey I: Compare with other states. Explain food insecurity - a term most are not familiar with. Survey II: Sort by rural and urban.

Notable Comment:

- This number is huge lately and the number of food boxes are only those that are able to get one box a month not those that starve the rest of the month...the system keeps people hungry by only giving them help once a month and the limited food dollars are often traded even with the new card system I was offered by three people today that would buy my groceries if I could do this or that with the cash I have...

Social Support Benchmarks

Benchmark Update Survey Analysis

58. INDEPENDENT SENIORS Percent of seniors over 65 living independently
 Source: Oregon Department of Human Services

37th

Consider bumping up the age.

Survey II	
Keep	40
Modify	1
Replace	0
Delete	5

Comments	Summary
Positive	Survey I: General positive comments.
Negative	Survey I: Not used.
Comments/?'s	Survey I: Seniors have a right to live independently as long as possible, state should not have balanced its budget on their backs. Survey II: What would this data be used for?
Suggestions	Survey I: Compare with other states. There's something vaguely antiquated presumptuous and insulting about this benchmark. Sixty-five hasn't been a useful benchmark of senior self-sufficiency for years. I'd kick up the age or kick this benchmark out. Survey II: Sort by race and gender and measure the % of seniors who choose to live independently.

59. WORKING DISABLED Percent of adults with lasting significant disabilities who are capable of working who are employed Source: Oregon Population Survey

28th

Leave alone.

Survey II	
Keep	44
Modify	1
Replace	0
Delete	4

Comments	Summary
Positive	Survey I: General positive comments.
Negative	Survey I: Not used. Not reliable – many disabled don't report their disability status.
Comments/?'s	Survey I: Working helps to improve self-esteem and state should help; high unemployment renders this very important. What does the state do specifically? Survey II: The amount of dollars adjusted for inflation for employment services or numbers actually served. What is the state commitment to this population over time? MHS has lost dollars. The ACS [American Community Survey] has questions on this and #64.
Suggestions	Survey I: Compare with other states. Suggested benchmark: % Percent of adults with lasting significant disabilities who are veterans. Survey II: Rank by disability percentages.

Social Support Benchmarks

Benchmark Update Survey Analysis

60. DISABLED LIVING IN POVERTY Percent of Oregonians with lasting significant disabilities living in households with incomes below the federal poverty level *Source: Oregon Population Survey*

50th
 Leave alone.

Survey II	
Keep	39
Modify	2
Replace	1
Delete	6

Comments	Summary
Positive	Survey I: General positives. Great to see this since disabled in poverty contributes greatly to homelessness Survey II:
Negative	Survey I: Not used. Survey II: Seems unnecessary with other measures. These are the people you are able to survey not the number of those who are poor.
Comments/?'s	Survey I: State should continue to provide opportunities to the disabled. Survey II: Does this measure tie to the census?
Suggestions	Survey I: Compare with other states. Seems redundant with benchmark #60 Survey II: Measure and define in a common way across all states.

Public Safety Benchmarks

Benchmark Update Survey Analysis

61. CRIME Overall reported crimes per 1000 Oregonians: a. person crimes b. property crimes c. behavior crimes *Source: Oregon State Police*

8th
Leave alone.

Survey II	
Keep	37
Modify	3
Replace	0
Delete	2

Comments	Summary
Positive	Survey I: With funding so scarce I see crime rising in Oregon. In Lane County alone there are hundreds of crimes that will not be filed or prosecuted due to lack of money. Survey II: This is a good stat except not all counties are reporting the same.
Negative	Survey I: Survey II:
Comments/?'s	Survey I: Lack of funding means crimes not prosecuted, prevention of child and substance abuse will prevent crime. Are these reported crimes or convictions? Do our deterrents work? Questions on crime categories and whether they are comparable to national stats. Survey II:
Suggestions	Survey I: Useful to have a benchmark of perception of public safety (2), compare with other states, track sex crimes, make sure system is consistent for statewide reporting (2) Survey II: Sort by statewide, county, urban, rural, violent and non-violent crimes.

62. JUVENILE ARRESTS Juvenile arrests per 1000 juvenile Oregonians per year: a. person crimes b. property crimes *Source: Oregon State Police*

23rd
Leave alone.

Survey II	
Keep	36
Modify	3
Replace	0
Delete	3

Comments	Summary
Positive	Survey I: Very important especially showing historical trends, used frequently Survey II:
Negative	Survey I: Arrests are as much an indication of the number of police and regional law enforcement focus as they are an indication of juvenile crime so as a result this is not a good benchmark Survey II:
Comments/?'s	Survey I: Go back to education - without hope, kids will commit crimes. No reference to outcome/placement in community. Is there interest in the number of juveniles who have alcohol and drug issues? Survey II:
Suggestions	Survey I: Add # of juveniles incarcerated under measure 11 and sentences; change measure to comply with verbiage of law, compare with other states, include behavior crimes (2); break down by location, gender, ethnicity Survey II: Per 100 juveniles. It is important to detect criminal activity early. state wide and by county. Add Behavior crimes and split victim / victimless. Distinguish between violent and non-violent

Public Safety Benchmarks

Benchmark Update Survey Analysis

63. STUDENTS CARRYING WEAPONS Percent of students who carry weapons *Oregon Department of Human Services*

87th

Clarify wording – "...of grade 9-12 students who report carrying weapons in the previous 30 days."

Survey II	
Keep	26
Modify	3
Replace	0
Delete	13

Comments	Summary
Positive	Survey I: Important, but subjective, needed Survey II:
Negative	Survey I: Not needed (4); secondary to #62 so remove. Survey II: Real measures please, not self reports. This may be more of a political issue than a practical issue.
Comments/?'s	Survey I: mostly dealing with questioning how this is defined and counted. One advocating zero tolerance. Survey II: How do you determine if they are carrying weapons?
Suggestions	Survey I: Measure damage done instead, measure # of people -not just students - carrying weapons, distinguish between carrying guns vs. weapons Survey II: Reporting needs to be standard and sorted statewide by county.

64. ADULT RECIDIVISM Percent of paroled adult offenders convicted of a new felony within three years of initial release *Source: Oregon Department of Corrections*

9th

Leave alone.

Survey II	
Keep	35
Modify	3
Replace	0
Delete	2

Comments	Summary
Positive	Survey I: Good benchmark, goes to the heart of the correction system, best way to measure effectiveness of corrections Survey II:
Negative	Survey I: not used Survey II:
Comments/?'s	Survey I: There is better data available including repeat offender status of probationers and abscond rates. Survey II: We need to make it less desirable for people to reside in jail and not face the responsibilities of life outside. There is not enough incentive to stay outside now for too many.
Suggestions	Survey I: Track recidivism 3 years after suspension of parole, compare to different states, include data at 5 & 10 yrs post prison, break down by gender, location, ethnicity. Survey II: Include paroled or probationed offenders. Sort statewide by county. Include pretrial release and other forms of supervised conditions. Measure # of incarcerated with mental health and/or addictions vs. treatment available.

Public Safety Benchmarks

Benchmark Update Survey Analysis

65. JUVENILE RECIDIVISM Percent of juveniles with a new criminal referral to a county juvenile department within 12 months of the initial criminal offense

Source: Oregon Youth Authority

21st

Leave alone.

Survey II	
Keep	37
Modify	1
Replace	0
Delete	3

Comments	Summary
Positive	Survey I: Best way to measure effectiveness of juvenile corrections Survey II:
Negative	Survey I: Survey II:
Comments/?'s	Survey I: The more we use adult terms the more we compromise the need for a juvenile system. Survey II:
Suggestions	Survey I: Should include data for 3, 5 years and 10 years post conviction; track re-offenses; compare with other states. Survey II: We are developing a fairly broad youth peer court system. Would like to see a benchmark around recidivism of youth going through peer court system - it is fairly high - - and plays a key role in juvenile prevention. This data would be much more useful if it were percent of adjudicated juveniles who have been through some type of treatment with a new criminal referral.

66. COOPERATIVE POLICING Percent of counties that have completed a strategic cooperative policing agreement Source: Oregon State Police

83rd

Check with State Police about continuing – all but one county is in.

Survey II	
Keep	27
Modify	2
Replace	2
Delete	10

Comments	Summary
Positive	Survey I: Needed Survey II:
Negative	Survey I: Doesn't seem important, pretty esoteric, not useful, don't understand so remove Survey II:
Comments/?'s	Survey I: Not a true benchmark. What is cooperative policing agreement? National ranking? Do the agreements impact crime levels? Good for OSP evals but not policy. Survey II: What does this mean and why is it important? Not all counties are the same.
Suggestions	Survey I: This is process, not outcome. Measure citizen perception of safety. Survey II: Keep this until all counties have an agreement then modify to measure to see whether it is being used in all counties. Communication and cooperation seems to be the goal.

Public Safety Benchmarks

Benchmark Update Survey Analysis

67. EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS Percent of Oregon counties and communities prepared for natural and technological emergencies or disasters: a. with hazard data and risk reduction natural only b. with response and recovery capabilities *Sources: Oregon Department of Geology and Mineral Industries (DOGAMI) and the Office of Emergency Management*
38th

Survey II	
Keep	32
Modify	6
Replace	0
Delete	4

Check with DOGAMI about changing per developmental benchmark #2013.

Comments	Summary
Positive	Survey I: Needed, very Important! Keep Measuring, Keep it Simple and brings emphasis to preparedness Survey II: Assuming volunteer services are included I think part b is the more important piece of this measure.
Negative	Survey I: Survey II: In general I do not see the linkage between prevention and these measures. I would expect these measures to be leading rather than lagging.
Comments/?'s	Survey I: National ranking? Survey II: How are they evaluated? How accurate? Should this also include potential terrorist attacks?
Suggestions	Survey I: Add terrorism aspect, add community wildfire protection plans, Survey II: Place more emphasis on this. Clarify definitions. Add "c. Have an integrated EP plan in cooperation with other local, regional, and state organizations." Sort statewide by county. The DRP (Note - not spelled out by respondent) condition needs to be independently tested.

Community Development Benchmarks

Benchmark Update Survey Analysis

68. TRAFFIC CONGESTION Hours of travel delay per capita per year in urbanized areas: a. Portland metro b. all other
 Source: Oregon Department of Transportation

44th
 Leave alone.

Survey II	
Keep	28
Modify	3
Replace	1
Delete	4

Comments	Summary
Positive	Survey I: General positives.
Negative	Survey I: Redundant with benchmark 70 (commuters), the metro area focus of this benchmark, information is not really useful. Survey II: Hours of travel delay measure a symptom rather than the causes of delays. Also bifurcating Portland metro and all other masks issues that may be present in some of the communities included in the all other category which may mean funding solutions for the other communities is insufficient.
Comments/?'s	Survey II: One of the reasons for increased congestions is unwillingness to build highways. How is delay defined?
Suggestions	Survey I: Address Oregon metro areas outside of the Portland area to this benchmark. Compare with other urbanized areas on a broader level (regional, national level). Include highway and/or traffic accident statistics and road repair statistics. Do cooperative long-range planning as a way to improve traffic congestion. Miles of state highway approaching (80 percent or better) capacity during peak driving hours. Would like to know percentage of intersections on state highways approaching (within 80 percent) failure. Survey II: Chart separately cities over 30,000. Add Willamette Valley as a subset. Provide more information on smaller communities.

Community Development Benchmarks

Benchmark Update Survey Analysis

69. DRINKING WATER Percent of Oregonians served by public drinking water systems that meet health-based standards

Source: Oregon Department of Human Services

29th

Leave alone.

Survey II	
Keep	31
Modify	3
Replace	2
Delete	3

Comments	Summary
Positive	Survey I: General positives.
Negative	Survey I: Meeting health-based standards should not be included because the "DHS will find and punish those who don't comply."
Comments/?'s	Survey I: Respondents commented that if all drinking water does not meet health based standards, why don't we just bring them up to par instead of measuring the problem? Of concern are those people not served with treated water (i.e. people with wells, etc.)
Suggestions	Survey I: Look at national ranking. Oregon Water Resources Department (OWRD) should be looked to for information. Work with OWEB and ODFW. Survey II: Look at fluoridation. More rigorous inspection of compliance with standards. Standards need to be clarified - not based in reality. Standards need to be clarified - not based in reality.. The [benchmark] report should show public drinking water systems that do not meet health-based standards.

70. COMMUTING Percent of Oregonians who commute during peak hours by means other than a single occupancy vehicle

Source: Oregon Population Survey

78th

Simplify language – "...other than driving alone."

Survey II	
Keep	27
Modify	1
Replace	1
Delete	7

Comments	Summary
Positive	Survey I: Comments note this benchmark as good and important for future planning.
Negative	Survey I: Negative comments note: unreliability of data, how the title and the benchmark are not accurately matched and the overlap between this benchmark and benchmark 68. Survey II: The desired outcome is not clear and will be the objective of strongly different positions.
Comments/?'s	Survey I: Encourage public transit and ride sharing to improve this benchmark. Survey II: One of the reasons for increased congestion is the unwillingness to build highways.
Suggestions	Survey I: Add time spent commuting. National ranking. Break down commuting by transportation mode and big versus little cities. Information should come directly from transportation service providers, not survey results. Survey II: Include definition of commuting, alternative fueled vehicles, and average miles per gallon per vehicle. Report details of "means." Measuring telecommuting would harmonize benchmark with state initiative.

Community Development Benchmarks

Benchmark Update Survey Analysis

71. VEHICLE MILES TRAVELED Vehicle miles traveled per capita in Oregon metropolitan areas for local non-commercial trips

Source: Oregon Department of Transportation

82nd

Leave alone.

Survey II	
Keep	26
Modify	1
Replace	1
Delete	9

Comments	Summary
Positive	Survey I: Notes this benchmark as good.
Negative	
Comments/?'s	Survey I: Why limited to metropolitan areas, and not statewide - there is a growing problem of long distance commuting in rural areas to reach jobs, which imposes real costs for individuals ODOT counties and the environment. Encouraging public transportation and ride-sharing. Survey II: What is the goal and why?
Suggestions	Survey I: Vehicle miles traveled by veterans for VA-provided health care. Look at national rankings, commercial truck mileages through Oregon. Look at the number of accidents caused by driver inattention. Break this benchmark into a two part measure: metro vs. non-metro. Survey II: Include more than just non-commercial please.

72. ROAD CONDITION Percent of roads in fair or better condition: a. state b. county Sources: Oregon Department of Transportation and the Association of Oregon Counties (AOC)

12th

AOC will suggest several new measures for both road and bridge condition.

Survey II	
Keep	30
Modify	5
Replace	0
Delete	2

Comments	Summary
Positive	Survey I: Important. Implications for increased funding for road work.
Negative	Survey I: Remove - there is not enough money to sustain this over time. Survey II: This measure masks variation within each category e.g., state roads in western vs. eastern Oregon. Fair is not a high enough standard for the lower range on the measure.
Comments/?'s	Survey I: Increase funding to cities and counties to improve roads and abandoning the light rail project in the Portland area Survey II: How is fair or better condition defined?
Suggestions	Survey I: Compare nationally. Include other infrastructure in this benchmark (bridges, dams, buildings, parks, etc). Measure road conditions for cities. Survey II: Measure primary highways. Cities should be added to the goals and percentage needs to be increased. Track actual lane miles reported by county and by responsible agency with history over time.

Community Development Benchmarks

Benchmark Update Survey Analysis

73. HOME OWNERSHIP Percent of households that are owner occupied
 Source: Oregon Population Survey

39th
 Leave alone.

Survey II	
Keep	32
Modify	2
Replace	0
Delete	4

Comments	Summary
Positive	Survey I: Respondents notes this benchmark as needed and important for housing planning.
Negative	Survey I: One respondent noted that this measure is used infrequently.
Comments/?'s	Survey II: Is the home occupied year round or seasonally? One of the reasons for unaffordable housing is the Urban Growth Boundary.
Suggestions	Survey I: Look at national ranking. Find ways to get more people into their own affordable homes. Look at average mortgage size in addition to ownership. Survey II: Combine with rentals show trend

74. AFFORDABLE HOUSING Percent of Oregon households below median income spending more than 30% of their income on housing including utilities: a. renters b. owners Source: Oregon Population Survey

57th
 Leave alone.

Survey II	
Keep	31
Modify	1
Replace	0
Delete	5

Comments	Summary
Positive	Survey I: This is a needed and critical benchmark
Negative	
Comments/?'s	
Suggestions	Survey I: Compare national rankings for this and rate of property value increase in Oregon cities versus the national average. Break down into % of median income subgroups so you can see differential impacts based on income levels. For example what per cent of people at 30% of AMI pay more than 30% of their income on housing compared with the per cent at 80% AMI? "Be a great question to ask around health care - spending more than 30% of income on health care - insurance co pays RX etc." Survey II: Must explicitly measure the amount of extra housing cost imposed by the UGB. The ACS has annual data that might help with this. [does not contain necessary data] http://www.census.gov/acs/www/Products/Profiles/Single/2002/ACS/Tabular/040/04000US414.htm

Environment Benchmarks

Benchmark Update Survey Analysis

75. AIR QUALITY Percent of time that the air is healthy to breathe for all Oregonians *Source: Oregon Department of Environmental Quality*

34th
 Leave alone.

Survey II	
Keep	37
Modify	3
Replace	0
Delete	4

Comments	Summary
Positive	Survey I Keep this benchmark. Survey II: None
Negative	Survey I: None Survey II: This has become subjective. Clarify definitions.
Comments/?'s	Survey I: A question was raised as to how one would geographically show this benchmark. Additionally one respondents comments raised the issue of the fairness of the LRAPA's measurements of air quality in Oakridge. Survey II:
Suggestions	Survey I: Look at Oregon's national ranking. Survey II: Sort by rural vs. urban, statewide by county, and by area. State what is in the airshed, percent of what pollutants, and from what sources. Use official EPA standards for criteria pollutants.

76. CARBON DIOXIDE EMISSIONS Carbon dioxide emissions as a percentage of 1990 emissions *Source: Oregon Office of Energy*

58th
 Consider better measure of global warming.

Survey II	
Keep	31
Modify	5
Replace	1
Delete	5

Comments	Summary
Positive	Survey I: This benchmark as important. Survey II:
Negative	Survey I: Notes that this benchmark's measurement is encompassed by benchmark 75 and should be removed. Another respondent called this measure "iffy" and the measurement of emissions an "educated guess at best." Survey II: No credible science based reason to do this. This is a subjective political mark.
Comments/?'s	Survey I: The Oregon Office of Energy changed its name to the Oregon Department of Energy during the 2003 session. Need to be clearer about exactly what sources are being measured with the BM. If only electric generation, specify in the language. How and where is this measured? Survey II: One reviewer did not appear to understand why the date 1990 was included in the measure. Eventually we need to become climate neutral.
Suggestions	Survey I: Look at Oregon's carbon dioxide emissions in the national context (ii) and not only looking at carbon dioxide but all toxins going into the air. Show heavy metals and particulate matter. Advice public on ways to decrease emissions and why it is critical.

Environment Benchmarks

Benchmark Update Survey Analysis

77. WETLANDS Wetland acreage change per year: a. freshwater b. estuarine
 Source: Oregon Department of State Lands

26th
 Leave alone.

Survey II	
Keep	34
Modify	6
Replace	1
Delete	3

Comments	Summary
Positive	Survey I: This measure as important, especially in the context of salmon. Survey II:
Negative	Survey I: This benchmark as not needed. Survey II: Subjective
Comments/?'s	Survey I: Survey II:
Suggestions	Survey I: Noted that change could mean any kind of change and that the kind of change needs to be better articulated (ii). Another suggestion notes the deficiencies in current wetlands mitigation process and suggests Oregon take a more realistic approach to wetlands management. a final suggestion is to look at Oregon's national ranking in wetland acreage change per year. Survey II: Note the name change to Oregon Department of State Lands. Consider average wetlands size in addition to total acreage, and track statewide by county. Use five and ten year comparisons. Map this and show maps for five year increments. Show what is occurring with state and federal government. Educate concerning mitigation.

Environment Benchmarks

Benchmark Update Survey Analysis

78. STREAM WATER QUALITY Percent of monitored stream sites with: a. significantly increasing trends in water quality b. significantly decreasing trends in water quality c. water quality good to excellent condition *Source: Oregon Department of Environmental Quality*

Survey II	
Keep	32
Modify	8
Replace	0
Delete	2

11th
Leave alone.

Comments	Summary
Positive	Survey I: Important to salmon listings and Oregon's water quality programs. Survey II:
Negative	Survey I: This indicator "strikes me as an effort to feel good or put a smiley face on a major area of environmental concern in Oregon." This measure is not very indicative of broader environmental health, which is a more important and better benchmark. Survey II: This is based on hype and not historical science. Standards set are not historic so a benchmark cannot work. There will be less apparent improvement as streams get better and stabilize. Using the percentage of monitored streams is meaningless. It should be the percentage of all streams!
Comments/?'s	Survey I: If temperature is used as a measure of water quality, it is a poor representative of current conditions. Survey II: How is "water quality" defined?
Suggestions	Survey I: Respondents suggest working with OWEB and other local watershed councils to bolster this benchmark and using an index of biotic integrity instead of current measures of water quality. Survey II: Define "water quality." It must include temperature and turbidity since they are key to critter health. Make it a percentage of all streams. Include detailed numbers. Increase community involvement.

Environment Benchmarks

Benchmark Update Survey Analysis

79. MINIMUM STREAM FLOW RIGHTS Percent of key streams meeting minimum flow rights: a. 9 or more months a year b. 12 months a year

Source: Oregon Water Resources Department

74th

Possible action. Contact commenter for clarification.

Survey II	
Keep	30
Modify	5
Replace	1
Delete	7

Comments	Summary
Positive	Survey I: Note this measure as a good benchmark. One comment notes the benchmark as good, but not essential. Survey II:
Negative	Survey I: "This is a ridiculous indicator. The instream water rights were set based on an 80% average flow rate. This means that they are always going to not be met 20 % of the time. I'm not sure at this point what the right indicator is for stream flow restoration but this definitely is a flawed indicator." Survey II: Historical data has been ignored all along so why bother.
Comments/?'s	Survey I: What flow rate is, who establishes that historical benchmark and how it is estimated and how many miles of streams are designated as critical habitat for fish or other riparian-dependent species. in particular the respondent would like to know this county by county as a percentage of total stream miles within county borders. One respondent was unclear if this was strictly an agricultural issue. Survey II:
Suggestions	Survey I: Work with landowners and watershed councils to meet minimum flow rights. Correlate with stream miles designated as critical habitat for salmon, etc. Survey II: Sort according to urban and rural breakout. Track the percentage of developed areas along streams and assess surface impacts on flow rates and on water quality. Get rid of the word "key." Define terms. Make information public.

Environment Benchmarks

Benchmark Update Survey Analysis

80. AGRICULTURAL LAND Percent of Oregon agricultural land in 1982 not converted to urban or rural development: a. cropland b. other agriculture land
 Source: U.S. Department of Agriculture

45th

Follow up with contact – UGB vs. non-UGB or cropland vs. other, but not both.

Survey II	
Keep	35
Modify	2
Replace	1
Delete	5

Comments	Summary
Positive	Survey I: this benchmark as a good measure of the effectiveness of Oregon's land use system and growth in the state. Survey II:
Negative	Survey I: this benchmark is not needed. Survey II:
Comments/?'s	Survey I: Questions why urban and residential lands are not used as a measure. Questions why the OPB choose 1982 as its reference year and notes that the date chosen will heavily influence analysis. Notes Coos County's ag. And forest land practices and raises some concerns about the actions of 1000 Friends of Oregon. Notes confusion as to how this benchmark is measures. Survey II: What is the goal and what does it mean? Is this in comparison to today?
Suggestions	Survey I: Better measure is the increase/decrease in ag land as reported in the 1997 Census of Agriculture. This was calculated on a county by county basis in 1997. Also would like to see change in ratio of income derived from livestock sales v. crop/nursery product sales." "indicate how much of the conversion was inside and outside of the of UGBs and rural development zones....we can stratify the new Benchmark to show just how much was planned conversion vs. land converted in farm zones where there should not be conversion." "We need another benchmark to track the number of acres (or percentage of farm and rangeland) that are managed sustainably. Eventually we need clearer management standards for ag lands and either regulations or incentives to promote continuous improvement toward that goal." Additionally, including Oregon's national ranking on this benchmark was suggested. Survey II: Use a % of total OR land slated for agricultural use-cropland. Ag land needs to be compared to productivity and carrying capacity. Map for current year and show prior years at intervals. Report non-crop land converted to agriculture since 1982. Upgrade to 2004 statistics. Use a better indicator.

Notable Comment: Ron Eber (DLCD) So far we have the NRI data for '82, '92 and '97. The next data set will be for '03 and should be available in early '05. After that we should get statewide data about every three years. This Benchmark shows land converted even though most of it was planned conversion because the conversion happened inside UGBs and other rural development zones. As used here converted means actually developed as opposed to planned for such development. We can in the text or through a new revision to the Benchmark indicate how much of the conversion was inside and outside of the UGBs and rural development zones. Thus instead of an overall acreage of land converted we can stratify the new stratified Benchmark to show just how much was planned conversion vs. land converted in farm zones where there should not be conversion. This also allows us to compare this between the various reporting periods. for instance I know that between 82-92 64% of the land converted was inside UGBs and rural D zones and between 92-97 71% was in planned areas. Hopefully in the next round we'll show the same progress.

Environment Benchmarks

Benchmark Update Survey Analysis

81. FOREST LAND Percent of Oregon forest land in 1970 still preserved for forest use *Source: Oregon Department of Forestry*

27th

ODF proposes a new data source and data series for the same measure.

Survey II	
Keep	34
Modify	4
Replace	0
Delete	3

Comments	Summary
Positive	Survey I: Noted as an important benchmark. Survey II:
Negative	Survey I: Noted an overlap in benchmarks between 80,81 and 82. Noted the data as unreliable Survey II:
Comments/?'s	Survey I: A respondent noted that there is a need to protect the forest. Another respondent wondered if the forest land referred to was with trees still standing or if it was just a designation issue. Survey II: What is a reasonable goal? What does "forest use" mean?
Suggestions	Survey I: Respondents suggest looking on a national level to comparing Oregon's national ranking on preserved forest land percentages and to include federal lands in the measure. One suggestion was to re-write this benchmark like the Agricultural lands benchmark. Another respondent notes that this benchmark needs to measure the number of operations and acres managed sustainably. Survey II: Use a % of total OR land slated for forest use. Need a measure of wild spaces and genetic/species diversity. Break down by ownership and define "forest use." Update to 2000 level of stats. (Apparent misunderstanding of the use of 1970.)

Environment Benchmarks

Benchmark Update Survey Analysis

82. TIMBER HARVEST Actual timber harvest as a % of potential harvest levels under current plans & policies: a. public lands b. private lands *Source: Oregon Department of Forestry*

35th

Leave alone.

Survey II	
Keep	33
Modify	4
Replace	0
Delete	4

Comments	Summary
Positive	Survey I: Noted the benchmark as needed. Survey II:
Negative	Survey I: Notes the overlap of benchmark 81 and 82 and brings up the need for only one. Notes the unreliable nature of the data. Notes that if there is a benchmark for % of potential timber harvest why is their not similar benchmarks for % of potential fish catch, etc.(ii). Notes that this benchmark is not an environmental benchmark (ii). Notes that this benchmark "suggests...that we should be achieving maximum timber harvest for the good of the State. That is by no means a widely agreed upon goal." Data is very unreliable. Survey II:
Comments/?'s	Survey I: Asks if "the use of the word plans include ODF, BLM and USFS under the public lands." Survey II: Not sure how to modify this one but hard to assess how something is doing relative to plan without being an expert on the plan. Would think you want some comparative data. What do the results indicate?
Suggestions	Survey I: Add federal land to benchmark, breakdown public lands section of benchmark to federal, state, and county state lands should be managed under Forest Management Plan, suggests that the state and federal governments need to re think their plan to employ more people in the forest industry because natural resources could be left untapped. This is more appropriate as an economic measure than environmental Survey II: % of Oregon land that may be used for timber harvest activities. Favor greater use of lands for economic use. Detail the timber harvest type - thin clear insect salvage age class species location board feet owner salvage rider sale burn salvage storm damage salvage environmental issues i.e. steep slope old growth class. Report actual timber harvests.

Environment Benchmarks

Benchmark Update Survey Analysis

83. MUNICIPAL SOLID WASTE Pounds of municipal solid waste land filled or incinerated per capita *Source: Oregon Department of Environmental Quality*

4th
Change to goals in statute.

Survey II	
Keep	35
Modify	6
Replace	1
Delete	1

Comments	Summary
Positive	Survey I: Good benchmark. Survey II:
Negative	Survey I: Survey II:
Comments/?'s	Survey I: How do we account for unincorporated areas? Survey II:
Suggestions	Survey I: Include a percentage of total solid waste; measure rate of recycling; have % recirculated; national ranking; pounds of waste recycled (not per capita); % of solid waste recycled. Survey II: Need total absolute #. Have % waste recycled/diverted. Get rid of "metro" control of solid waste. Track statewide by county. Discuss long-term waste. Benchmarked percentage goals would be better measure. Use a report such as a percentage that allows comparison. Map or list for every community.

Notable Comment: Although this is a fine benchmark it is not one that my agency the Department of Environmental Quality does much to address directly nor do the other affected persons in the solid waste community do much with this particular measure. The reason is that there are two other measures that are set in statute: a Recovery Rate measure and a Solid Waste Generation measure. The recovery rate measure specified in ORS 459A.010(1) says that by 2005 the recovery rate defined as the amount of waste recovered divided by the total waste generated shall be at least 45% and shall increase to 50% by 2009. The generation measure states that there will be no increase in per capita solid waste generation beginning in 2005 and no increase in total solid waste generation as of 2009. Solid Waste Generation is the sum of the solid waste being disposed and the solid waste being recovered. Meeting the Benchmark 83 helps us to achieve the two goals in statute because reduced disposal helps increase recovery rates and decrease generation but it is the goals in statute that most people and agencies are concentrating on meeting.

Environment Benchmarks

Benchmark Update Survey Analysis

84. HAZARDOUS WASTE CLEAN-UP Percent of identified Oregon hazardous waste sites cleaned up or being cleaned up: a. tank sites b. other hazardous substances *Source: Oregon Department of Environmental*

25th

Research measure of breast milk toxins.

Survey II	
Keep	35
Modify	4
Replace	0
Delete	3

Comments	Summary
Positive	Survey I: Survey II:
Negative	Survey I: Isn't important because ODEQ carries "the big-stick". Survey II:
Comments/?'s	Survey I: Would this include Portland Harbor, a Superfund site? Not sure what this measure is really trying to get at. Survey II:
Suggestions	Survey I: Measure tonnage deposits to Oregon's class I hazardous waste site near Arlington, break out deposits from Oregon and from other states; include national ranking; total number of sites, total area of sites, and total people living near sites are probably all more important benchmarks. Survey II: Identify superfund sites and dollars applied to clean up. Track statewide by county. Look at number of acres cleaned. Look back at old sites. Try trend lines showing number of sites identified on same chart with trend lines showing # cleaned up. Compare to other states. Massachusetts has good measures on this.

Environment Benchmarks

Benchmark Update Survey Analysis

85. FRESHWATER SPECIES Percent of monitored freshwater species not at risk:

a. salmonids b. other fish c. other organisms amphibians mollusks

Source: Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife

59th

Leave alone. (Defined "monitored" in endnote.)

Survey II	
Keep	31
Modify	7
Replace	0
Delete	5

Comments	Summary
Positive	Survey I: Good benchmark; very important. Survey II:
Negative	Survey I: With the rules enforced they are not in danger of extinction, so this is not necessary. Survey II: A political problem without science. Has no basis in reality. Too dependent on number monitored.
Comments/?'s	Survey I: More important to agency than policy makers; at risk from what, how is risk defined?; what is monitored? Are those things the right ones? Seems like too many indicators are measured here while not enough elsewhere. "I would rather see a figure of 3 species out of 30 monitored than 10% since I don't think a percentage gives as much or as meaningful information." Survey II: How are monitored species determined?
Suggestions	Survey I: Absolute numbers (as opposed to %) are absolutely necessary for a benchmark like this; should be able to make retroactive adjustments; ODOT has some good performance measures concerning fish and culverts (# - 4 Number of miles of stream habitat opened to fish as a result of culvert replacements and retrofits. # - 5 Number of culvert replacements and retrofits).; ORNHIC should be added as a source of data; (Oregon Natural Heritage Information Center) Survey II: Better define at risk; get rid of monitored; use the negative form.

Environment Benchmarks

Benchmark Update Survey Analysis

86. MARINE SPECIES Percent of monitored marine species not at risk: a. fish b. shellfish c. other mammals only - plant data N/A *Source: Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife and the Oregon Natural Heritage Information Center*

60th

Leave alone. (Defined "monitored" in endnote.)

Survey II	
Keep	31
Modify	6
Replace	1
Delete	5

Comments	Summary
Positive	Survey I: Good benchmark; very important
Negative	
Comments/?'s	Survey I: How many are at risk? Are Marine species more difficult to measure?; at risk from what? How is risk defined?; be careful whose data you use, opinions shouldn't be trusted. Survey II: How are monitored species determined?
Suggestions	Survey I: Absolute numbers (as opposed to %) are absolutely necessary for this kind of evaluation (ii); should contain a provision for retroactive adjustment (see comment for detail). Survey II: Get rid of the word "monitored." List species along with percentage. Define at risk.

87. TERRESTRIAL SPECIES Percent of monitored terrestrial species not at risk: a. plants b. vertebrates c. invertebrates
Source: Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife

80th

Leave alone. (Defined "monitored" in endnote.)

Survey II	
Keep	28
Modify	5
Replace	1
Delete	8

Comments	Summary
Positive	
Negative	Survey I: All the rules that are enforced remove the need for this benchmark.
Comments/?'s	Survey I: At risk from what? How is risk defined?; How many are at risk and is risk equated with threatened or endangered? Survey II: How are monitored species determined?
Suggestions	Survey I: Absolute numbers (rather than %) are absolutely necessary for this kind of benchmark (ii); ORNHIC should be added as a source of info; should contain a provision so that retroactive adjustment is possible (see comment for explanation). Survey II: Get rid of the word "monitored." List species along with percentage. Define at risk.

Environment Benchmarks

Benchmark Update Survey Analysis

88. SPECIES PROTECTION Species populations that are protected in dedicated conservation areas: a. species found in streams or rivers b. other
 Source: Oregon Natural Heritage Program

70th

Check with biodiversity folks on possibility of a better measure.

Survey II	
Keep	30
Modify	5
Replace	0
Delete	6

Comments	Summary
Positive	
Negative	Survey I: Not meaningful, needs to address success of conservation, not just number of attempted conservations; needs work. Survey II: Pretty subjective and political. This line contains no accurate or useful information.
Comments/?'s	Survey I: May be the best we have, but doesn't really have useful information; Long response on problems with Oregon and federal endangered species laws. Survey II: Are you counting the species or listing them?
Suggestions	Survey I: Need to measure population maintenance and enhancement; track changes in land use and management over time; Survey II: Potential change - At-risk species populations that are found in areas managed for them: a. species found in rivers or streams, b. other. New data should allow for this approach which is better. Use further scientific study. Provide all info to public. Set in the context of reasonable objectives.

Notable comments: 1. This one needs work. It isn't very meaningful. We need one that tracks changes in land use and management over time. (See Heinz Center report and discussion about landscape pattern). The goal should be for each ecoregion a certain percentage (between 10 and 40 percent) managed for conservation including public lands (like refuges) and private lands (under conservation agreements like easements or other agreements). This one should also track the configuration of natural areas (for connectivity patch size, etc). If the state had a conservation plan we could track progress toward goals like % of land in each ecoregion protected or managed according to the plan.

2. I don't know if this is the correct space to put opinions of Oregon and federal laws and how they relate to Oregon's additional species protection laws and schemes. Presuming commentary is appropriate somewhere in this survey I'll put it here. Upon examination the federal Endangered Species Act has not recovered a single species. Nevertheless Congress will not dump or significantly alter it. That being arguably, the case a state endangered species law has even less prospect of recovering a species. With the burden of the federal ESA Oregon should get rid of its own state ESA. It should also get rid of the Natural Heritage Program. We have parks, monuments, vast forest and coastal property holdings in the public sector and environmental protection rules that in some cases are good and necessary. We do not need a state endangered species law or Natural Heritage program to add to the burden since they do not do enough good to make themselves worth the additional trouble. For example, if a species is listed by a state and not the federal government, federal rules and policies constrain land and resource management. BLM Policy 6840 says the agency shall treat state listed species as though they are federally listed (pretty much what it says). I've read the Natural Heritage program lists and other documents. I believe it would be in Oregon's better interest to abolish the Natural Heritage program. Even if Oregon were in a condition that it could afford the operations of this sort of program, it cannot afford the costs.

Environment Benchmarks

Benchmark Update Survey Analysis

89. INVASIVE SPECIES Number of most threatening invasive species not successfully excluded or contained since 2000

Source: Oregon Department of Agriculture

10th

Leave alone.

Survey II	
Keep	35
Modify	6
Replace	0
Delete	2

Comments	Summary
Positive	Survey I: "Needed", "very important," especially in farm country. Survey II: This is a true environmental problem that needs to be watched.
Negative	Survey I: "remove" Survey II:
Comments/?'s	Survey I: not used Survey II:
Suggestions	Survey I: Name major species; most threatening does not lend itself to an objective number; include number of acres treated to control invasive species. Survey II: Name them in order by % of ground (covered). Define "excluded or contained." Add something about their distribution, statewide by county. Remove "threatening." Do acres affected by invasives.

Environment Benchmarks

Benchmark Update Survey Analysis

90. STATE PARK ACREAGE Acres of state-owned parks per 1 000 Oregonians
 Source: Oregon Parks and Recreation Department

47th

Parks and Recreation may suggest modification.

Survey II	
Keep	33
Modify	5
Replace	0
Delete	5

Comments	Summary
Positive	Survey I: Important to maintain; good indicator of livability; Survey II:
Negative	Survey I: Survey II:
Comments/?'s	Survey I: is it decreasing and therefore decreasing quality of life? Survey II:
Suggestions	Survey I: Measure all parks not just state. Survey II:

Notable comment: Kyleen Stone, OPRD While I really like that there is a benchmark of this nature, the benchmark the way it is written and reported does not factor in parklands owned by local governments, county governments and the federal government.

Also, the notion that you would have increasing park lands in an environment of increasing populations may not be a sustainable benchmark over time. At some point, the rate of population increase will outstrip your ability to acquire parks and open spaces and would leave less room for your increased population to build and live. (Although, I personally believe it will be many biennia before we get to that point; I have heard some citizens argue that we are already past that point.)

Can we discuss with you so we can develop of a more complete and sustainable benchmark for the future?

2005-07 Benchmark Master - Developmental Benchmarks

DEVELOPMENTAL BENCHMARK	STATUS	BOARD DIRECTION
2001. Percent of worker applications that meet employment criteria for the job	No known work on this.	
2002. Percent of cities desiring industrial development that have marketable industrial sites	Check Economic Revitalization Team.	
2003. Percent non-retired Oregonians who are saving for retirement either directly or through their employer (excluding social security)	Data available for 2002 and 2004.	
2004. Percent of Oregonians with children under the age of 18 who are saving for their children's college expenses	Data available for 2002 and 2004.	
2005. The change in number of jobs lost/gained due to international trade	No known work on this.	
2006. Percent of students who attain a Certificate of Advanced Mastery	Waiting for Dept of Ed.	
2007. Indicators of Oregon's heritage health (Undefined measure)	Undefined measure.	
2008. Percent of Oregonians with geographical access to health care	No known work on this.	
2009. Percent of school age children 1st through 3rd grades without tooth decay	No known work on this. Need to check with Human Services.	
2010. Percent of adults age 18-54 experiencing intimate partner violence	No known work on this. Data was supposedly in development when issue was last reviewed by the Board.	
2011. Percent of all pregnancies among women aged 15-44 that are intended.	No known work on this.	
2012. Development of a positive youth measure. (Undefined measure)	Some staff work has occurred . Still no good proposal.	
2013. Percent of Oregon communities with necessary risk reduction for geological hazards	Need to check with DOGAMI	
2014. Percent of development in Oregon occurring within the Urban Growth Boundary	No known work on this.	
2015. Trends in accessibility or mobility for seniors and disabled citizens (Undefined measure)	No known work on this.	

2005-07 Benchmark Master - Developmental Benchmarks

DEVELOPMENTAL BENCHMARK	STATUS	BOARD DIRECTION
2016. Percent of Oregon incorporated cities meeting the telecommunications index standard	May be moot. Need to check with Economic and Community Development.	
2017. Trends in the toxics releases into the environment (Measure undefined)	No known work on this.	
2018. Percent of assessed groundwater that meets drinking water standards	Comes out of SOER. No known work on it.	
2019. The amount of intact or functional riparian vegetation found along streams and rivers	Comes out of SOER. OWEB may be working on this.	
2020. Trends in soil quality as measured by the amount of carbon and the rates of erosion as compared to acceptable rates	Comes out of SOER. No known work on it.	
2021. Amount of forest types in different structural stages compared to historical ranges	Check with Department of Forestry	
2022. Proportion of agriculture or rangeland managed with sustainable practices	Comes out of SOER. No known work on it.	
2023. Trends in health of stream communities using an index of invertebrate populations	Part of OWEB suggested watershed measures. Not sure of status since Geoff H. left.	
2024. Percent of land in native vegetation types	Comes out of SOER. No known work on it.	
2025. Percent of at risk species with conservation plans	May be superceded by changes Board adopted last time. Need to check with Jimmy Kagan. Not the best benchmark candidate.	
XXXX. Rate of fatherlessness (Undefined measure)	No known work on this.	
XXXX Percent of Oregonians who have taken steps to sustain themselves for 72 hours following an emergency.	Added at the request of the Red Cross, Need to check on current status.	
XXXX Land use and land cover changes tracked over time (Undefine measure)	Comes out of SOER. OWEB and others are working on possible related measures.	