



MEMORANDUM

TO: Water Resources Commission

FROM: Racquel Rancier, Senior Policy Coordinator

SUBJECT: Agenda Item H, December 7, 2017
Water Resources Commission Meeting

Updating the Department's Key Performance Measures

I. Introduction

In January 2017, staff reported to the Commission that most of the Department's Key Performance Measures (KPMs) have been in place since 2005 and the Department intended to begin a review of the KPMs. Staff will provide an update on the review process and request feedback from the Commission.

II. Background

KPMs are reviewed by the Legislature during the budget presentation process and they are ultimately set and approved by the Subcommittee when the Department's budget is reported out. Each year, the Department compiles and submits a report on 14 KPMs. The Department's 2017 Key Performance Measure Report is available online at: http://www.oregon.gov/owrd/pages/law/performance.aspx#Performance_Measures

The Department may propose new KPMs or revisions to existing KPMs to the Oregon Legislature. The Department may also request changes to the targets for existing KPMs. While timelines have not yet been set, proposals for changes to KPMs are usually due in April of even-numbered years, and are then discussed by the Legislature during the long-session in odd-numbered years. As a result, changes proposed by the Department in April 2018 will be considered by the Legislature during the 2019 Legislative Session.

III. Review of Feedback to Date

External Stakeholder Survey: In late August, the Department sent out a survey to various stakeholder groups, requesting feedback related to which KPMs are useful, which need to be modified, if any should be deleted, and if any new KPM's should be proposed. Specifically, the survey asked the following questions:

1. Which KPMs do you think are useful? Why?
2. Are there any KPMs you would recommend the Department keep but modify? How and why would you modify the KPM?

3. Are there any KPMs that you think are uninformative, unimportant, or confusing? Would you recommend removing those KPMs? Please explain why.
4. Are there other data or issues that you would like to see measured as a KPM? What is missing? What new KPMs would you propose?

Stakeholders were given two months to provide feedback. Responses were received from representatives of WaterWatch of Oregon (WW), the League of Conservation Voters (LCV), Oregon Farm Bureau (OFB), Oregon Association of Nurseries (OAN), Oregon Environmental Council (OEC), and Trout Unlimited (TU). Summaries of results are included in Attachment 1.

Staff Discussions: In October, the Director's office began meeting with Sections or Divisions to solicit feedback on KPMs from staff across the agency. Meetings with staff are still underway; however, feedback to date has been incorporated into the section on the Department's Preliminary Assessment in Attachment 1. Staff were asked:

1. If there is an existing KPM for the Section/Division: Do you think this [KPM] is a useful metric to track the Department's activities in this section? Based on what you know, is there anything you would modify about this KPM?
2. Consider your work and the work of others within the section/division. What activities or metrics do you think would be useful to track and communicate the Department's work? Are these metrics already tracked or would a new database/method of tracking need to be developed?

IV. Commission Feedback

During the meeting, staff will seek feedback from the Commission on the KPMs. Commissioners should consider the questions asked of staff and external stakeholders, as well as the feedback received. Specifically, staff will ask the Commission the following:

1. Are there any adjustments to existing KPMs that you would like us to consider (modifications or deletions)?
2. Are there other metrics that you think it is important for the Department to track?

V. Conclusion

Over the next few months, staff will continue to evaluate the KPMs and develop recommendations to be submitted to the Legislative Fiscal Office in April. The Department anticipates that KPM revisions will be an iterative process. Most changes will be proposed after completion of the Strategic Planning efforts and undertaking other actions, such as creating or updating databases needed to track the potential new measures.

Attachment 1: KPM Feedback and Initial Assessment

Summary of Feedback and Initial Assessment of Oregon Water Resource Department's Key Performance Measures

I. Feedback on Existing Key Performance Measures (KPMs)

KPM 1: Percent of watersheds that need flow restoration for fish that had a significant quantity of water put instream through WRD administered programs.

Stakeholder Feedback:

- OEC: This KPM is useful. Targets should be increased and reflect ODFW restoration priorities.
- OFB: Generally, I think that KPMs 1 and 2 are not appropriate KPMs for OWRD. Flow restoration and pursuing instream water rights should be with those agencies that pursue instream water rights. For example, ODFW has staff engaged to conduct studies, pursue instream water rights, and work with landowners on creative arrangements to restore flow. While OWRD manages those water rights and the voluntary programs, OWRD should maintain a relatively neutral role in those processes – to the extent that they become the primary advocate for instream water rights, it shifts the mission of the agency and makes it difficult for water users to trust them as a neutral water rights administrator.
- LWVOR: The target needs to be raised to continue to assure fish have the water they need to survive. Although about half of the current success has depended on the voluntary actions of water rights holders, another half has been due to direct work of the Dept. Are there additional policies needed to increase success by more than 2% per year? Increase target to 34%. Targets should require the Dept. to stretch, not to be complacent.
- TU: This KPM helps prioritize and provide important context to streamflow restoration efforts throughout the State. It is critical that these actions continue to receive attention and discussion before the Legislature and in other forums. We appreciate that the target has been increased for the 2018 and 2019 years but recommend that OWRD and ODFW confer on appropriate target levels.
- WW: This KPM is useful because this KPM keeps this goal before the agency and Legislature. That said, we believe targets should be increased, as it appears this KPM is still using the 2002 target. WRD should confer with ODFW on targets. Flow targets should also somehow marry with ODFW's stream restoration priorities.

Department Preliminary Assessment: Further evaluation is needed.

KPM 2: Protection of instream rights – ratio of streams regulated to protect instream water rights to all streams regulated.

Stakeholder Feedback:

- WW: This KPM is useful because this KPM should be a top priority of the agency. That said, we would suggest conferring with ODFW on the metric. This does not reflect the number of instream water rights that are met annually, simply those that the WRD regulated for. Both numbers are important. Moreover, it should be clarified to field staff that regulation should be tied to the flow numbers in the certificate, not an "average" over the day (as we are seeing in Tumalo, for instance).
- OFB: Generally, I think that KPMs 1 and 2 are not appropriate KPMs for OWRD. Flow restoration and pursuing instream water rights should be with those agencies that pursue instream water rights. For example, ODFW has staff engaged to conduct studies, pursue instream water rights, and work with landowners on creative arrangements to restore flow. While OWRD manages those water rights and the voluntary programs, OWRD should maintain a relatively neutral role in those processes – to the extent that they become the primary advocate for instream water rights, it shifts the mission of the agency and makes it difficult for water users to trust them as a neutral water rights administrator.

- TU: Protection and enforcement of instream water rights is extremely important and this should be a priority action for OWRD. This KPM informs this point however additional metrics would be helpful: Modify to demonstrate level of instream rights protected annually in addition to those that were regulated by OWRD.
- OEC: This KPM is useful.
- LWVOR: The League would support the suggested staff change of number of streams regulated divided by total. This statistic might also get at the number of staff and equipment needed to fairly regulate and protect instream water rights—directly connecting the KPM with the budget.

Department Preliminary Assessment: The method for calculating the results and the corresponding target need to be revised, or this KPM needs to be removed or replaced. Under the current method of calculating this KPM, the number of regulations for instream water rights by category of regulation is divided by the number of total streams regulated. This calculation is not meaningful because it is not comparing the same items, leading the results to be higher than if the number of streams regulated for instream rights were compared to the number of streams regulated in total. At a minimum, a new calculation method for this KPM needs to be proposed. Modifications to the calculation method may not require Legislative approval; however, changes to the targets will require approval. Two options for modifying or replacing this KPM are discussed below. The Department has not yet determined which is the best approach and is seeking feedback on this KPM.

- Option 1. Modify the targets and calculation. The number of streams regulated for instream water rights would be divided by the total number of streams regulated. The KPM would not change, just the calculation method and targets. The new approach would mean that while the trends stay the same (increasing regulation for instream water rights, with annual fluctuations based on the water year), the actual percent will be reduced. However, the Department, to some extent, cannot control the outcome of this measure, as it depends on water conditions.
- Option 2. Change the target to the number of streams monitored for instream water right flows. This would tell us how well we are doing on monitoring instream water rights. It would be difficult to increase this target consistently year over year without additional staff (see internal feedback on KPM #4).

KPM 3: Monitor Compliance: Percent of total regulatory actions that found water right holders in compliance with water rights and regulations.

Stakeholder Feedback:

- OEC: This KPM is useful; however, calculations should be revised to reflect statewide compliance with all water right conditions, not just regulated rights. The current measure is important but tells a very incomplete and misleading story.
- LWVOR: Comments in the KPM Report to the Legislature implies that WRD has enough staff to do its job since the target reached is 99%. However, the “this metric does not necessarily reflect compliance with water right conditions.....” If this measurement is meant to reflect how well WRD is doing related to true compliance, then some change in how to truly measure compliance needs to be found: How often staff interacts with all water rights holders and how often staff can observe areas where water might be used—legally or illegally. Reporting the number of miles each staff travels, how many educational presentations made..... Compliance is critical to good management. But implying that we have a 99% compliance rate is not helpful if it is not really true.
- OFB: I think the most useful KPMs are those directly related to OWRD’s core mission of water resources management. That includes KPMs 3-5 and 8-13.
- WW: This KPM is useful because the concept is critical to proper water management. That said, this metric is very misleading. As we saw in the 2016 legislature, many stakeholders mistook results to mean that 98% of all permit holders are in compliance with their permit conditions. This is incorrect (see WRD memo to Helm workgroup). The metric should be reworked to actually determine compliance to water right permit conditions, including rate/duty, measurement and reporting, fish passage/screening, etc.

- TU: Information regarding compliance with water rights provides important context that helps facilitates an understanding of actual water use, the effectiveness of Oregon’s water rights laws and appropriate allocation of budgetary resources. However this KPM may be more useful with additional metrics: Provide information on total number of water rights in compliance relative to total water rights. At present, this metric only provides information on water rights in compliance relative to those that were the subject of regulatory actions by OWRD which was confusing to Legislators and others this past legislative session. Additionally, provide information on compliance of water right holders on key terms of water right permits (rate/duty, etc.).

Department Preliminary Assessment: Interpreting this KPM is a challenge. The definition of regulatory action is convoluted and subject to misinterpretation. This KPM does not include actions related to groundwater. In addition, it does not reflect compliance with water right conditions. Staff are currently discussing a revamp of the field regulation database, so there is an opportunity to track information that is more meaningful and will allow the Department to better understand regulation activities. The goal is to have a database that watermasters find easy to use, and may increase efficiency. The Department anticipates that this may lead to a proposed change in this KPM in the future, once the Department determines what is feasible to track without increasing watermaster workloads. In addition, the Strategic Planning process and review of watermaster workloads may also result in a better understanding of potential metrics to track.

KPM 4: Stream flow gaging: Percent change from 2001 in the number of WRD operated or assisted gauging stations.

Stakeholder Feedback:

- LWVOR: Again, the target is not aspirational, but simply a means to accept that we are unable to provide funding or require water rights holders to provide gages. As mentioned in the KPM Report, data alone is useless without using the data to analyze for outcomes. If this KPM does not also recognize need for analysis, then we need another KPM to tell that story.
- WW: Streamflow gauging---because stream gauging is critical to proper water management, especially with regards to instream water rights. We would suggest increasing the target; at the very least incorporating the 70 locations noted in the WRD Audit. Having a more robust target would be helpful for budget efforts, for both gauging stations and hydrotech staff.
- OFB: I think the most useful KPMs are those directly related to OWRD’s core mission of water resources management. That includes KPMs 3-5 and 8-13.
- TU: Stream gauging helps provide information critical to effective water management. However, we recommend modifications to this KPM to increase the target. We appreciate the target has been increased for the 2018 and 2019 years; however, given the importance of gauging to water rights administration we recommend that it increase at a steeper rate.as noted below.
- OEC: This KPM is useful.

Department Preliminary Assessment: Increasing gaging stations without increasing the corresponding staff to maintain the stations and process the data is unsustainable. The Department is beginning to fall behind on processing gaging station data. Further discussions are needed; in the meantime, it does provide some meaningful information regarding the Department’s stream gaging activities.

KPM 5: Assessing ground water resources – percent change from 2001 in the number of wells routinely monitored to assess ground water resources

Stakeholder Feedback:

- TU: Information regarding groundwater use is critical to effective water management and therefore it is important to have an understanding of OWRD’s progress acquiring this information and where data gaps remain. However, we recommend modifications to this KPM: Increase the target generally and include a target for assessing groundwater resources in critical basins/areas. Especially in critical basins, information on groundwater use in extremely important toward ensuring sustainable management and protecting surface flows and groundwater dependent ecosystems.

- OEC: KPM is useful. Targets should be increased to help ramp up data collection to incorporate into future groundwater assessments and to provide information in priority areas where groundwater assessments will not be completed for some time.
- LWVOR: Again, the target doesn't reflect the need for this information in order for WRD to process water rights permits. This KPM indicated that we are doing well at assessing groundwater, when we know that is not the case. If we continue to lose private wells' data, then the target should reflect the need to again stretch to obtain the data.
- OFB: I think the most useful KPMs are those directly related to OWRD's core mission of water resources management. That includes KPMs 3-5 and 8-13.
- WW: KPM is useful because observation wells provide critical data to the WRD. Highlighting this work in a KPM is also important for budgetary purposes. This data also feeds into GW investigations. We would suggest increasing the target, at least to those needed in priority areas. WRD might also consider expanding this so that the metric captures other data gaps---groundwater measurement and reporting generally, groundwater investigations, etc.

Department Preliminary Assessment: This KPM only measures what is in the state observation well network, not all of the agency's wells that are monitored. In addition, it does not reflect whether all measurements were done as scheduled. Further discussions are needed to determine if modifications are required. In the meantime, it does provide some meaningful information regarding the Department's observation well network.

KPM 6: Equip citizens with information – Percent of water management related datasets collected by WRD that are available to the public on the internet.

Stakeholder Feedback:

- LWVOR: If the datasets being measured under this KPM have been met AND we know that we do not have all the data needed to manage Oregon's water, then determining what new datasets should be made available should be a part of this discussion. One question that should be asked when considering a change in this KPM is not only what data should the public have, but what data is needed by other agencies so they can manage/regulate Oregon's water under their purview. Is the need for more technology or more staff?
- OFB: For KPMs 6-7, I would like to see the focus be less on public accessibility of data from the internet, and more on ensuring that the public has access to accurate and reliable information on the state of water resources.
- WW: KPM is useful because public access to agency data is very important across spectrums. That said, it is unclear which datasets are part of the KPM goal vs. datasets that WRD has determined are not part of the goal.

Department Preliminary Assessment: This KPM does not address the needs of staff internally for database functions. The initial set of datasets to be made available is nearly complete. Therefore, this KPM needs to either be deleted or a new KPM target needs to be identified with the inclusion of new datasets, which will result in a target reduction. Staff have begun discussing other metrics that may be more meaningful, but further work is needed.

KPM 7: Equip Citizens with information – Number of times water management related data was accessed through website.

Stakeholder Feedback:

- WW: It is unclear what purpose #14 (customer service) and # 7 (number of times water management data was accessed through the internet) serve.
- OFB: For KPMs 6-7, I would like to see the focus be less on public accessibility of data from the internet, and more on ensuring that the public has access to accurate and reliable information on the state of water resources.

- LWVOR: This KPM relates to website friendliness and ability of citizens to find the information they need. One of the questions should be around what citizens are aware is on the website as well as why or how they would use the information. It seems that DAS' IT unit might be able to help in this discussion. Of greater importance to the League is how accessible/interactive is this data with the needs of other agencies.

Department Preliminary Assessment: This KPM monitors a static number of web applications; new applications are not included in the calculations. The Department is currently updating its website; the Department will be able to better assess potential KPM modifications after the transition to the new web platform.

KPM 8: Number of significant diversions with measuring device installed.

Stakeholder Feedback:

- All respondents said this KPM is useful.
- OEC: This KPM is useful. Targets should be increased to fully implement the 2000 Water Measurement Strategy.
- LWVOR: This KPM seems to fairly reflect the need for field staff AND increased pressure needed on "significant" water rights holders to install measuring devices. We can hope that new technology will decrease the costs while holders increase in their commitments. If that doesn't happen, then this KPM should help in advocating for policy changes to address this KPM.
- WW: This KPM is useful because this is critical to ensuring forward progress on measurement of water use, which is critical to responsible water management. That said, this KPM should be amended so that the WRC strategy is fully implemented in the near term (in other words, increase the target accordingly). It has been 17 years since the WRC adopted the strategy, and implementation has been exceedingly slow. Additionally, reporting should indicate how many of the measurement devices were required under permits/certificates.
- OFB: I think the most useful KPMs are those directly related to OWRD's core mission of water resources management. That includes KPMs 3-5 and 8-13.
- TU: Information regarding surface water use is critical to effective water management. This KPM will help ensure continued progress toward meeting the goals of the Measurement Strategy. However, we recommend modifications to this KPM to include a near-term time-frame target to complete implementation of Measurement Strategy.

Department Preliminary Assessment: This does not measure all devices watermasters have worked to have installed, because it only focuses on the surface water significant points of diversion initially prioritized in the 2001 Strategic Measurement Plan. The KPM fails to capture all of the watermaster's efforts on measurement; thereby, not reflecting the true workloads or progress. In addition, current targets do not take into account the limits on staff resources. In some cases, devices may no longer be functioning, which is not reflected in this KPM. The Department is currently conducting a review of its water use measurement and water use reporting efforts; these efforts may result in a need to request a change in the KPM in the future. Changes may require a new database or an update to the existing database.

KPM 9: Promote efficiency in WMCP reviews

Stakeholder Feedback:

- LWVOR: Promote Efficiency in WMCP Reviews: This KMP needs to be kept as a reminder that Plans need to be reviewed and WRD staff is needed for such review. Also, we are hopeful that more Plans will be submitted to WRD. What this KPM does not reflect is whether the Plan submitted is deficient and if WRD staff needs to interact with the submitter to address that deficiency. We realize that the KPM is related to WRD's actions, but the need to have Plans that meet the goals of doing these Plans should also be the responsibility of WRD. And, if appropriate, additional plans should be submitted by large water users of all types.
- OFB: I think the most useful KPMs are those directly related to OWRD's core mission of water resources management. That includes KPMs 3-5 and 8-13.

Department Preliminary Assessment: This KPM seems to provide meaningful information about performance in the review of Water Management and Conservation Plan reviews. The Strategic Planning process may highlight opportunities to track a different metric; however, the Department does not anticipate a need to request a change for the 2019 session.

KPM 10: Promote efficiency in water right application processing.

Stakeholder Feedback:

- OFB: I think the most useful KPMs are those directly related to OWRD’s core mission of water resources management. That includes KPMs 3-5 and 8-13.
- WW: As I recall, KMP #10 and #11 (application and transfer processing) were intended to help resolve the large application/transfer backlogs of the mid/late 1990s. It is unclear if these KPMs are still useful.
- LWVOR: Promote Efficiency in Water Right Application Processing: The ability of WRD to process groundwater applications “in a timely manner” is directly related to the lack of data in the groundwater program. (Should this KPM be divided between surface water and groundwater applications?) In presenting this KPM to legislators, that fact should be made clear. Linking KPMs among agency programs should be used to tell the agency’s story. WRD comments surrounding staff turnover and retirements should raise a red flag to legislators—especially since agencies have been encouraged to hold vacancies open in order to affect savings. We are also aware of the number of public employees able to retire now and in the next ten years. That stat is alarming for all public agencies. Should PERS “reform” continue to be a conversation, then agencies will need to be prepared for eligible staff to retire. Some of the potential employee salary and benefit changes may also hamper hiring new competent staff, especially in high specialty areas. If not a KPM, then an agency report of this issue to legislators and LFO is appropriate.

Department Preliminary Assessment: Currently, the target is higher than the target for transfers, while reviews are becoming more complex, in part because of increased limits on water availability and more innovative and complex water proposals. The Department is considering whether to request a reduction in the proposed target to at least align with the transfers target at 30 percent, or, given the more detailed review associated with new permits, 20 percent. This KPM provides some meaningful information about performance in the review of new water right applications; however, it also highlights the continued challenge of assessing groundwater rights in such a short timeframe. The Department anticipates a need to request a change in the target for the 2019 session. The Strategic Planning process and Groundwater Workplan may highlight a need for a different metric in the future.

KPM 11: Promote efficiency in transfer application processing.

Stakeholder Feedback:

- OFB: I think the most useful KPMs are those directly related to OWRD’s core mission of water resources management. That includes KPMs 3-5 and 8-13.
- WW: As I recall, KMP #10 and #11 (application and transfer processing) were intended to help resolve the large application/transfer backlogs of the mid/late 1990s. It is unclear if these KPMs are still useful.
- LWVOR: Obviously the target should be increased since the agency has met the target more often than not. It should be recognized that WRD assessed the problems with this issue and found ways to increase the quality of the applications received. That should be one of the outcomes of these KPMs.

Department Preliminary Assessment: This KPM seems to provide meaningful information about performance in the transfers section; however, it does not necessarily convey the workload demands on reviewers such as the groundwater section, or ODFW. The Department does not anticipate a need to request a change in the target or methodology for the 2019 session. The Strategic Planning process may highlight opportunities to track a different metric.

KPM 12: Promote efficiency in field staff regulatory activities: POD per field staff.

Stakeholder Feedback:

- OFB: I think the most useful KPMs are those directly related to OWRD’s core mission of water resources management. That includes KPMs 3-5 and 8-13. KPM #12 (promote efficiency in field staff regulatory activities) is a little confusing in its presentation. We agree that it would be helpful to have a metric to help highlight the fact that the state is dedicating far too few dollars to field staff, but #12 does not clearly achieve that. Moreover, field staff activity is not limited to determining the “number of places where water is legally taken out of stream and used.”
- LWVOR: The explanation of this KPM doesn’t seem to connect with efficiency, but with simply the number of diversions vs. number of staff. How is it efficient to reduce diversions when the need is for MORE data, not less? With new water rights being approved, it would seem that a better number would be the number of staff per diversions—or a ratio of staff per regulated water right.

Department Preliminary Assessment: The Department is currently conducting a review of watermaster workloads, and revamping our database that is used to develop data for our annual field activities report. This KPM is effective at communicating the large number of points of diversion per field staff; however, these numbers are beyond the Department’s control and only reflect a portion of the Field staffs’ workloads. The Strategic Planning process may also highlight opportunities to track a different metric. Due to the efforts underway and the Strategic Planning process, the Department does not anticipate requesting a change in the target or methodology for the 2019 session.

KPM 13: Water use reporting.

Stakeholder Feedback:

- All respondents said KPM is useful.
- LWVOR: This KPM is ONLY successful because of the staff assigned. So long as this staff is needed to address this issue, this KPM should be kept and the target should increase.
- TU: The reporting of water use information provides important information that is critical to effective water management. This KPM helps ensure continued progress on this point by demonstrating the level of compliance with existing reporting requirements.
- OEC: Targets should be increased to step up collection of critical data and encourage compliance
- OFB: I think the most useful KPMs are those directly related to OWRD’s core mission of water resources management. That includes KPMs 3-5 and 8-13.
- WW: KPM is useful because this is required for governmental bodies by law and without this KPM it is unclear what level of compliance would be achieved. Moreover, this KPM is very useful for budgeting purposes, especially in that it serves to educate the legislature how much compliance suffers when the reporting position at WRD is cut. This KPM is important to ongoing efforts to ensure water user accountability. It is unclear if this data set includes those who have a water right reporting condition that is separate from statutory requirements (i.e. non-governmental entities).

Department Preliminary Assessment: The Department is currently conducting a review of its water use measurement and water use reporting efforts; these efforts may result in a need to request a change in the KPM in the future. For example, the current KPM monitors how many entities have submitted at least one of their required reports; however, it does not identify whether an entity has submitted reports for all water rights it is required to report on. This is in part because water use information is reported based on the point of diversion, not on the water right.

KPM 14: Customer service

Stakeholder Feedback:

- WW: It is unclear what purpose #14 (customer service) and # 7 (number of times water management data was accessed through the internet) serve.
- LWVOR: Customer Service: Staff has suggested more immediate feedback after WRD actions. This KPM is the same for many agencies so replacing the current survey with a different measurement mechanism

would need to be cleared with LFO. However, the staff makes a good argument that it would be more helpful to the agency to get feedback from individual actions as then problems could more clearly be addressed. A problem that might arise with this approach is the customer not feeling comfortable answering to the agency immediately after an action since many customers interact with the agency multiple times and might be concerned that their honest assessment might lead to retaliation. The narrative regarding how the agency might increase positive feedback should be considered during this review.

Department Preliminary Assessment: Currently, the survey is conducted only once every two years; respondents often do not remember the service, or contact information has changed. Surveys are also flagged as spam in email folders. The survey does not help the Department understand customer service outside of final orders on water rights transactions. As previously discussed, the Department will look at other options for conducting the survey in the future to improve response rates and obtain feedback more timely. The Department may also look at broadening the survey to include other services outside of final orders on water right transactions. While this will result in a change to the methodology for conducting the survey, the Department has to prioritize this within the context of other agency workloads and priorities. A change in the methodology might not require Joint Ways and Means approval.

II. Feedback on Adding New KPMs

Stakeholder Feedback:

- OFB: I do not see any KPMs related to OWRD's granting programs or supporting infrastructure investment and storage develop as a way to build system resiliency and help prepare for changing climate conditions. I would like to see OWRD have a KPM around efficient administration of the grant programs and success of the grant programs in terms of actual projects on the ground.
- TU: (1) Recommend adding a KPM that sets a target to "synthesize or assess" data that has been acquired. This could either be a percentage of total data or a timeframe (assess data within X months of its acquisition). (2) All "assessed" data should be available to the public within a certain timeframe. (3) As noted above, add a KPM that sets a target to achieve monitoring of a certain percentage of GW basins in "critical" groundwater basins/areas. This should also include timeframes.
- WW: (1) Resolution of pending instream water right protests. As WRD knows, upwards of 60 instream water right applications were protested over twenty years ago. The state needs to resolve these. (2) Number of river basins that have completed groundwater investigations (or some other metric that captures groundwater data gaps, assessment of the information, public distribution, etc.). (3) Well construction compliance (new, existing and abandoned)
- LWVOR: In that area, it would be helpful to know what measurements staff might find helpful in assuring that the IWRS is implemented. We know that a lack of data is critical to implementation. And there are one-time actions such as updating agency cooperative agreements. Are there measurements related to addressing drought? One might be a measurement related to the new Dam Safety bill. There is no measurement around the grant and loan programs—not their processing, but the actual success of the project (in that the project funded met its goals). It would be helpful to legislators to know whether or not the money provided met an outcome.
- OAN: We want to see some performance measures for the 839 grants and loans.

Department Preliminary Assessment: The Department appreciates the feedback on potential new KPMs and is considering next steps as well as reviewing and developing internal recommendations. Staff have noted that no KPMs address well construction, dam safety, or the water resources development program. The Department will consider this feedback as it goes through the Strategic Planning process and determines next steps for potential future KPMs.