

AUDIT RESPONSE REPORT

Office of the Secretary of State
Bill Bradbury
Secretary of State

Jean Straight
Deputy Secretary of State



Audits Division
Charles A. Hibner, CPA
Director

255 Capitol Street NE, Suite 500
Salem, OR 97310
(503) 986-2255
fax (503) 378-6767

January 25, 2007

Katy Coba, Director
Oregon Department of Agriculture
635 Capitol Street NE, Suite 360
Salem, Oregon 97301-2532

Dear Ms. Coba:

The Audits Division has completed the constitutionally mandated audit of agencies that had Measure 66 expenditures for the 2003-05 biennium. The purpose of our audit was to determine the following: (1) whether agencies receiving Measure 66 funds spent them as the constitution intended and reported expenditures accurately for the 2003-05 biennium; and (2) whether agencies have established performance measures and are gathering the necessary Measure 66 data relevant to those performance measures.

We found that the Oregon Department of Agriculture (department) expended its Measure 66 funds for the 2003-05 biennium substantially in compliance with laws and regulations. The department has developed performance measures and is gathering the relevant data. Although the department substantially complied in expending its Measure 66 funds, we noted the following that we shared with department management.

- We tested a sample of the department's services and supplies expenditures charged as Measure 66 capital and operating expenditures. We question the following expenditures charged as Measure 66 capital expenditures: monthly car pool reimbursements, monthly phone bills from AT&T and the Department of Administrative Services, a monthly cell phone service bill, lab supplies, and supplies for a workshop. The department could not demonstrate that these costs were part of a specific Measure 66 project. According to advice from the Department of Justice (DOJ), these expenditures do not qualify as Measure 66 capital expenditures as they are not tied to a specific Measure 66 project. We question \$112,593 in expenditures based on a projection of the results of the sample of expenditures tested. **We recommend** the department ensure that services and supplies expenditures charged as Measure 66 capital expenditures are part of a specific project and are adequately documented.
- We tested a sample of the department's payroll costs charged as Measure 66 expenditures. We found that some employees charged time as Measure 66 capital expenditures while performing non-project specific tasks such as attending a workshop, preparing training for employees, reviewing grant proposals, and

Katy Coba, Director
Oregon Department of Agriculture
Page 2

preparing weed risk assessments for the Oregon State Weed Board. In other cases, the department could not demonstrate that the employees were working on specific Measure 66 projects on the dates the Measure 66 capital expenditures were charged. We question \$160,674 in expenditures based on a projection of the results of the sample of payroll tested. **We recommend** the department ensure that employee hours charged as Measure 66 capital expenditures are for time worked on a specific project and are adequately documented.

- We also reviewed the leave analysis, prepared by the department for the sample of employees we tested, for work time charged as Measure 66 capital expenditures. Based on DOJ advice, leave earned by department employees while working on Measure 66 capital projects would qualify as a capital expenditure. The analysis showed that some employees charged more vacation and sick leave as Measure 66 capital expenditures than earned while working on Measure 66 capital projects. We question \$1,390 charged as Measure 66 capital expenditures based on a projection of the results of our review of the analysis. **We recommend** the department ensure that leave charged as Measure 66 capital expenditures does not exceed the leave earned by employees working on Measure 66 capital projects.

Please refer to audit report No. 2007-01 for the results of our Measure 66 audit. Should you have any questions, please contact me at (503) 986-2349.

Sincerely,
OREGON AUDITS DIVISION

Kelly L. Olson, CPA
Audit Manager

KLO:bk
cc: Dan Hilburn, Administrator, Plant Division
Ray Jaindl, Administrator, Natural Resources Division
Lindsay Ball, Director, Department of Administrative Services

Report No. 2007-01

January 31, 2007



Charles A. Hhoner, Director, Audits Division

Bill Bradbury, Secretary of State

Secretary of State
Audit Report

Compliance Audit of Measure 66 for 2003-05 Biennium

Summary

PURPOSE

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

BACKGROUND

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

RESULTS IN BRIEF

State agencies spent approximately \$113 million in Measure 66 funds between July 1, 2003, and June 30, 2005. For the Parks Subaccount and the Restoration and Protection Subaccount, the agencies substantially complied with the intended uses of those funds as stated in the *Oregon Constitution and Oregon Revised Statutes* and based on Department of Justice opinions. Expenditures from the Restoration and Protection Research Fund through June 30, 2005, were 60 percent capital in nature. Currently, Measure 66 funds are dedicated through the year 2014. Final compliance with the requirement that at least 65 percent be capital expenditures will be determined in the year 2014.

We also found that agencies have developed performance measures related to Measure 66. During the past biennium, some of these agencies worked with the Oregon State Legislature to develop or revise Measure 66 performance measures. We did not audit or verify the performance measure data due to these revisions. In future audits, we will begin to determine the validity of the data being presented to support the performance measures.

RECOMMENDATIONS

We recommend that:

- Agencies ensure all capital expenditures charged to Measure 66 relate to a specific capital project and are adequately documented. In addition, agencies should ensure only leave earned while working on Measure 66 capital projects is charged to capital expenditures.
- Oregon Watershed Enhancement Board continues monitoring to ensure that at least 65 percent of the expenditures in the Restoration and Protection Research Fund are capital expenditures.

AGENCIES' RESPONSES

The agencies generally agree with the recommendations.

Introduction

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

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

Background

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

Expenditures from the Parks Subaccount were limited to:

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

because of natural, scenic, cultural, historic and recreational values; and

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

Expenditures from the Restoration and Protection Subaccount were limited to:

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

A further restriction on the expenditures from the Restoration and Protection Subaccount is that at least 65 percent of the money must be used for "capital expenditures." According to Oregon Revised Statute 541.351(4), "Capital expenditures" means direct expenses related to:

- (a) Personal property of a nonexpendable nature including items that are not consumed in the normal course

of operations, can normally be used more than once, have a useful life of more than two years and are for use in the enforcement of fish and wildlife and habitat protection laws and regulations; or

- (b) Projects that restore, enhance or protect fish and wildlife habitat, watershed functions, native salmonid populations or water quality, including but not limited to:

- Expenses of assessment, research, design or other technical requirements for the implementation of a project;
- The acquisition of determinate interests, including fee and less than fee interests, in land or water in order to protect watershed resources, including appraisal costs and other costs directly related to such acquisitions;
- Development, construction or implementation of a project to restore, enhance or protect water quality, a watershed, fish or wildlife, or riparian or other habitat;
- Technical support directly related to the implementation of a project; and
- Monitoring or evaluation activities necessary to determine the actual effectiveness of a project.

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

Further, since the passage of Measure 66 in 1998, we have received clarification from the Department of Justice on the intent of the ballot measure and on the following associated audit issues:

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

Audit Results

Parks Subaccount Expenditures

The funds in the Parks Subaccount are appropriated to the Oregon Parks and Recreation Department (OPRD). The funds were allocated between administration, operations, land acquisition, local park grants, facility repair and maintenance, and heritage conservation. According to the Legislatively Adopted Budget for the 2003-05 biennium, Measure 66 funds were 39 percent of OPRD's total budget.

For the 2003-05 biennium, Measure 66 expenditures in the Parks Subaccount totaled \$56.6 million. All expenditures of the OPRD are allowable under the requirements for Measure 66 funds. Therefore, we did not test expenditures for compliance.

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

In the 2003-05 biennium, the Oregon State Legislature allocated Measure 66 funds to the following five agencies: Oregon Watershed Enhancement Board, Oregon State Police, Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife, Oregon Department of Agriculture, and the Oregon

Department of Environmental Quality. These agencies' uses of Measure 66 funds are as follows:

The Oregon Watershed Enhancement Board (OWEB) promotes and implements programs to restore, maintain, and enhance watersheds in the State of Oregon. OWEB uses Measure 66 operational funds to support OWEB's administration and operations and uses Measure 66 capital funds to support projects and grants to restore, maintain and enhance watersheds. According to the Legislatively Adopted Budget for the 2003-05 biennium, Measure 66 funds were about 43 percent of OWEB's budget.

The Oregon State Police (OSP) uses Measure 66 funds for the enforcement of fish and wildlife and habitat protection laws. The capital funds are used to purchase fish and wildlife support enforcement vehicles and boats. The operational Measure 66 funds are used to fund staff positions each biennium for fish and wildlife enforcement. According to the Legislatively Adopted Budget for the 2003-05 biennium, Measure 66 funds were about 1 percent of OSP's budget.

The Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife's (ODFW) Measure 66 capital funds are used for new construction, replacement, or major repair of fish screens and diversion passages along designated streams and waterways. Measure 66 capital funds were also used in the 2003-05 biennium for the conversion of the Fall Creek Hatchery into a state of the art Hatchery Research Center. According to the Legislatively Adopted Budget for the 2003-05 biennium, Measure 66 funds were about 4 percent of ODFW's budget.

The Oregon Department of Agriculture (ODA) uses Measure 66 funds to support the operating costs of ODA's Soil and Water Conservation Districts, Healthy Streams, and Confined Animal Feeding Operations. The

Soil and Water Conservation program grants funds to Soil and Water Conservation Districts for conservation programs for water quality improvements and watershed management. As part of the Healthy Streams program, ODA works with landowners to develop agricultural water quality management plans to meet state water quality standards in basins where agricultural nonpoint source pollution is a major factor. In conjunction with this effort, ODA also works with Confined Animal Feeding Operations to improve the level of compliance with water quality regulations. ODA uses Measure 66 capital funds to control noxious weeds as published by the Oregon State Weed Board through approval of various grants. Beginning in the 2003-05 biennium, Measure 66 capital funds also were used to control insect pests and a plant disease (sudden oak death). According to the Legislatively Adopted Budget for the 2003-05 biennium, Measure 66 funds were about 10 percent of ODA's budget.

The Oregon Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) receives Measure 66 operational funds, which are used for water quality monitoring activities that support watershed restoration. According to the Legislatively Adopted Budget for the 2003-05 biennium, Measure 66 funds were about 1 percent of DEQ's budget.

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

Audit Results

Parks Subaccount Expenditures

The funds in the Parks Subaccount are appropriated to the Oregon Parks and Recreation Department (OPRD). The funds were allocated between administration, operations, land acquisition, local park grants, facility repair and maintenance, and heritage conservation. According to the Legislatively Adopted Budget for the 2003-05 biennium, Measure 66 funds were 39 percent of OPRD's total budget.

For the 2003-05 biennium, Measure 66 expenditures in the Parks Subaccount totaled \$56.6 million. All expenditures of the OPRD are allowable under the requirements for Measure 66 funds. Therefore, we did not test expenditures for compliance.

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

In the 2003-05 biennium, the Oregon State Legislature allocated Measure 66 funds to the following five agencies: Oregon Watershed Enhancement Board, Oregon State Police, Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife, Oregon Department of Agriculture, and the Oregon

Department of Environmental Quality. These agencies' uses of Measure 66 funds are as follows:

The Oregon Watershed Enhancement Board (OWEB) promotes and implements programs to restore, maintain, and enhance watersheds in the State of Oregon. OWEB uses Measure 66 operational funds to support OWEB's administration and operations and uses Measure 66 capital funds to support projects and grants to restore, maintain and enhance watersheds. According to the Legislatively Adopted Budget for the 2003-05 biennium, Measure 66 funds were about 43 percent of OWEB's budget.

The Oregon State Police (OSP) uses Measure 66 funds for the enforcement of fish and wildlife and habitat protection laws. The capital funds are used to purchase fish and wildlife support enforcement vehicles and boats. The operational Measure 66 funds are used to fund staff positions each biennium for fish and wildlife enforcement. According to the Legislatively Adopted Budget for the 2003-05 biennium, Measure 66 funds were about 1 percent of OSP's budget.

The Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife's (ODFW) Measure 66 capital funds are used for new construction, replacement, or major repair of fish screens and diversion passages along designated streams and waterways. Measure 66 capital funds were also used in the 2003-05 biennium for the conversion of the Fall Creek Hatchery into a state of the art Hatchery Research Center. According to the Legislatively Adopted Budget for the 2003-05 biennium, Measure 66 funds were about 4 percent of ODFW's budget.

The Oregon Department of Agriculture (ODA) uses Measure 66 funds to support the operating costs of ODA's Soil and Water Conservation Districts, Healthy Streams, and Confined Animal Feeding Operations. The

Soil and Water Conservation program grants funds to Soil and Water Conservation Districts for conservation programs for water quality improvements and watershed management. As part of the Healthy Streams program, ODA works with landowners to develop agricultural water quality management plans to meet state water quality standards in basins where agricultural nonpoint source pollution is a major factor. In conjunction with this effort, ODA also works with Confined Animal Feeding Operations to improve the level of compliance with water quality regulations. ODA uses Measure 66 capital funds to control noxious weeds as published by the Oregon State Weed Board through approval of various grants. Beginning in the 2003-05 biennium, Measure 66 capital funds also were used to control insect pests and a plant disease (sudden oak death). According to the Legislatively Adopted Budget for the 2003-05 biennium, Measure 66 funds were about 10 percent of ODA's budget.

The Oregon Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) receives Measure 66 operational funds, which are used for water quality monitoring activities that support watershed restoration. According to the Legislatively Adopted Budget for the 2003-05 biennium, Measure 66 funds were about 1 percent of DEQ's budget.

Restoration and Protection Subaccount Expenditures Compliance with Constitutional Requirements

We reviewed the Restoration and Protection Subaccount expenditures for all five agencies discussed above. See the following table for the Measure 66 expenditures incurred during the 2003-05 biennium and cumulative total since Measure 66 was implemented in the 1999-01 biennium.

When testing expenditures incurred between July 1, 2003, and June 30, 2005, we found that two of the agencies (Oregon Department of Agriculture and Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife) classified \$913,176 as capital expenditures that did not meet the definition for capital expenditures as outlined in statute and Department of Justice advice. Of the questioned expenditures, \$910,246 did not qualify as capital expenditures because the agencies could not demonstrate that the expenditures related to a specific capital project. The remaining \$2,930 resulted from employees' charging paid leave in excess of that earned while working on Measure 66 capital projects. The expenditures questioned as capital expenditures appear to be valid Measure 66 operating expenditures and are included as such in the following determination of compliance.

Final determination on whether the state complied with the requirement that at least 65 percent of the Restoration and Protection Subaccount money must be used for capital expenditures will be made in 2014, when voters will decide whether to continue dedicating funds for parks, beaches, and habitat and watershed restoration. Currently, through the 2003-05 biennium, the Oregon State Legislature budgeted the funds such that 66 percent was to be used for capital expenditures. Of

Restoration and Protection Subaccount Measure 66 Expenditures**				
Agency	Capital Expenditures 2003-05 (In Millions)	Operating Expenditures 2003-05 (in Millions)	Capital Expenditures To Date (in Millions)	Operating Expenditures To Date (in Millions)
OWEB	\$24.5	\$ 5.2	\$58.0	\$16.3
ODFW	\$ 8.8	\$ 0.2	\$16.0	\$ 6.9
OSP	\$ 0.7	\$ 4.9	\$ 2.0	\$11.3
ODA	\$ 3.1	\$ 4.3	\$ 5.3	\$10.3
DEQ	\$ 0.0	\$ 3.3	\$ 0.0	\$ 6.2
ODF*	\$ 0.0	\$ 0.0	\$ 0.0	\$ 0.4
Total	\$37.1	\$17.9	\$81.3	\$51.4

* Oregon Department of Forestry
 ** Amounts as reported by agencies

the \$132.7 million Measure 66 expenditures incurred through June 30, 2005, capital expenditures, after reduction for the unallowable expenditures described above, represented 61 percent and operating expenditures represented 39 percent. However, an additional \$15.0 million of capital funds have not been spent. If spent as such, capital expenditures will represent 64.6 percent of the total expenditures and the State of Oregon will be less than 1 percent out of compliance.

As of June 30, 2005, the State of Oregon substantially complied with the intended purposes of Measure 66.

We recommend that agencies ensure all capital expenditures charged to Measure 66 relate to a specific capital project and are adequately documented. In addition, agencies should ensure only leave earned while working on Measure 66 capital projects is charged to capital expenditures.

Agencies' Responses:

All agencies agree to ensure all capital expenditures charged to Measure 66 relate to a specific project and are adequately documented. Also, agencies will ensure that only leave earned while working on Measure 66 capital

projects is charged to capital expenditures.

Restoration and Protection Research Fund

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

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

Of the \$2.3 million expenditures incurred through June 30, 2005, 60 percent was for capital expenditures and 40 percent for operating expenditures. As of June 30, 2005, the State of Oregon substantially complied with the intended purposes of Measure 66.

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

Agencies' Responses:

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

Performance Measures

Part of the constitutional audit requirement is to measure the effectiveness and performance of agencies receiving Measure 66 funds. In order to measure effectiveness and performance, each agency receiving Measure 66 funds has established individual performance measures. During the past biennium, some of these agencies worked with the Oregon State Legislature to develop or revise Measure 66 performance measures. These measures and data gathered relevant to these measures will provide information to the Legislature and the people of Oregon to use in making a determination related to the performance of Measure 66 funds.

See Appendix A for a listing of each agency's performance measures, data available to date, and the source of the data. We did not audit or verify the data as many of the approved performance measures changed during the 2003-05 biennium and limited data was provided. In future audits, we will begin to determine the validity of the data being presented to support the performance measures.

Objectives, Scope and Methodology

The objectives of our audit were to determine whether:

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

The scope of our review included six agencies receiving and expending Measure 66 dedicated funds during the 2003-05 biennium. These agencies included the Oregon Parks and Recreation Department, Oregon State Police, Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife, Oregon Department of Agriculture, Oregon Department of Environmental Quality, and Oregon Watershed Enhancement Board. Our audit period covered Measure 66 expenditures incurred from July 1, 2003, to June 30, 2005.

In performing this audit, we reviewed applicable sections of the Oregon Constitution, statutes, and ballot measure summaries. We also reviewed prior audit work related to the 1999-01 and 2001-03 Measure 66 audits (Reports No. 2002-46 and 2005-17). We also interviewed responsible agency officials and program staff.

To assess compliance with the requirement that a percentage of Measure 66 funds were to be used for capital expenditures, we selected a sample of expenditures for each agency and evaluated controls over those expenditures. We reviewed the agencies supporting documentation for the expenditures selected and concluded on compliance with relevant constitutional and legislative requirements. After completing sample testing, questioned costs were projected to the population unless we were able to identify all questioned costs in the population.

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

We conducted this audit in accordance with generally accepted government auditing standards. Agency management letters related to this audit report were issued to agencies that had expenditures for the 2003-05 biennium for the

Restoration and Protection Subaccount.

Appendix A: Measure 66 Performance Measures

Oregon State Police Measure 66 Performance Measures										
Key Performance Measure	Year Measure Effective	Data								Data Source
		1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2005	
1. Percentage of anglers contacted angling in compliance with rules and laws associated with salmon and steelhead bag limits, licensing/tagging, means of take and species.	1999	88.4%	89.1%	89.5%	89.2%	87.6%	89.1%			BrosLund Report
		Target								
		85.0%	85.0%	85.0%	85.0%	85.0%	85.0%	85.0%	85.0%	

Oregon Department of Environmental Quality Measure 66 Performance Measures										
Key Performance Measure	Year Measure Effective	Data								Data Source
		1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2005	
1. Cumulative percentage of waterbody segments with approved TMDL's.	2001	N/A	6%	23%	29%	34%	38%	39%		Water Quality Program database and the number of TMDLs approved by EPA.
		Target								
		N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	27%	27%	41%	
2. Undertake monitoring activities in coordination with other state agencies and consistent with the Oregon Plan Monitoring Strategy** by doing the following:										
		Data								Biomonitoring Database
		1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2005	
71 (118%)	68 (113%)	78 (130%)	71 (118%)	76*** (127%)	***	***	***			
A. Establish and monitor approximately 10 reference sites and 50 randomly selected monitoring site locations per year for the monitoring study	2001	60	60	60	60	60	60			Biomonitoring Database
		Target								
		100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	
B. Complete sample analysis, enter data into Biomonitoring database, and verify data entry within six months of final data collection	2001	100%	100%	100%	75%	60%	***	***		Biomonitoring Database
		Target								
		100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	

* An EPA consent decree issued in 2000 established the target of 1,153 approved TMDLs by 2010.
 ** DEQ and ODFW developed a coordinated monitoring program in 1997 and implemented it starting in 1998. This program assesses the biological, chemical, and habitat condition of small streams and rivers in western Oregon.
 *** Due to budget constraints in 2003, not all parameters were measured at all sites. Approximately 80% of the sites had a reduced level of habitat data collection.
 **** Work for this measure is no longer funded through Measure 66.

Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife Measure 66 Performance Measures															
Key Performance Measure	Year Measure Effective	Data										Data Source			
		1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	1999	2000	2001		2002	2003	2004
1. Natural fish population monitored annually per FTE.	1997	1.11	1.01	0.94	1.05	0.77	0.94	1.00	Target						Fish Division and HR Division
		1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	1.02	1.03	1.04	1.05	1.06		
2. Number of unscreened priority water diversions.	1997	2,959	2,878	2,731	2,630	2,531	2,462	2,395	Target						Fish Screen and Passage Program Database
		1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2,965	2,900	2,803	2,656	2,555	2,456	

Oregon Department of Agriculture Measure 66 Performance Measures															
Key Performance Measure	Year Measure Effective	Data										Data Source			
		1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	1999	2000	2001		2002	2003	2004
1. Number of the top 100 plant pests, diseases, or weed species successfully excluded each year.	2002	N/A	N/A	N/A	99	100	100	100	Target						OISC Annual Report Cards
		1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	N/A	N/A	N/A	99	99	99	
2. Percentage of biological control agents released, which successfully control target pests and weeds.	2005	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	61%	Target						ODA Bio-Control Program
		1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
3. Number of plant species not listed in Oregon where department activities played a role in the decision.	2001	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	Target						Plant Division plant conservation records
		1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	0	0	1	1	1	1	

Oregon Department of Agriculture Measure 66 Performance Measures															
Key Performance Measure	Year Measure Effective	Data										Data Source			
		1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	1999	2000	2001		2002	2003	2004
4. Percentage of permitted Oregon Confined Animal Feeding Operations found to be in compliance with their permit during annual inspections.	1999	80%**	94%**	96%**	90%**	78%**	81%**	88%**	Target						Annual Reports
		1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	50%	50%	75%	75%	75%	95%	
5. Percentage of monitored stream sites associated with predominantly agricultural use with:	2005	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	35%	Target						LASAR Data
		1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
A. Significantly increasing trends in water quality	2006	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	78%	Target						Base-DEQ
		1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
B. Water quality in good to excellent condition	2006	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	*	Target						Base-DEQ
		1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
C. Decreasing trends in water quality	2006	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	2004	Target						Base-DEQ
		1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	

* Not yet determined.
 ** Update of database. Indicated errors in calculating percentage in previous years. New numbers indicate correct percentage.

Oregon Watershed Enhancement Board Measure 66 Performance Measures															
Key Performance Measure	Year Measure Effective	Data										Data Source			
		1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	1999	2000	2001		2002	2003	2004
1. Percentage of total funding used in agency operations.	2004	N/A	N/A	5.8%	5.8%	6.3%	6.1%	8.2%	Target						OWEB Legislatively Approved Budget and OWEB Fiscal Database.
		N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	6%	Data					
2. Percentage of funding from other sources resulting from OWEB's grant awards.	2004	N/A	N/A	200%	200%	200%	137%	180%	Target						OWEB grant applications, grantee final reports, watershed action plans, and OWEB Basin Restoration Priorities (in development through 12/2005).
		N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	200%	Data					
3. Percentage of OWEB's watershed restoration investments that address established basin and watershed restoration priorities.	2004	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Target						Internal OWEB Fiscal Department tracking system and periodic independent audits.
		N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	70%	Data					
4. Percentage of complete grant payment requests paid within 30 days.*	2004	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	100%	Target						Internal OWEB Fiscal Department tracking system and periodic independent audits.
		N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	95%	Data					
5. Trend in monitored native fish populations in key OWEB investment areas.**	2004	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	137,487	Target						Internal OWEB Fiscal Department tracking system and periodic independent audits.
		N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	200%	Data					

Oregon Watershed Enhancement Board Measure 66 Performance Measures															
Key Performance Measure	Year Measure Effective	Data										Data Source			
		1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	1999	2000	2001		2002	2003	2004
6. Trend in monitored native riparian plant communities in key OWEB investment areas.***	2004	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Target						Oregon Plan Monitoring Data, and data collected by state and federal natural resource agencies, and non-governmental partners.
		N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Data					
7. Percentage of monitored stream miles within key OWEB investment areas showing improved water quality.***	2004	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Target						Oregon Plan Monitoring Data, and data collected by state and federal water quality management agencies, and non-governmental partners.
		N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Data					
8. Extent to which watershed councils funded by OWEB accomplish its work plans each biennium.	2004	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	85%	Target						OWEB Watershed Council Support grant applications, OWEB grantees final reports, OWEB Regional Program Representative Reports, and OWEB Watershed Council Support Advisory Committee Reports.
		N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	85%	Data					
9. Percentage of reporting areas containing native fish listed under the federal or state Endangered Species Act where monitoring information about listed fish species is considered adequate to meet the goals of the Oregon Plan Monitoring Strategy.***	2004	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Target						The Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife's Natural Resources Inventory Management Program, the Oregon Plan Monitoring Strategy, Oregon Plan Monitoring Data, and analysis by the Oregon Plan Monitoring Team.
		N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	25%	Data					

Oregon Watershed Enhancement Board Measure 66 Performance Measures									
Key Performance Measure	Year Measure Effective	Data					Data Source		
		1999	2000	2001	2002	2003			
10. Percentage of Oregon species listed as threatened or endangered under the Federal Endangered Species Act that have been de-listed in the last year.	2004	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	The Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife Endangered Species Coordinators in the Wildlife Division and Fish Division; the Oregon Department of Agriculture's Native Plant Conservation Program Botanist and the Oregon Natural Heritage Program's Rare and Endangered Invertebrate Program Zoologist.		
		Target							
		2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005		
11. Percentage of species listed as threatened or endangered under the Oregon Endangered Species Act that have been de-listed in the last year.	2004	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Endangered Species Office, and National Marine Fisheries Service Office.		
		Target							
		2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005		
12. DAS Customer Service Performance Measure Placeholder.	2006	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Placeholder; data source to be determined.		
		Target							
		2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005		

* Data are from completed restoration projects only. Data are not available for 2004 because tracking began late in 2004.
 ** Combined trend data for multiple fish species are confusing and have not been done to date. Population data for coastal Coho salmon are provided here.
 *** Current databases are not in place and methods for monitoring do not allow for a depiction of percentages and trends.


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

Oregon Parks and Recreation Department Measure 66 Performance Measures												
Key Performance Measure	Year Measure Effective	Data										Data Source
		1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005				
1. Percentage of all qualified local recreation and heritage grant requests funded.	New 2005; not yet approved by JLAC	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Grants Unit and Heritage Conservation Division's records
		Target										
		2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005					
2. Average number of days between close of grant application period and grant award notification.	New 2005; not yet approved by JLAC	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Grants Unit and Heritage Conservation Division's records
		Target										
		2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005					
3. Average number of days between receipt of complete grant reimbursement request and payment.	New 2005; not yet approved by JLAC	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Grants and Accounting Unit's records
		Target										
		2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005					
4. Percentage of Oregonians who believe that Oregon is doing a "Very or Somewhat Good" job of providing parks and natural areas and preserving Oregon's heritage.	Modified by Legislature in 2005	N/A	90%	N/A	93%	N/A	91%	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Progress Board biennial survey. Note: this measure will draw data from two questions from the survey.
		Target										
		2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005					
5. Number of visitors to Oregon State Parks (millions).	2002	N/A	37.9	39.5	39.7	39.4	39.2	44.0	42.9	N/A	N/A	Car counters at day use parks and number of camping sites sold multiplied by a factor that represents the average number of visitors per car/site
		Target										
		2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005					

Oregon Parks and Recreation Department Measure 66 Performance Measures																	
Key Performance Measure	Year Measure Effective	Data										Data Source					
		1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	Target	1999	2000		2001	2002	2003	2004	2005
6. Number of properties, sites, or districts that benefit from an OPRD-managed heritage program.	New 2005	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Heritage Conservation Division records
		1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005		N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
7. Percentage of acquisition needs met.	New 2005	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005		1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	Resource Management and Planning Division records
		N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
8. Percentage of parks that have achieved designated level of service as prescribed in Interpretive Master Plan.	2002	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005		1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	Interpretive Database
		N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	20%	30%	N/A
9. Number of new beach and river access sites added to the state parks system.	2002	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005		1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	Property Database
		N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	15%	25%	N/A
10. Miles of new trail added to the state parks system.	2002	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005		1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	Property Database
		N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	3	3	4

Oregon Parks and Recreation Department Measure 66 Performance Measures																	
Key Performance Measure	Year Measure Effective	Data										Data Source					
		1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	Target	1999	2000		2001	2002	2003	2004	2005
11. Percentage of alternative camping opportunities per total campsites available.	2002	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005		1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	Facilities Database
		N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	4.4%	4.4%	N/A
12. Percentage reduction in facilities backlog since 1999 (data is biennial).	1999	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005		1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	Project and Facilities Management System
		N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	4.7%	4.9%	N/A
13. Percentage of core department functions funded by non-Lottery revenue sources.	New 2005; not yet approved by JLAC	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005		1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	Discussions ongoing; Financial Services Division records
		N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
14. Percentage of customers rating their overall satisfaction with the agency above average or excellent.	New 2005; not yet approved by JLAC	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005		1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	Survey data from Reservations Northwest
		N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
15. Number of people who obtain a reservation through the reservation center compared to the number who do not obtain a reservation.	New 2005; not yet approved by JLAC	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005		1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	Reservations Northwest records
		N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Oregon Parks and Recreation Department Measure 66 Performance Measures													
Key Performance Measure	Year Measure Effective	Data										Data Source	
		2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2000	2001	2002	2003		2004
16. Number of fee waivers, reductions or exemptions for campground usage.	New 2005; not yet approved by JLAC	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Target					Reservations Northwest records
		N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	2002	2003	2004	2005		
		N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Data					
		N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	2002	2003	2004	2005		
17. State Fair attendance.	New 2005; not yet approved by JLAC	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Target					State Fair records
		N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	2002	2003	2004	2005		
		N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Data					
		N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	2002	2003	2004	2005		
18. Percentage of people who say they will attend future fairs.	New 2005; not yet approved by JLAC	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Target					Annual State Fair survey
		N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	2002	2003	2004	2005		
		N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Data					
		N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	2002	2003	2004	2005		
19. Number of exposition center events/percentage of occupancy.	New 2005; not yet approved by JLAC	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Target					State Fair records
		N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	2002	2003	2004	2005		
		N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Data					
		N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	2002	2003	2004	2005		



**Secretary of State
Audits Division**
 255 Capital St. NE, Suite 500
 Salem, OR 97310

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

AUDIT MANAGER: *Kelly L. Olson, CPA*
 AUDIT STAFF: *Gary L. Fredricks, CPA
 Natalie D. Naas
 William Rodriguez
 Alan D. Rasmussen*
 DEPUTY DIRECTOR: *Mary E. Wenger, CPA*

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

This report, a public record, is intended to promote the best possible management of public resources. Copies may be obtained:

Internet: <http://www.sos.state.or.us/audits/index.html>
 Phone: at 503-986-2255
 Mail: Oregon Audits Division
 255 Capitol Street NE, Suite 500
 Salem, OR 97310

AGENCY TRAINING REPORT

Agency: Oregon Department of Agriculture
Contact person: Karin Nilsson, Personnel Manager
Telephone: 503-986-4617
E-mail: knilsson@oda.state.or.us

PART ONE: BENCHMARK SUMMARY REPORT

Total permanent employees: 369
Total percent receiving 20 hours
or more of education and training
for period 7/1/05 through 6/30/06: 70 percent

PART TWO: AGENCY TRAINING PLAN SUMMARY FOR THE 2005-07 BIENNIUM

The department's mission is threefold: 1) ensure food safety and provide consumer protection; 2) protect agricultural natural resources; and 3) promote economic development in the agricultural industry. To accomplish this mission ODA is dedicated to developing a technically proficient, responsive, informed workforce. The department's training goal is to provide opportunities for skill enhancement and assist in maximizing the potential for optimum productivity. By instilling confidence and competence in its workforce, ODA is better prepared to offer the best services possible.

ODA's workforce is located throughout the state and the number of employees varies greatly throughout the year due to seasonal employment. In addition, a large part of the workforce work out of their homes. These three factors create a challenge in assuring that employees receive the necessary training.

ODA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT PRIORITIES

ODA's training priorities for 2007-09 are:

- 1) Provide New Employee Orientation session for all new employees
- 2) Cultural Awareness & Diversity for all employees
- 3) Maintain technical proficiency of workforce
- 4) Supervisory/management training

- 5) Provide ongoing safety training
- 6) Information systems training
- 7) Training to improve the work environment
- 8) Career development training

GOALS FOR MEETING WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT PRIORITIES

- New Employee Orientation—All new employees receive a one hour one-to-one orientation. The session covers subjects such as benefits, department overview, ethics, safety-drug-violence, and harassment-free workplace policies, PERS and the Oregon Savings Growth Plan, etc. This will be provided by the in-house personnel staff.
- Technical Proficiency—ODA will continue to seek and encourage participation in training and other learning opportunities to maintain a high level of technical expertise. The professional technical workforce will participate in seminars, workshops and related job rotation opportunities. Divisions will provide career specific training opportunities at quarterly and semi-annual staff meetings. On-the-job training will occur in the Commodity Inspection Districts throughout the state to prepare employees for promotional opportunities. ODA will continue its policy of providing educational assistance whenever possible, to employees pursuing formal education to increase technical expertise. Educational assistance may be in the form of tuition reimbursement, and/or educational leave. The department will also consider flexible work schedules to accommodate class schedules.
- Supervisory/Management Training—All new supervisors will attend management classes provided by DAS within 1 year of appointment to management service. Non-management employees seeking supervisory training will be encouraged to attend DAS classes as well. As new training is developed, the agency will ensure that employees are provided the opportunity to attend. Supervisors are encouraged to attend training opportunities focused on team building, team management, conflict resolution, etc.
- Safety Training—ODA will provide the prescribed driver's education training and refresher courses to all employees who drive a motor

vehicle in the performance of their job. The agency will also provide necessary training to ensure the safest work environment possible. The Division Safety Committee has been active in arranging for training and mitigating risks.

- Information Systems—The ODA Information Technology Section will train employees on agency computer system and assure a standard level of skill. The MIS will also train intermediate and proficient users on program specific software. The agency will provide additional training in conjunction with changes or upgrades to computer hardware and software to allow maximum user proficiency.
- Work Environment—In conjunction with ODA’s Affirmative Action Plan, the department will provide opportunities for diversity related training. ODA is committed to offering training on the American With Disabilities Act and prevention of harassment to managers and supervisors. In addition, the department will seek to provide cultural awareness training to all employees.
- Career Development—ODA encourages employees in their career development endeavors. Consideration will be given to employee requests for educational leave and/or educational financial assistance, as well as on-the-job training and participation in special projects. The department will focus on training to develop and improve skills in problem identification, problem solving, team building and team management.
- Other—ODA will continue to meet or exceed the workforce development benchmark, that is: 1) 50 percent of permanent employees will receive at least 20 hours of training per year; 2) employee development will equal 2.5 percent or more of payroll by the end of the 05-07 biennium.

INDIVIDUAL EMPLOYEE DEVELOPMENT PLAN METHODOLOGY

Individual employee development plans are developed annually during the performance appraisal process. The supervisor and employee mutually decide what training is needed to ensure improvement of the employee’s job knowledge and skills. The employee development plan may include training related to employee’s current job or focused toward career development. The training objectives are documented on the performance evaluation form and are reviewed periodically throughout the review

period. Employee development is a performance measure for supervising managers and consequently evaluated annually on their activities in this regard. The employee development benchmark goals are reviewed and the expectation made clear to supervisors at the beginning of review periods.

AFFIRMATIVE ACTION REPORT

AFFIRMATIVE ACTION PLAN FOR BIENNIUM 2007-2009

OREGON DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

I. STATUS AND PROGRESS 05-07 BIENNIUM:

(See analysis chart as Attachment A.)

WOMEN:

Officials/Administrators: We are over parity by 5.5 women in this category. There has been an error in the AA reports we receive from DAS, where our employees at salary range 31 had been counted in the middle management rather than upper management category. That made a significant increase of 6.8 women over last biennium in this area.

PROFESSIONALS: UNDER PARITY BY 9.1

We are at or over parity in Natural Resource, Personnel, Veterinarians, Purchasing Analysts, Accounting & Revenue and Program Coordinators/Analysts. The reason for the one low category is explained below. This is an improvement of one person over last biennium.

B11—This is a new category for ODA—Inspector/Compliance. Our Measurement Standards Specialists became Compliance Specialist 2. They used to fall under C-Technicians. These inspectors work in the field and test gasoline and pumps, propane, all types of scales, etc. They must lift equipment and test weights of 50 pounds and may do that several times daily. They also work around fumes, oil, and dirt and are outside or driving the majority of the time. It is a field that is difficult to hire any experienced employees into, and there is great difficulty in hiring women in this field. In spite of that, we have over the years hired one female who since promoted to management, one female who resigned, and one who demoted from Inspector to Office Manager.

TECHNICIANS: UNDER PARITY BY .9

This is an improvement of .3 over last biennium, probably aided by the removal of the Measurement Standards Inspectors from this category.

PARAPROFESSIONALS: OVER PARITY BY 1.1

This is an improvement of .4 women over last biennium.

ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT: OVER PARITY BY 12.1

SERVICE MAINTENANCE WORKER: OVER PARITY BY 6.6

PEOPLE OF COLOR:

ODA has made progress in three categories, and had some losses in three categories. Administrators, Paraprofessionals, and Service/Maintenance workers had decreases from 2.3 down to .1 people. The biggest decrease was the loss of two people of color in the service maintenance worker category. There is more competition from private employers in Hermiston and Ontario where many of these positions are located.

The increases of 1.5 people in Professionals, 1.1 people in C-Technicians, and 1.3 people in Administrative Support were considered successes because these positions require more skills and pay more than Service Worker positions.

We are still over parity in categories F and H.

PEOPLE WITH DISABILITIES:

We had an increase of 1.2 in Administrative Support and stayed the same in Technicians. We lost 1.6 persons in the Maintenance Worker category.

The majority of our positions are located in the field and require a good deal of physical effort, which may discourage applicants. Several of our employees with disabilities have declined to be coded as such.

II. ANALYSIS

ODA has made progress in the hiring of women, people of color, and people with disabilities even though there are numerous challenges in doing so: 1) The Department of Agriculture is not a large or high profile agency, 2) Many of the professional positions are in the natural sciences where women and minorities are still not highly represented, 3) a good number of the positions are very physical in nature involving lifting up to 50 pounds and require working outdoors around gas stations and petroleum fumes, in dairies and animal feedlots, etc. 4) “agriculture” has a negative “field work” connotation to some people, 5) the Human Resources Office had only one Professional position (and one Personnel Technician) to serve an agency of over 600 employees, so outreach and relationship building among minority

groups and creating an inclusive environment have not been able to be a primary focus. It was our hope that by adding one professional staff in HR, we would be able to increase outreach activities. However, workload increases and cutting of positions has not allowed this to improve as yet. Many times the upper management pool of applicants comes from inside the agency, because of the specific agency knowledge and experience.

In spite of this rather small and homogenous pool, the department has done an excellent job of hiring and promoting women and minorities into upper management.

Only the Shipping Point Inspector group has the real potential to hire and promote people of color (we are at or above parity for women). These positions are hired from the ag workers and laborers who work in food processing sheds and plants, pulling samples of commodities for grading. Many of these people are of minority status. However, many of them are migrant workers or have few skills, and have demonstrated reluctance to taking on more challenging duties or working toward a promotion. The managers of these positions are willing and do work to help the people who show any interest or ability to be promoted.

The B11 category in this agency is made up of Measurement Standards Inspectors. Measurement Standards Inspectors work out of their homes all over the state, and must live in the area they inspect. They must routinely lift 50 lb. test weights, pump gas, test scales and do numerous physically demanding, dirty work being exposed to fumes and outside elements. It isn't a position that has been easy to fill with males, and it has been most difficult to attract and/or retain females and minorities. In spite of this, the department has had one long-term female inspector who promoted to a mid-management position in the division. The division has hired two people of color who seem to be satisfied employees and have stayed several years.

The agency has interviewed people from the HIRE Program, and we have no identified barriers to employment. A large number of our jobs are physical in nature and involve working outside; this may be a deterrent to some applicants with disabilities. We are also aware that some of our employees with disabilities do not wish to be identified as such, even though there is no detriment in doing so.

III. STRATEGIES

We have been participating with DAS and other agencies in placing large advertisements in minority publications and job fairs. We also are working with Parrish Middle School as a business partner and working to share information about the types of employment available here.

Our managers have done an excellent job of recruiting for and hiring people of color. They have actually done better than the statistics show, because unfortunately at least one person in the professional category did not complete trial service.

We conducted a diversity awareness training session for the entire agency, and have obtained DVDs for future training sessions. We will be able to send these out to staff who were unable to attend the all staff meeting.

The ODA Director is supportive of affirmative action and diversity awareness and encourages managers to hire and create working environments that welcome diversity.

SPECIAL REPORTS

ATTACHMENT A

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
AA SUMMARY 05-07 BIENNIUM

CURRENT STATUS

EEO	Women	People of Color	Disabled
A.	Over parity by 5.5	Under parity by 6.9	Under parity by 3.1
B.	Under parity by 9.1	Under parity by 2.5	Under parity by 9.0
C.	Under parity by .9	Under parity by 5.6	Under parity by 4.7
E.	Over parity by 1.1	Under parity by .4	Under parity by .3
F.	Over parity by 12.1	Over parity by 1.8	Over parity by .4
H.	Over parity by 6.6	Under parity by 2.1	Under parity by 3.7

PREVIOUS BIENNIUM STATUS

EEO	Women	People of Color	Disabled
A.	Under parity by 1.3	Under parity by 5.4	Under parity by 2.5
B.	Under parity by 10.1	Under parity by 4.0	Under parity by 8.4
C.	Under parity by 1.2	Under parity by 6.7	Under parity by 4.7
E.	Over parity by .7	Under parity by .3	Under parity by .2
F.	Over parity by 13	Over parity by .5	Under parity by .8
H.	Over parity by .8	Over parity by .2	Under parity by 2.1

MOVEMENT FROM LAST BIENNIUM TO CURRENT BIENNIUM

EEO	Women	People of Color	Disabled
A.	Up by 6.8	Down by 1.5	Down by .6
B.	Up by 1	Up by 1.5	Down by .6
C.	Up by .3	Up by 1.1	Same
E.	Up by .4	Down by .1	Down by .1
F.	Down by .9	Up by 1.3	Up by 1.2
H.	Up by 5.8	Down by 2.3	Down by 1.6

⤿ This page intentionally blank. ⤿