Teleconference Public Meeting Agenda

This public meeting will be conducted as a virtual meeting. Written testimony can be submitted in advance, but no later than 11:25 a.m. on the meeting day to lori.calarruda@dogami.oregon.gov. Written comments received will be distributed to the Board.

Dial: 1-253-215-8782
When prompted, enter ID number: 895 7147 1404
If prompted for a Password: 665599

8:30 a.m.  Item 1:  Call to Order – Chair Scott Ashford
8:35 a.m.  Item 2:  Introductions – Chair Scott Ashford and Staff
8:40 a.m.  Item 3:  Review Minutes of December 1, 2022 Board Meeting
Board Action: The Board will be asked to take an action on this item
8:45 a.m.  Item 4:  Financial Report – Steve Dahlberg, Chief Financial Officer
Board Action: The Board will be asked to take an action on this item
9:05 a.m.  Item 5:  Governor’s Recommended Budget (GRB) – Ruarri Day-Stirrat, Director
Board Action: The Board will not be asked to take an action on this item
9:25 a.m.  Item 6:  Legislative Update – Christina Appleby, Legislative Coordinator
Board Action: The Board will not be asked to take an action on this item
9:35 a.m.  Break
9:50 a.m.  Item 7:  A Brief History of Nearly Everything About the DOGAMI Coastal Program – Jonathan Allan, Coastal Geomorphologist
Briefing: The Board will not be asked to take an action on this item
10:30 a.m.  Break
10:40 a.m.  Item 8:  MLRR Update – Sarah Lewis, MLRR Program Manager
Briefing: The Board will not be asked to take an action on this item
10:55 a.m.  Item 9:  GS&S Update – Jason McCLAughry, Interim GS&S Program Manager
Briefing: The Board will not be asked to take an action on this item
11:05 a.m.  Item 10:  Director’s Report – Ruarri Day-Stirrat, Director
Briefing: The Board will not be asked to take an action on this item
11:15 a.m.  Item 11:  Public Comment
Only written comments received prior to or by 11:25 a.m. on the day of the meeting will be accepted
11:25 a.m.  Item 12:  Board Adjourn
PLEASE NOTE

AGENDA
The public portion of the Board meeting will begin at 8:30 a.m. and proceed chronologically through the agenda. Times listed on the agenda are approximate. At the discretion of the Chair, the time and order of agenda items—including addition of intermittent breaks—may change to maintain meeting flow.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY
Only written comments will be accepted.

REASONABLE ACCOMMODATION OF DISABILITIES
Please contact us at least three business days prior to the meeting to let us know if you need reasonable accommodations. Contact the Director’s Office at (971) 673-1555 to make your request.
Regarding: Agenda Item 3 – Review Minutes of December 1, 2022 Board Meetings

Proposed Board Action: The Board Minutes of December 1, 2022 Board meeting be Approved/Approved as Amended/Not Approved.
1) **Call to Order:** (Scott Ashford, Board Chair)

Chair Scott Ashford called the meeting to order at 8:32 a.m.

2) **Introductions:** (Scott Ashford, Board Chair, and Staff)

Chair Scott Ashford, Vice-Chair Linda Kozlowski, Board Members Anne MacDonald, and Erica Medley, were all in attendance via Zoom video/phone. Board Member Diane Teeman was not in attendance.

Department of Geology and Mineral Industries (DOGAMI) Staff in attendance:
- Ruarri Day-Stirrat – Director/State Geologist
- Sarah Lewis, MLRR Program Manager
- Lori Calarruda, Recording Secretary/Executive Assistant
- Alex Lopez, Public Affairs Coordinator
- Steve Dahlberg, Chief Financial Officer (CFO)
- Jason Mc Claughry, Interim GS&S Program Manager
- Bill Burns, Engineering Geologist
- Laura Gabel, Coastal Field Geologist
- Christina Appleby, Legislative Coordinator/Geohazards Analyst

Others in attendance:
- Diane Lloyd, Department of Justice (DOJ)
- April McDonald, Legislative Fiscal Office (LFO)
- Sione Filimoehala, DAS Office of the Chief Financial Officer
- Annette Nelson – OSU Student

Chair Ashford announced he would be leaving the meeting at the first break and that Vice-Chair Kozlowski would take over chairing the meeting.

3) **Introduction of New Board Members:**

Chair Ashford/Director Day-Stirrat welcomed new Board Members Anne MacDonald and Erica Medley. They introduced themselves at the previous meeting.

4) **Review Minutes of September 27, 2022 Board Meeting:**

Chair Ashford asked if there were any changes to the minutes as presented. No changes.

Board Action: **Kozlowski moved to approve the minutes of September 27, 2022 as submitted.**

**MacDonald seconded. Motion carried.**
5) **Confirm 2023 Board Meeting Dates:**

The Board discussed the Proposed 2023 Board Meeting Dates.

The 2023 DOGAMI Board Meeting dates are:

- **March 6, 2022** (Monday)
- **June 26, 2022** (Monday)
- **September 25, 2022** (Monday)
- **December 11, 2022** (Monday)

Board Action: *Kozlowski moved to approve the proposed Board Meeting dates as discussed.*

*MacDonald seconded.* Motion carried.

6) **Financial Report:**

Steve Dahlberg, Chief Financial Officer, presented the DOGAMI FY2023 Budget Status Report, as of September 30, 2022, for the Geological Survey and Services (GS&S) and Mineral Land Regulation & Reclamation (MLRR) programs.

Dahlberg stated the financial actuals, projections, and graphs are in the Board Packet, and his presentation is to provide a brief summary of the financials ending September 2022. For GS&S, General Fund has a $6.4M budget, with expected Expenditures of $5.5M, resulting in being $.945M under budget (14.7%). This allows the Agency to invest in future geologic and scientific research.

Other Funds has an Expenditure Limitation Authority budget of just under $2.5M, with expected Expenditures of $1.0M, resulting in being nearly $1.5M under the authorized budget (59.1%). The Revenues of $930,000, comes from Grants: $507,000 (54.5), Lidar $277,000 (29.8%), and Strong Motion Instrument Fund (SMIF) $146,000 (15.7%). There are potential new grant proposals from Oregon State Parks and Regional Disaster Preparedness Organization (RDPO), and a large Lidar project from Department of Forestry, that will change the projections.

Federal Funds has an Expenditure Limitation Authority budget of just under $5.8M Budget, with expected Expenditures of $5.2M, resulting in being nearly $0.6M under the authorized budget (10.3%). The Revenues of $5.2M, comes from Grants: $2.3M (44.2%), Lidar almost $2.9M (55.8%). Lidar is the largest bulk of DOGAMI’s work, but the Agency continues to work with federal funders for future projects. Dahlberg stated the Agency has made a conscious effort to shift towards large federal grants, away from many small ones.

MLRR has an Expenditure Limitation Authority budget of $4.3M, with expected Expenditures of $4.1M, resulting in $0.23M under budget (5.4%). The Revenues of $4.9M comes from fees and DEQ Water Quality permits.

Kozlowski asked Dahlberg about the Agency being $1.5M under budget and if it received more grants than expected. Dahlberg explained Other Funds are driven by grants from other State agencies or
private partners. This year had a little slow down but anticipates the 2023-25 biennium to be stronger.

Chair Ashford asked for clarification of Other Funds. Dahlberg explained the Other Funds budget is actually an Expenditure Authority and the limitation amount the Agency can spend up to; they are also reimbursement type funds, where the Agency must spend money for staff and other resources to receive them. Ashford stated he is understanding being underbudget to mean that is not necessarily the amount the Agency will spend. Dahlberg answered that is correct and explained that compared to General Fund, where the Agency is provided a budget it can spend up to but not go over, for Other Funds and Federal Funds it is given an authority to spend, but if there are no grants there is no money to spend.

For updates and highlights, Dahlberg said DOGAMI submitted two large USGS 3DEP Lidar proposals: Willamette Valley for 8,169 sq miles, about $4.1M, and Deschutes County for 5,810 sq miles, about $2.8M. The Agency successfully collaborated with Oregon Department of Forestry for an almost $2.2M Lidar project to cover 4,629 sq miles, that is driven by the Private Forest Accord. The Agency will need to request an Other Funds Expenditure Limitations Authority Budget increase for about $730,000 in early 2023. Dahlberg said the Agency received a Gold Star Certificate from DAS CFO for excellent financial work in fiscal year 2021, he recognized the Business Office team for their good work this last year.

Dahlberg said regarding the status of the 2023-25 Budget process, the Agency had a meeting with the current Governor’s Office for initial processing of POPs and CFO Analyst recommendations. DOGAMI is waiting for the transition of the Governor’s Office and staff and expect the Governor’s Recommended Budget (GRB) should be completed in January 2023.

In closing, Dahlberg said DOGAMI is doing well and has a very healthy outlook.

Chair Ashford congratulated Dahlberg on his great work since taking over as CFO and thinks the acknowledgement by DAS is an indication DOGAMI is doing things right. Kozlowski agreed.

Medley asked what the criteria is for needing to get new Lidar. McClaughry stated there are still areas of the State that have not been flown yet, and DOGAMI is working with USGS to cover the rest of the State. For the Willamette Valley, it was collected back in 2007 and 2009, sensors have improved providing for the ability to get better resolution on topographic data. In many areas there is room to improve the Lidar data and bring it all up to USGS standards for the federal data collections.

MacDonald added kudos for the work the Agency has done.

Kozlowski asked about the transition of leadership at the State. Director Day-Stirrat said it is up in the air at the moment, but the Chief of Staff and the DAS Director have been appointed; there are a lot of things that have to be worked out.

Board Action: Kozlowski moved to accept the Budget Status Report as presented. Medley seconded. Motion carried.

7) Civil Penalties:
Sarah Lewis, MLRR Program Manager, presented Program recommended Civil Penalties.

Lewis stated the MLRR Program is asking for consideration of Civil Penalties. She explained Civil Penalties have been in place for two years now and provided a little background for the new Board Members. She discussed how the Program prioritizes which sites to go after for Civil Penalties and reviewed the framework of the Continuum of Mining Without a Permit (MWOP) to reflect how they determine the severity of the violation. Lewis explained the continuum table with the range and types of considerations used by DOGAMI staff to assess each MWOP case. It lists major factors for determining severity and includes mitigating consideration and aggravating elements. The violations at each site may then be considered across the spectrum of each factor. By taking all the factors together, they get a sense of the overall severity of the violation, and can rank the site or case on a scale from 1 to 10. She noted that there is no zero on the scale; every mining without a permit site is technically eligible for a Civil Penalty. Due to limited resources, and with the Governing Board’s support, the Program can only focus on the most egregious cases that are 7 or higher.

Lewis reviewed the Morgan Creek site to demonstrate how staff determined the rating. Based on magnitude of harm and aggregating factors, it was ranked an 8, and the case was approved by the Board for Civil Penalties in July of 2020.

Lewis reviewed the steps for Proceeding with Civil Penalties. The framework was developed in 2019 in conjunction with DOJ, following DOGAMI’s rules and statutes, which is all summarized in an Internal Management Directive available on the Agency’s website. Lewis stated the Program tries every avenue possible to achieve compliance before asking for Civil Penalties. This usually means the site has been in non-compliance for several years.

Ashford asked about the Class 1-4 Violations and noticed that Class 4 Violation goes directly to the Board. Lewis explained Class 1-4 are DOGAMI classes that are increasing in severity; an example of Class 1 being non-payment of renewal, and Class 4 being Mining Without a Permit.

Lewis briefly discussed what happens if the respondent requests a hearing. She stated there continue to be opportunities to resolved the case informally throughout the process; and mentioned the options that can be taken if the respondent is unable to pay.

Lewis said the Morgan Creek site did ask for a hearing and discussed how the process played out. It was resolved via a Consent Agreement, which she stated has been effective. All the established milestones have been met to date, and the agreed to penalty payments are being received timely. Lewis shared photo evidence of the success with two pictures of site showing before and after the required reclamation steps were taken.

Lewis presented the new case Ekroth Quarry (29-0040), Mining Without a Permit via Trespass. It is a permitted site in Tillamook County and the current permittee took it over in 2010. They have mined outside their approved permit boundary since 2014. Efforts to achieve compliance with the site have involved multiple agencies over several years.

In the June 2021 Board meeting, MLRR presented this site’s details, which also included mining on to State lands, where the Department of State Lands holds the mineral rights, and Department of Forestry owns the timber. There were two landslides into Electric Creek, which is Marbled Murrelet nesting habitat. Originally MLRR anticipated having a penalty amount by the December 2021 Board
meeting, but subsequent updates to Board included progress being made with the hiring of a qualified consultant, and good coordination amongst State agencies and with the permittee. Unfortunately, progress has completely stalled.

Lewis said the Ekroth Quarry has significant aggregating factors, and ranks as a 9 on the continuum. The permittee continues to comply with the Suspension Order, however at last contact in October 2022 the consultant was no longer working with them, and MLRR staff have not received any indication of their next steps. Their continued lack of response is why this request comes to the Board.

Lewis said to develop recommendations for the amount, we reviewed the documented and classified violations that include:

• Engaging in Mining Without a Permit – Class 4
• Removing for profit any valuable mineral from any portion of mining property preserved from mining – Class 3
• Failure to mark boundaries for excavation areas, stockpiles, setbacks and buffers prior to mining – Class 3
• Operating a surface mine without legal interest in the land sufficient to ensure authority to operate and reclaim – Class 3
• Operating a surface mine without landowner and mineral interest owner approval – Class 2
• Failure to comply with a Department Order – Class 3
  • NOV – Trespass
• Failure to comply with a Department Order – Class 1
  • NOV – Security
• Failure to maintain adequate reclamation security – Class 1

Lewis then reviewed the chart for Determining Magnitude of the Violations to assess the amount of Civil Penalties. None of the mitigating factors are currently applicable at the site. All the aggregating factors can be assessed for the term of this violation. Because of that, the Program has chosen to use the maximum amount for each occurrence of the violations.

Kozlowski asked about the moderate rating to determine the amount. Lewis explained the moderate/median is the default amount and then either goes up or down in charges based on mitigating and/or aggravating factors.

Kozlowski asked when the cooperation stopped. Lewis answered over the last 6 months. The Program had been working with their consultant, but then the consultant said they were no longer working with them, so the avenue for progress has stopped since MLRR is unable to contact them.

Ashford asked about the economic benefit and the difference between mitigating and aggravating factors. Lewis explained it is for economic benefit, a larger amount would be aggravating.

Lewis reviewed the Aggravating Factors that include economic benefit, magnitude of harm, number of violations, previous similar violations, and pattern of conduct. She stated this is where the documentation comes in. MLRR can demonstrate the magnitude of harm by: the sediment deposition into Electric Creek due to the slides; calculating the volume of that material, and if that was removed and sold, what that economic benefit would have been to the operator; and the width
of the setback that they were not supposed to mine into, as it has a volume that can be calculated by
using the numbers of trucks sold into market. The Program was able to make some estimates around
what that economic benefit might be and are cautiously looking at somewhere over $1M with this
site. Lewis stated this has been going on for over 8 years and the Program has the ability to
determine how to calculate the number of occurrences for either daily or annually.

Chair Ashford asked if the Agency is setting precedent or does DOGAMI have the freedom to look at
each set of violations independently. Lloyd said the Agency is in the beginnings of implementing the
Civil Penalties Program and going forward it is trying to develop the guidance for staff to maintain
consistency by applying the factors consistently to make sure that individuals in this situation are
treated equally and reasonably. But each of these factual situations is unique, which limits it in that
way. Lloyd said the goal with the IMD and the directives to staff, is to try to ensure that the
Department is following a process that will result in similar results in similar situations. Lloyd added
as the Agency develops this Program and uses these tools more than what have existed, the Board
could move towards putting more of this in rule, so that there are more of these standards in the
rules, so that the public's aware of those at the outset.

Chair Ashford thanked Lloyd and said every time the Board does something, they will want to reflect
on what was done the last time, as he is sure some of the violators will as well.

MacDonald asked if the Agency is working with DEQ to determine water quality violations and if
there are overlapping penalties. Lewis explained DOGAMI is not double penalizing them, that each
agency has their own set of penalties and violations. DEQ was a $5,600 penalty for the water quality
violation; $4,713 in royalties to DSL; and ODF will also recover the loss of timber and timber
production at the end of the project, when that amount is assessed. She said DEQ has a very
prescribed rule for their calculation and she did not know the frequency, but could check with DEQ.

Lewis reviewed the Total Occurrences for each violation chart, which some of these occurrences go
back to 2012. Chair Ashford asked the reason for using a monthly basis. Lewis answered the time
frame for complying with orders is usually 3-6 months, so using the year step would allow for
overlooking them a couple of times per year, which is why she thinks a month is a more appropriate
step.

Lewis asked for Board approval for Penalty Option 2 in the amount of $432,000 with a lower
threshold of Expedites Enforcement Offer (EEO) amount of $68,500, that allows the Program
flexibility in negotiations, while ensuring that a minimum penalty is set; the Program could not go
below this amount without additional approval by the Board. The Program’s ultimate goal is to get
the site in compliance.

Chair Ashford said he thinks the number of occurrences is reasonable and does not think the number
of occurrences should be lowered, but the amount charged can be. He thinks the EEO should be
higher. Medley agreed with Chair Ashford that for setting precedent going into the future, the
number of occurrences should be higher and charging a lower amount makes more sense to her.

MacDonald asked if the minimum amount with the additional bond amount will cover the cost of the
reclamation, including work on the sediment deposition in Electric Creek. Lloyd said DOGAMI’s
authority is in statute ORS 517, the authority is in setting the reclamation bond to cover the amount
to reclaim the site based on the reclamation plan. The amount of the Civil Penalty is truly a penalty, and not designed to mitigate for natural resources, or for habitat loss.

MacDonald understood what Lloyd said, but Lewis had mentioned the reclamation bond had not been increased to account for the mining on the trespass land and into the buffer. Lewis replied the EEO would only be offered if there were other agreements in place to ensure reclamation.

Lewis referred to the program’s calculations and informed Chair Ashford that if the number of occurrences were calculated monthly the EEO would increase from $68,500 to $113,000.

Kozlowski said the goal is to go in and to negotiate and to provide action, but thinks the higher amount may get their attention. The amount is high, but she worries a lower amount would not cover cost recovery for staff’s time. Lewis stated the Program is not allowed to consider that when determining the penalty amount, it can only rely on the violations and occurrences. Lloyd added there is not specific provisions for that in the statutory authorities.

Lewis reminded the Board that Civil Penalties collected do go towards Program expenses incurred to administer the Civil Penalty first. So, unlike other agencies, DOGAMI does receive those Civil Penalties for Program use, specifically the Voluntary Reclamation Program under Division 38. A discussion took place and Lewis said the EEO ($68,500) is the lowest amount the Program would be comfortable with.

Kozlowski asked what the first steps are. Lewis answered the Notice of Civil Penalty Packet for the higher amount, that will include the milestones for reclamation and the expectations; the EEO is a negotiating tool.

Medley said the resulting amount and penalty is reasonable. It does seem really egregious, the amount of time and the fact that they did have awareness at one point and then dropped it. The more the Program can make the aggregating and mitigating factors more quantitative for the future, she thinks is great when describing volumes and quantities. It is really helpful for being able to remove any subjectivity one might have.

MacDonald said she looks at the penalty amounts relative to the estimated economic benefit, and would hate to see an enforcement program that assesses penalties that are so low that it becomes an easy cost of doing business, incurred penalties. She appreciates the work that Lewis and her staff has done to pull this together, and supportive of going forward with the proposal.

Kozlowski said she is really impressed with the work Lewis and her staff have done; it is an excellent job.

Chair Ashford agreed and appreciated them starting this Program and getting it to this point and making it as clear as it is, and really prioritizing the sites. He thinks it is something that has helped the Board.

Board Action: Kozlowski moved to accept the Civil Penalties Proposal as presented. Ashford seconded. Motion carried.

8) Technical Presentation: Post-Fire Debris Flow:
Bill Burns, Engineering Geologist, gave a technical presentation on Post-Fire Debris Flow.

Burns stated the presentation would be on some Post-Fire Debris Flow research and projects the Agency is working on, related to the mega fires in Western Oregon that happened on Labor Day 2020 and burned about 11% of the Cascades in Oregon.

Burns discussed the Eagle Creek fire of 2017 located in the Columbia River Gorge. He said on January 12-13, 2021 there was an Atmospheric River storm in that caused debris flows and one out of Levens Creek that caused a fatality. These events were a wakeup call for research to understand post-fire debris flows, and the risk, and work on risk reductions, especially in Western Oregon, where they are very poorly understood.

Burns discussed the research teams DOGAMI staff joined, focusing on the partnership and data collection with the USGS Landslide Program. This program is where, after fires in the US, they go in and run their post-fire debris flow models, which tries to predict where there might be post-fire debris flows in the future. Research is being done trying to determine where and how debris flows start; staff collect field points, field notes and pictures for each one. The goal is to update the USGS likelihood model for regions of Oregon. It helps them to determine how much rainfall it takes before a debris flow will occur. This will help them determine thresholds of rainfall that will allow them to put out alerts before the storm.

Burns stated most of the post-fire debris flow research has taken place in Southern California, in Arizona, New Mexico, and Colorado, where they have very different climates, geology, vegetation and types of rainfalls that happen in those areas. They are not sure if those models actually work here in Western Oregon, where there are extreme differences, and since there does not need to be forest fires to cause debris flows, it can happen without fires. He showed a graph depicting visually what might be happening.

He explained another major part of the research being done in Western Oregon on investigating how debris flows start by asking questions related to: if there is more runoff; trees losing root strength; soils change because all the ground force floor vegetation being burned off; timber harvesting. Research is being done with Oregon State University, looking at the root strengths and how the root strengths change when a forest burns. The thinking is there could be a decrease in that root strength, causing an increase in landslides in these post-fire environments.

Burns stated some conclusions on the post-fires debris flow research are that wildfire does have an influence on debris flows in Western Oregon, but is probably quite different than what happens in the drier climates of Southern California, Arizona, New Mexico, and Colorado. More research is needed to determine how much rainfall feel when there were debris flows, or non-debris flows, so that thresholds can be established.

Burns discussed DOGAMI proposed projects to FEMA to further assess the Post-Fire Debris Flows and work with the impacted communities on risk reduction. Some of the Scope of Work include collecting Lidar, mapping past events and deposition areas; modeling the future susceptibility; analyzing the risk (buildings with people living in them in the hazard zones), and determining and implementing risk reduction steps.
Kozlowski asked what some of the ways they mitigate the potential landslide hazards. Burns said by determining risk reduction; the first step is awareness: making people aware of the area they are in and informing them of the hazard zone. Once they are aware, working on establishing the thresholds so landslide warnings can be properly issued. Other options include DLCD working on land use planning – mitigating the hazard and/or avoid building in those areas; catch nets: debris flow netting to help reduce the spread of the flow.

Kozlowski asked what LCOG was. Burns answered Lane Council of Governments, located in Lane County where the Holiday Farm fire took place. He explained the Agency can pass through grant money to DLCD and LCOG to help with the post-fire debris flow projects; they are partnering with DOGAMI.

MacDonald said this work would connect up with ODF&W, Department of Forestry, and OWEB’s revegetation strategies. She asked if they are looking at debris flows damming creeks and addressing hazards related to flooding upstream caused by blockage, channel migration zone, issues around evulsion. Burns said DOGAMI is working with all these agencies, along with many other State Agencies and making them aware. With regards to channel blocking, the Agency is also looking at mapping the hazard.

Medley asked since the State gets atmospheric rivers and debris flows in non-burned areas all the time, if they are looking at sort of the relative risk level after an area has been burned, and how much more at risk, or what that threshold be for precipitation and cause these debris flows in an area that has been burned versus one that has not. Burns explained they are looking at looking at the background hazard and mapping that hazard because it is important. He said there are a few dams along the North Santiam there are concerns about. Some debris flows actually flow into bodies of water like lakes and some may effect drinking water; there are also concerns with infrastructure damage.

Kozlowski asked when they will be at the risk assessment standpoint. Burns explained they have four projects in those areas that are in a stair step phase approach and are expected to take 2-3 years to complete.

Kozlowski stated that partnering with other agencies and providing the data so they all can work for the same result is impressive.

Briefing: **No Board Action Required.**

9) **MLRR Update:**

Sarah Lewis, MLRR Program Manager, provided an update on MLRR.

**Survey Responses and Customer Service**

Lewis said there were some lingering requests and questions from the presentation around the Key Performance Measures at the September meeting, so additional information about longer term trends in those survey results and some ideas for improving responses going forward will be provided.
Lewis stated KPM 5 Customer Service was originally shown as the total number of responses for the Agency. She showed graphs reflecting the breakdown between the MLRR and GS&S programs and the percentage of responses ranked good or excellent; the number of responses has gone down over the last three years. Kozlowski asked if the Agency knows why there was such a reduction. Gabel said yes, there's a lower level of engagement between GS&S and customers versus MLRR, and once a year an email blast is sent out, which was delayed getting out this year. Going forward, the Agency will implement sending out multiple emails; having an online survey; asking people to do a survey when they view or download our publications and when staff give a presentation; and emails will be sent out to certain groups after specific meetings. Kozlowski said they sound like excellent ideas and will see how it is working. Kozlowski asked to have an update provided at the June meeting.

Gabel provided an answer to Board Chair Ashford’s previous question on KPM 1 about the measure of how many of the State’s Urban Grown Boundary (UGB), all the population centers, have had hazards mapped, because it looked like all had something done. Gabel looked into it, and as the KPM is defined and calculated, something has been done, as every UGB is getting credit for the statewide earthquake shaking maps done for both Cascadia and any crustal faults. She explained that she removed that blanket statewide work, and of the 217 UGBs, and all but 68 have had something mapped outside of that layer. Kozlowski asked Gabel to give Ashford a call with the information.

Lewis continued her update discussing the MLRR portion of the Customer Service Responses and tied them to the decrease in timeliness of processing active applications. She reviewed a graph that compared them from 2020 to now. The current applications processing time is an average of 11 months, and the Program’s goal and target is around 4-6 months. In addition to doubling the timeline, the number of applications have doubled, and the fact that staff are keeping processing at 11 months is testament to their continued productivity.

Lewis reviewed the breakdown of the responses and comments, then discussed action steps the Program is taking to address the concerns. Lewis stated there are not a lot of easy solutions, since the processing of permits takes technical expertise by staff, but additional staff members have been brought on to help and there has been incremental increase/improvement in the Program’s ability to process the permit applications more quickly.

Regarding communication, several ideas were discussed at the September meeting. The Program has developed and implemented a triage protocol for handling emails and will work to acknowledge emails within 3-5 business days, and provide a substantive response or a timeline for follow up in that email; which only half of the staff feel they can do that right now. It was also brought up to have an auto-reply message to go out stating staff are overwhelmed but will get back to them; two staff have implemented that option.

Kozlowski asked of the two staff, what percentage of their time is spent on responses. Lewis said 40%-50% of their time. She added staff are very frustrated and would love to be able to answer all the questions, and they want to be able to process permits faster, but it has gotten to the point where the request for status updates is actually interfering with their ability to make progress on the reports. Kozlowski said at least an answer is better than no answer at all and it should help.

Lewis said outreach is another category they received feedback on. In addition to the quarterly newsletter and putting information on the website, staff are coming up with ideas about how to
provide tutorials on how to fill out forms, or hold virtual meetings where they walk people through certain things, but that will depend on staff capacity. The Water Quality Program, in coordination with DEQ, is an example of successful outreach by MLRR and could be a model for the whole program.

MacDonald said Department of State Lands has a robust status portal and asked if the Program has looked at using something like that. She also thinks they will always get chunks of permits and asked if the program has consultants they could look at having as backup. Lewis said the Program did not have the capacity financially in the past and it would be less expensive to have staff long term. The Grassy Mountain Project does have on call consultants that are reimbursed as part of the direct cost recovery project. With respect to a portal, Lewis said they did work with DSL and DEQ around potential implementation of online tracking and permitting. The Agency’s number one Policy Option Package (POP) is for ePermitting that will actually piggyback on DEQ’s Your DEQ Online system.

Permitting Update

Lewis said the program has received a few more permit applications since the last meeting, and are up to 72.

Lewis officially recognized and thanked Cathy Cross, who was the MLRR Office Specialist since 1992, for her work; she stated today is Cathy’s last day as she has retired. The recruitment has been posted for the position and it closes December 11th. Staff are helping to cover the work she did until someone is hired.

For the Grassy Mountain update, Lewis stated there has been some media coverage lately. The Technical Review Team (TRT) met and the Consolidated Application process continues to move forward. The application has not been deemed complete yet and DOGAMI is waiting on additional information from the applicant. DOGAMI and BLM have an agreement in place to coordinate to the maximum extent possible, and keep the timelines in step for the NEPA Process at the federal level and the state’s Environmental Evaluation, which occur after the applications are complete. It is a great team at BLM and there are frequent meetings working to make sure that everything moves in lockstep as it goes forward.

Kozlowski said Glassy Mountain has turned out to be very complex.

Briefing: No Board Action Required.

10) GS&S Update:

Jason Mc Claughry, Interim GS&S Program Manager, provided an update on the GS&S program.

McClaughry said GS&S staff are currently working on 15 non-Lidar grants, eight are Federal Funds and seven are Other Funds, there are also five Lidar projects; Dahlberg previously went over the budget details in the Financial Update.

The Board Packet has the first GS&S Program newsletter called Oregon GEO and it focuses on Agency updates, as well as particular staff highlights or scientific research topics that are going on within GS&S; it is available online. This will be a companion to the ENGAGe Newsletter that’s put out by MLRR.

McClaughry reviewed in detail two Lidar proposals, and stated he is proud of the Lidar team’s efforts.
1. USGS 3-Dep FY23 Proposal for $7,219,268, covers parts of ten counties, including 7,081 sq. miles in the Willamette Valley for $3,698,393, which is largely updates to make it 3-Dep compliant, and 6,714 sq. miles of Deschutes County for $3,520,775.

2. Oregon Department of Forestry/Private Forest Accords cooperative agreement for $2,182,537.50 that covers 4,629 sq. miles.

McCloughry stated conversations have been started with Bureau of Land Management (BLM) for another 5,000 sq. miles to be collected in parts of Oregon. He showed a map for the Lidar coverage and said he anticipates in the next 3-5 years moving towards have statewide coverage of Lidar data.

Briefing: No Board Action Required.

11) Director’s Report:
Ruarri Day-Stirrat, Director & State Geologist, provided an update on the Agency.

Agency Update

Director Day-Stirrat stated due to the Lidar projects the Agency will need to ask for an Expenditure Limitation increase. Both analysts from LFO and DAS CFO are aware of the implication, as the Agency speaks to them on a regular basis.

Day-Stirrat attended the OCAPA Board meeting the week before Thanksgiving, where he informed them of the current situation regarding the number of permits; the lobby group and membership are aware of the situation and conversations with OCAPA will take place around solutions.

Day-Stirrat stated across the Agency, from management, labor, and staff members, has looked at its processes, and have updated almost everything related to safety. Going into a new biennium, DOGAMI feels it is in a very strong place to make sure that staff are safe and able to do their jobs on a daily basis. Over the last several months, several activities have taken place regarding safety.

1. The Agency has been working on the Continuity of Operations Plan (COOP), a formal document that describes the legal necessities of the Agency in an event of a disaster, and outlines succession planning and communication with staff; it is mostly done.

2. DOGAMI has been reinvigorating the Disaster Preparedness Plan with Alex Lopez taking the lead, there is no overlap with the COOP.

3. The COOP and Disaster Preparedness Plan will be rolled out to staff at the end of January, who will be asked to provide personal cell phone numbers as part of COOP; there is a Communication Plan in the event of a disaster.

4. Several months ago the Agency participated in the Governor’s Disaster Cabinet; at the meeting DAS requested that all leadership affirm they were 14 days ready, that affirmation has occurred.

5. The Agency Safety Committee and labor, have reinvigorated the Agency’s field safety documentation and included a recent policy. This is important to the Agency and comes with a small financial burden for equipment needed to ensure staff of both Programs are safe in the field while doing State business.
Finally, the Agency is working with DAS Motorpool to exchange older end-of-life vehicles for new up-to-date vehicles, as safety starts at the office and finishes when staff return to the office. This is not to downplay office safety.

Kozlowski said it is amazing and really that the Agency, for which represent disaster preparedness, has an internal program; it is consistent with its mission, and thanked Day-Stirrat for doing it.

Briefing: **No Board Action Required.**

**12) Public Comment:**

Only **written comments** received prior to or by 11:45 a.m. on the day of the meeting were to be accepted. Chair Ashford asked for any written public comments. No public comments.

Kozlowski thanked Medley and MacDonald for joining the Board, their input is helpful and broadens the approach as the Board looks at both MLRR and GS&S issues.

**13) Board Adjourn:**

Vice-Chair Kozlowski adjourned the meeting at 11:24 a.m.

**APPROVED**

Scott Ashford, Chair
Staff Report and Memorandum

To: Chair, Vice-Chair, and members of the DOGAMI Governing Board

From: Steve Dahlberg, Chief Financial Officer

Date: February 24, 2023

Regarding: Agenda Item 4– Financial Report

Attached is the DOGAMI Budget Status Report, as of December 31, 2022 for the Geological Survey and Services (GS&S) Program and the Mineral Land Regulation & Reclamation (MLRR) Program.

*Proposed Board Action: The Budget Status Report be Approved/Not Approved as presented.*
TO: DOGAMI Governing Board
FROM: Steve Dahlberg, Chief Financial Officer
DATE: February 24, 2023
SUBJECT: Financial Operations and Reporting

Board Governance

The Board has a duty to provide guidance related to operational decision-making and to affirm the Agency is appropriately managing its financial resources. Four key areas of responsibility include:

- The Board reviews all proposed budgets.
- The Board periodically reviews key financial information and audit findings.
- The Board is appropriately accounting for resources.
- The Agency adheres to accounting rules and other relevant financial controls.

In addition to operational communication, this memo will include topical areas of discussion related to these objectives with the expectation of inquiry and follow up as needed to support Board governance.

Fiscal Year 2023 (July 2022 – June 2023)

The information in this board report is as of DECEMBER 31, 2022, which is 18 of 24 months of the biennium. The revenue collections, accounts payable, indirect cost capture, and financial system structure set up are routine and our normal processing.
The General Fund expenditures are projected to be $5,786,663 which will be under-budget by $657,374 or 10.2%. The current projection includes investments in acquiring new scientific data to enhance forward looking geological needs and requirements. These projects include collecting magnetic and radiometric data by aircraft, providing information about the structure and composition of rocks in the targeted area. DOGAMI also approved additional post-fire debris flow research, Eastern Oregon mineral scoping, and internal process updates to be more efficient in our data processing. These projections, in addition to the normal anticipated expenses, have amounts earmarked for public outreach, grant preparation, web site upgrade, consulting for the strategic planning initiative, replace or upgrade aging technology, and employee training.

The Other Funds projected revenues are nearly $3,126,000 consisting of lidar projects for nearly $2,338,300, other grants for $787,700, and the Strong Motion Instrument Fund (SMIF) for $146,260. Included is the Private Forest Accord project with Oregon Department of Forestry (ODF) and is a Lidar project represents nearly $2.2M. This project is expected to be completed by the end of the biennium. The projected expenses are $3,204,794 is 30.0% over the budgeted expense limitation. The Agency has requested an increase in the expenditure limitation of $740,000. The Strong Motion Instrument Fund represents almost $206,300 of the ending balance. The overall projected ending balance for Other Funds will be almost $651,600.

The Agency received two (2) awards for Multi-Hazard Risk Assessments. One is from Oregon State Parks for Ecola State Park of $124,910 and the other is from DLCD for $120,560. The Agency is waiting for a funding decision to our proposal of $81,491 to the Portland’s Regional Disaster Preparedness Organization (RDPO).
**The Federal Funds** projected revenues are $5,050,505. The projected non-lidar federal grant revenues are close to $2,300,000 (46% of total federal revenues) driven by FEMA (45%), NOAA (40%), and USGS (15%).

The projected federal Lidar revenues are $2,750,500 (54% of total federal revenues) driven by FEMA (51%), BLM (26%), and USGS (23%).

DOGAMI has recently submitted multiple grant proposals to USGS. The Agency is working on several other proposals including two USGS Lidar proposals in the Willamette Valley and Deschutes County (smaller version of a previous proposal), USGS Earth MRI Initiative, USGS 3D Elevation Program (3DEP) Lidar collection, National Tsunami Hazard Mitigation Program (NTHMP), FEMA Cooperating Technical Partners (CTP), and Dept of Energy & Washington Geological Survey for a carbon sequestration grant.

The projected federal fund expenses are $4,872,077 or 15.5% under the budgeted expense limitation. The Federal funds are projected to have an ending balance of $152,508. Note: Lidar projects are dependent upon clear weather, pending how good/bad winter is, it may delay some revenues and matching expenses into the next biennium. The projects are not at risk, just the timing.

**Strong Motion Instrument Fund (SMIF)**  
As of December 31, 2022

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2021-23 Actual Revenue &amp; Expenditures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beginning Balance (July 1, 2021)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual &amp; projected Revenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual + Projected Expenditures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMIF Projected Ending Balance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**The Strong Motion Instrument Fund** are projected to end the biennium with a balance of $206,297. The projected revenue includes seven (7) deposits made thus far in the biennium and expecting one (1) more deposit before the biennium ends. These revenues are from developers of large building projects in-lieu of installing seismic instruments in their buildings. The projected expenditures represent the current work order with the University of Oregon (UofO) for $200,000, which supplies the funding for 24 new sensors at 18 new sites. The contract with UofO goes through December 2023, therefore the $200,000 may not be fully spent in the current biennium and will be recorded in the 2023-25 biennium.
Mineral Land Regulation & Reclamation (MLRR) Program
As of December 31, 2022

### 2021-23 Projected Revenue & Expenditures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Other Funds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Available Revenue*</td>
<td>$ 5,334,559</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Expenditures</td>
<td>$(4,117,395)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLRR Ending Balance</td>
<td>$ 1,217,165</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percent under Expenditure budget  4.0%
Percent of target 6-month operating reserve  103.3%
* Includes the beginning balance

The MLRR Program is projected to finish the biennium under the expenditure budget limitation by $170,253 reflecting 4.0% of the expenditure budget. MLRR will have a robust ending balance of $1,217,165 and is now at 103.3% of the anticipated six-month operating reserve target. This target for the 6-month operating reserve outlook for 2025 has been recalculated with the latest projections, including using the 2023-25 biennium budget in the calculation. The projected revenues for the biennium continue to hold solid because of the approved fee increase in January 2021. This revenue, along with careful spending, is performing as expected or slightly better and provides confidence that the program will achieve the goal of a six-month operating reserve in the 2023-25 biennium. MLRR has recently filled a Limited Duration (LD) position and is actively recruiting for a second LD position to help with the very high permit application workload.

Reclamation Guarantee Fund
As of December 31, 2022

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beginning 2021-23: 58 Cash Securities</td>
<td>$ 669,943</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 New Securities</td>
<td>$ 343,924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-5 Security Releases</td>
<td>$(40,375)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biennium to Date: 67 Cash Securities</td>
<td>$ 973,492</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Reclamation Guarantee Fund retains $973,492 in cash securities. Since the last board meeting, one (1) new security have been added and released two (2) securities. This brings the biennium total of 14 new securities and the release of 5 securities.

March 6, 2023
Business Office Activities

All required grant financial reporting is complete and up to date. We continue our monthly project manager meetings, using tracking tools and project financials to review the financial status and project updates.

The Business Office continues to be on-time with processing accounts payable items, creating invoices and federal draws, various grant reporting, and diving deeper into the analysis of the grants and lidar projects.

Oregon State went live with a new Workday payroll platform beginning December 1, 2022. As with new systems, it's a change and will take a few months for all the kinks to be worked out.

Financial Terms:

Allotment – the agency’s plan of estimated expenditures, revenues, cash receipts and disbursements. Quarterly, agencies submit their request for the allotment to DAS and upon approval, funds are made available to the agency.

Appropriation – An amount of money from the General Fund approved by the Legislature for a certain purpose.

ARB – Agency Requested Budget. Using the CSL, adding Policy Option Packages (POP’s).

Budget – The target of the revenues and expenses for the agency.

CSL – Current Service Level. Starting point of the budget process based upon the previous biennium budget with various adjustments for inflation and other DAS adjustment percentages, program phase-outs, previous biennium one-time costs.

Expenditure Authority – One who has the permission to authorizes or approves the spending for the agency.

Expenditure Limitation – For Other and Federal Funds – the spending limits set by the legislature identifying the maximum amount the agency may spend, defined in the agency’s budget. These funds must have a revenue source in place. If the agency receives more funds (revenues), the agency may to a legislative session for an increase and approval to spend the additional revenues.

March 6, 2023
**Expenses / Expenditures** – The decrease in net current financial resources. These include disbursements through Payroll for salary and benefits and Accounts Payable for service & supplies as well as accruals for the current period.

**Federal Funds** – Money provided for a specific set of work from a Federal Agency. DOGAMI typically works with BLM, FEMA, NOAA, and USGS. These are the typical federal agencies DOGAMI have submitted proposals and received a grant.

**Grant Awards** – The total amount of the grant from a funder. The award document contains a number of specific grant details items including start and end dates, brief description, contact, etc. A lot of work is done before a grant is awarded. This frequently includes working directly with a funder and building a proposal for consideration. Some grants are competitive, which the agency is competing with other for an entire grant or a portion of the available money the funder has available to distribute.

**Grant Balance** – The remaining amount of a grant after work is charged to the grant. Work charged to the grant will be followed with a draw or invoice to be reimburse the agency for the work completed. The agency continues to work until the end of the project and/or there’s no remaining grant balance.

**GRB** – Governor Recommended Budget. Using the ARB plus modifications the Governor’s Office recommends.

**LAB** – Legislative Approved Budget. Final decisions and changes. Base Budget is approved, may be followed with other bills that changes (add/subtracts) from the agency’s original bill.

**ORBITS** – Oregon’s Budget Information Tracking System. The system used to store all budget information and prepare budget requests and reports.

**ORPICS** – Oregon’s Position Information Control System. The system to establish and maintain budgeted positions and related expenditures at a detail level. The personal information is summarized and added to ORBITS.

**Other Funds** – Money received by state agencies that does NOT come from the General Fund or from the federal government. These are typically from other state agencies, cities or counties, or private companies where they are paying DOGAMI for services. Any money that’s not provided by the Oregon state general fund directly to DOGAMI and not by a federal agency is considered an Other Fund.

**Revenues** – The recording of inbound cash from external sources. Revenues are collected through Invoicing, Draws, and Transfers. This term ‘revenues’ is normally used with Other/Federal Funds.
Reversion – The amount of the General Fund that is not spent at the end of the biennium. Reminder – the GF starts with a zero balance and ends with a zero balance.

SABRS – The State Audit and Budget Reporting Section. Supports the DAS Chief Financial Office with budget preparation and execution.

Salary/OPE – Costs of personal and related benefit costs. OPE are Other Personal Expenses, commonly referred as fringe benefits or just benefits.

Service & Supplies – Non-Payroll costs. These include travel, training, professional services, State charges for services, legal, office, and capital asset expenses (over $5,000 and a useful life greater than 1 year).

ATTACHMENTS:

DOGAMI Financial Report
## Geological Survey & Services (GS&S) Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget Category / Line Item</th>
<th>2021-23 Budget by Funding Source</th>
<th>2021-23 Actual Revenue &amp; Expenditures</th>
<th>Actual Budget Spent</th>
<th>2021-23 Projected Revenue &amp; Expenditures</th>
<th>2021-23 Actual + Projected Revenue &amp; Expenditures</th>
<th>Actual + Projected Budget Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>General Funds</td>
<td>Other Funds</td>
<td>Federal Funds</td>
<td>All Funds</td>
<td>General Funds</td>
<td>Other Funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beginning Balance</td>
<td>750,913</td>
<td>750,913</td>
<td>750,913</td>
<td>2,149,316</td>
<td>5,765,844</td>
<td>14,339,197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2022-23 Revenue &amp; Time</td>
<td>6,444,037</td>
<td>2,149,316</td>
<td>5,765,844</td>
<td>14,339,197</td>
<td>5,786,663</td>
<td>3,125,833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3,732,145</td>
<td>764,632</td>
<td>3,811,450</td>
<td>8,008,247</td>
<td>5,786,663</td>
<td>13,963,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Available Revenue</td>
<td>6,444,037</td>
<td>2,149,316</td>
<td>5,765,844</td>
<td>15,118,197</td>
<td>5,786,663</td>
<td>3,125,833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditures:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel Services</td>
<td>3,851,150</td>
<td>535,210</td>
<td>2,255,913</td>
<td>6,442,275</td>
<td>999,424</td>
<td>1,115,220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2,167,279</td>
<td>368,539</td>
<td>1,242,547</td>
<td>3,878,364</td>
<td>999,424</td>
<td>1,115,220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services &amp; Supplies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-state Travel</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out-of-state Travel</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governmental Vag (Grp)</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Services</td>
<td>133%</td>
<td>999%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT Professional Services</td>
<td>9,387</td>
<td>88,112</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>97,499</td>
<td>28,159</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Services</td>
<td>165,467</td>
<td>730,275</td>
<td>3,057,430</td>
<td>3,953,172</td>
<td>17,282</td>
<td>227,674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publicity &amp; Publications</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>64,253</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tax Payments &amp; Taxes</td>
<td>458,432</td>
<td>243,316</td>
<td>779,343</td>
<td>779,343</td>
<td>329,281</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lease Payments &amp; Taxes</td>
<td>7,301</td>
<td>1,028</td>
<td>2,368</td>
<td>10,697</td>
<td>2,225</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Funds</td>
<td>976,967</td>
<td>502</td>
<td>502</td>
<td>502</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Services</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities Maintenance</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities Maintenance</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency Related S &amp; S</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency Related Charges</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Service Fund</td>
<td>735,690</td>
<td>35,600</td>
<td>1,489,430</td>
<td>1,489,430</td>
<td>314,878</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT Professional Property</td>
<td>8,534</td>
<td>30,609</td>
<td>96,797</td>
<td>10,052</td>
<td>19,082</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT Professional Property</td>
<td>23,900</td>
<td>37,153</td>
<td>272,075</td>
<td>272,075</td>
<td>75,017</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Equipment</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Equipment</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Automotive &amp; Aircraft</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Automotive &amp; Aircraft</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Processing Software</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Processing Hardware</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Capital Outlay</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect</td>
<td>342,036</td>
<td>55,079</td>
<td>266,853</td>
<td>400,913</td>
<td>342,036</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Services &amp; Supplies</td>
<td>2,392,881</td>
<td>1,900,459</td>
<td>3,500,929</td>
<td>8,008,247</td>
<td>1,035,094</td>
<td>2,388,857</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditures</td>
<td>6,444,037</td>
<td>2,149,316</td>
<td>5,765,844</td>
<td>14,339,197</td>
<td>5,786,663</td>
<td>3,125,833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GS&amp;S Ending Balance</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>730,528</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officer Funds</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>704,608</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Includes the Strong Motion Instrument Fund (SMIF)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under-budget</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>848,014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Mineral Land Regulation & Reclamation (MLRR) Program

#### 2021-23 Budget by Funding Source

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget Category / Line Item</th>
<th>2021-23 Budget by Funding Source</th>
<th>2021-23 Actual Revenue &amp; Expenditures</th>
<th>2021-23 Projected Revenue &amp; Expenditures</th>
<th>2021-23 Actual + Projected Revenue &amp; Expenditures</th>
<th>Actual + Projected Budget % Total Spent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other Funds</td>
<td>Other Funds</td>
<td>Other Funds</td>
<td>Other Funds</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beginning Balance</td>
<td>401,956</td>
<td>401,956</td>
<td>401,956</td>
<td>401,956</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2023 Revenue &amp; Transfer</td>
<td>4,236,525</td>
<td>4,139,838</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Available Revenue</td>
<td>4,638,281</td>
<td>4,139,838</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Expenditures:

- **Personnel Services**
  - 2021-23 Budget: 3,051,569
  - 2021-23 Actual: 2,451,409
  - 2021-23 Projected: 3,051,569
  - 2021-23 Actual + Projected: 5,503,038
- **Services & Supplies**
  - 2021-23 Budget: 4,308,350
  - 2021-23 Actual: 2,952,121
  - 2021-23 Projected: 4,308,350
  - 2021-23 Actual + Projected: 7,260,470

### Other Programs

#### Reclamation Guarantee Fund

- **Projected Revenues**
  - Beginning Balance: 1,580,456
  - Projected Revenues: 17,800

#### Strong Motion Instrument Fund (SMIF)

- **Beginning Balance**
  - SMIF Ending Balance: 206,297
- **Projected Revenues**
  - Projected Revenues: 340
- **Total Expenditures**
  - Total Expenditures: 200,000

#### SMIF Ending Balance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SMIF Ending Balance</th>
<th>$ 206,297</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>58 Cash Security’s</td>
<td>$ 669,943</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 New Securities</td>
<td>$ 343,924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Security releases</td>
<td>$ (40,375)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Current Projections, with actuals through December 2022.
2021 - 2023 Monthly Activity
GS&S - GENERAL Funds

- Monthly - Personnel Costs
- Monthly - Service & Supplies
- 2021-23 LAB Budget (Straight-line)

Actual vs. Forecast
GS&S - OTHER Funds
2021 - 2023 Comparison of Expense Projections
Board meetings in Oct/Dec/Jun/Sep/Dec/Mar

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenses</th>
<th>Change $ and % of Biennium</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B2 - B1</td>
<td>$76,700  6.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3 - B2</td>
<td>$175,100 -14.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B4 - B3</td>
<td>$-23,945 -2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B5 - B4</td>
<td>$-7,850  -0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B6 - B1</td>
<td>$52,065,905 181.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2021 - 2023 Monthly Activity
GS&S - OTHER Funds

- Monthly - Personnel Costs
- Monthly - Service & Supplies
- Revenue - Other Funds
- Forecasted Revenues

Actual vs Forecasted Revenues Graph for GS&S - OTHER Funds from July 2021 to June 2023.
GS&S - FEDERAL Funds
2021 - 2023 Comparison of Expense Projections
Board meetings in Oct/Dec/Jun/Sep/Dec/Mar

Expenses - Change $ and % at end of Biennium
* B2 - B1 = $126,500 = 2.6%
* B3 - B2 = $286,900 = 5.8%
* B4 - B3 = $218,100 = 4.2%
* B5 - B4 = $223,306 = -4.5%
* B6 - B5 = $86,696 = 1.8%
2021 - 2023 Running Balance: Budget to Spending
GS&S - FEDERAL Funds

- Personnel
- Service & Supplies
- 2021-23 LAB Expenditure Limitations
- Revenue - Federal Funds
- Forecasted Revenues
2021 - 2023 Running Balance: Budget to Spending
MLRR - OTHER Funds

- Personnel Costs
- Service & Supplies
- 2021-23 LAB Expenditure Limitations
- Actual - MLRR Revenues
- Forecasted Revenue

Actual | Forecast

Staff Report and Memorandum

To: Chair, Vice-Chair, and members of the DOGAMI Governing Board

From: Ruarri Day-Stirrat, Director & State Geologist

Date: February 21, 2023

Regarding: Agenda Item 5 – Governor’s Recommended Budget (GRB)

Director Day-Stirrat will review the Governor’s Recommended Budget (GRB).

Proposed Board Action: The Board will not be asked to take an action on this item.
### DOGAMI Programs Delivers Science & Stewardship

#### Five Person Governing Board Confirmed by Senate

#### Agency Leadership (Administration, IT and Finance 8 FTE)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mineral Lands (12 FTE)</th>
<th>Geological Survey &amp; Services (15 FTE)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regulation &amp; Reclamation of Surface Mining, Exploration, Oil &amp; Gas, Geothermal, Chemical Process Mining</td>
<td>Landslide Inventory &amp; Susceptibility Mapping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Flood &amp; Channel Migration Mapping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Earthquake &amp; Seismic Hazards Mapping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tsunami &amp; Coastal Erosion Mapping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Geological &amp; Mineral Resource Mapping</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Lidar Mapping**
Mineral Land Regulation and Reclamation (MLRR)
Geological Survey & Services (GS&S)

'West Hills' Landslides Mapped from Lidar

Rockfall along Hwy 30 between Clackskanie and Astoria (2022). Image from ODOT
Geological Survey & Services (GS&S)
Post-Fire Debris Flow Risk after Wildfire

January 2021 Fatal Post-Fire Debris Flow. Source of debris flow within the 2017 Eagle Creek Fire, Columbia River Gorge, Oregon (photo courtesy of ODOT)

- DOGAMI collaborates with local communities to leverage technical expertise and federal funding to assess erosion and debris flow risk
Long-Term Vacancies

• The Agency has no positions that qualifies for long-term vacancy status
  • Currently no vacant position in the Agency
• 2022 was an exceptionally successful year in hiring for vacant positions
  • Workload necessitated hiring:
    • Limited Duration Staff
    • Intern
• Increase in both the number of Staff who hold Registered Geologist Licenses in Oregon and/or an advanced degrees
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Performance Measures and Focus Areas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Geological Survey &amp; Services</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Hazards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earth Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MLRR</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Resource Management</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outreach &amp; Education</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Governance &amp; Operations</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Strategic Focus Areas
- **Natural Hazards**
- **Earth Science**
- **Resource Management**
- **Outreach & Education**
- **Governance & Operations**

### Key Performance Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KPM#1: Hazard Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KPM#2: Geologic Mapping Completion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KPM#3: Lidar Coverage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KPM#4: Percent of Mines Sites Inspected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KPM#5: Customer Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KPM#6: Governance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
KPM#1 Geologic Hazard and Risk Assessment Completion

- Percent of population residing in Oregon Urban Growth Boundary Areas (UGBs) that have completed geologic hazard and risk assessments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Report Year</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
KPM#2 Detailed Geologic Map Completion

- Percent of Oregon (inhabited) where geologic data in the form of high-resolution maps have been completed to be used for local problem solving.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reporting Period 2021-2022</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Report Year</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Actual</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Year/Scale</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:100k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:24k</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
KPM#3 Lidar Data Completion

- Percent of Oregon (sq. miles) with Lidar data at USGS quality level 2 or better.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Report Year</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>56.1%</td>
<td>60.50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
KPM#4 Permitted Mines Sites Inspected

- Percent of Permitted Surface Mine Sites Inspected Biennially (with 1 year of data reported)
  - Total sites: 920
  - Unique Inspections: 65

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Report Year</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target</td>
<td>50% (100%)</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>6% (15%)</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>15-20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Revised KPM #4 proposed - Percent of Active Mine Sites Inspected Annually
KPM#5 Customer Service

- Percent of customers rating their satisfaction with the agency's customer service as "good" or "excellent" in six categories.
KPM#6 Governance

**Board Evaluation Criteria**

1) Executive Director’s performance expectations are current
2) Executive Director receives annual performance feedback
3) The agency’s mission and high-level goals are current and applicable
4) The Board reviews the Annual Performance Progress Report
5) The Board is appropriately involved in review of the agency’s key communications
6) The Board is appropriately involved in policy-making activities
7) The agency’s policy option packages are aligned with their mission and goals
8) The Board reviews all proposed budgets
9) The Board periodically reviews key financial information and audit findings
10) The Board is appropriately accounting for resources
11) The agency adheres to accounting rules and other relevant financial controls
12) The Board members act in accordance with their roles as public representatives
13) The Board coordinates with others where responsibilities and interests overlap
14) The Board members identify and attend appropriate training sessions
15) The Board reviews its management practices to ensure best practices are utilized

- Percent of yes responses by Governing Board members to the set of best practices.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Report Year</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target</strong></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Actual</strong></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Agency Budget Overview

General Fund
• Agency is provided balance, draws down over Biennium, and ends at or near zero.

MLRR Revenues (Other Funds – Fees)
• Revenues from permit applications, renewals, tonnage fees and cost-recovery.
• A small operating balance carries over from year-to-year.

GS&S Grants (Federal Funds and Other Funds)
• Grant awards provide staff salary and research funds; new grants added each year as existing grants are drawn down.
• Grant award periods may cover several years.
GS&S Grant Activity

2019-25 GS&S Grants - Revenue, Awards, Balance - Actual + Forecast

- Actuals to December 2022, with forward looking projections

- Total Ending Balance
  - FY19: $3,229,472
  - FY20: $3,862,999
  - FY21: $2,939,893
  - FY22: $4,268,526
  - FY23: $6,343,066
  - FY24: $5,555,984
  - FY25: $5,362,999
  - FY26: $5,286,442

- Total Awards
  - FY19: $3,428,632
  - FY20: $3,334,783
  - FY21: $3,155,576
  - FY22: $4,024,390
  - FY23: $7,483,647
  - FY24: $3,562,772
  - FY25: $3,969,751
  - FY26: $3,289,885

- Total Revenue Draws
  - FY19: $1,446,168
  - FY20: $2,701,257
  - FY21: $4,078,681
  - FY22: $2,695,758
  - FY23: $5,409,106
  - FY24: $4,076,968
  - FY25: $3,755,757
  - FY26: $4,046,308
GS&S Grants Revenue - Funding Mix Trend

FY 2020 Active Grants Revenue $2.7M
- 43% Other Fund
- 57% Federal Fund
- 0% Lidar

FY 2021 Active Grants Revenue $4.1M
- 34% Other Fund
- 23% Federal Fund
- 43% Lidar

FY 2022 Active Grants Revenue $2.7M
- 41% Other Fund
- 50% Federal Fund
- 9% Lidar

FY 2023 Active Grants Revenue $5.4M
- 20% Other Fund
- 72% Federal Fund
- 7% Lidar

2019-21 Active Grants Revenue $6.8M
- 31% Other Fund
- 44% Federal Fund
- 25% Lidar

2021-23 Active Grants Revenue $8.1M
- 65% Other Fund
- 27% Federal Fund
- 8% Lidar

Actuals to December 2022, projection to biennium end
GS&S Non-Lidar Federal Fund Revenue - Funders Mix Trend

2019-21 Federal Funders Revenue $2.1M

- 43% BLM, $924,719
- 37% FEMA, $793,978
- 1% NOAA, $15,078

2021-23 Federal Funders Revenue $2.3M

- 40% BLM, $899,415
- 45% FEMA, $1,011,443
- 0% NOAA
- 15% USGS, $338,986

Proposals pending funder decisions
- $50k USGS Geologic Data Preservation (FY24)
- $500k USGS STATEMAP Geologic Mapping (FY24)
- $330k USGS Earth MRI Resource Mapping (FY24-26)
- $350k DOE Carbon Sequestration Siting (FY24-25)

Actuals to December 2022, projection to biennium end
GS&S Non-Lidar Other Fund Revenue - Funders Mix Trend

2019-21 Other Funders Revenue $1.7M

- DSL 26% $427,256
- DLCD 16% $261,646
- GEOS 11% $185,790
- OEM 3% $57,304
- OTHER 20% $332,504
- OWSC 9% $146,344
- UNIV 15% $258,422

2021-23 Other Funders Revenue $0.6M

- DSL 55% $319,501
- DLCD 25% $143,183
- GEOS 6% $34,813
- OEM 3% $19,686
- OTHER 7% $42,360
- OWSC 1% $4,320
- UNIV 2% $13,183

Actuals to December 2022, projection to biennium end
2021-23 Unresolved Issues Addressed by Policy Option Packages

MLRR
- Permit applications outpace staffing levels
- Permittee and Staff frustration at backlog
- Continued applications anticipated with federal and state investments in infrastructure
Biennial Revenue History

Revenue/Expenditure Limit By Biennia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>GF</th>
<th>FF</th>
<th>OF-MLRR</th>
<th>OF-GS&amp;S</th>
<th>Positions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013-15</td>
<td>$4,000,000</td>
<td>$4,400,000</td>
<td>$2,802,703.7</td>
<td>$4,897,296.3</td>
<td>49.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015-17</td>
<td>$4,806,968</td>
<td>$5,415,399</td>
<td>$2,919,483</td>
<td>$2,738,152</td>
<td>45.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017-19</td>
<td>$5,359,949</td>
<td>$3,782,406</td>
<td>$3,500,297</td>
<td>$1,738,550</td>
<td>43.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019-21</td>
<td>$5,424,733</td>
<td>$3,859,582</td>
<td>$3,675,689</td>
<td>$2,175,823</td>
<td>41.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021-23</td>
<td>$5,775,318</td>
<td>$5,105,372</td>
<td>$4,062,298</td>
<td>$3,193,810</td>
<td>35.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2023-25</td>
<td>$9,810,611</td>
<td>$5,519,902</td>
<td>$4,245,101</td>
<td>$3,337,531</td>
<td>41.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Budget Drivers, Risks & Information Technology

Information Technology:
- ePermitting, modernize customer interface and improve customer service
- IT Resiliency Initiative

Budget Drivers:
- Build and Implement ePermitting
- Match Federal Funds
- Grow the Geologic Mapping Program focused on Water and Mineral Resources
- Address the needs of Oregonians through Agency KPMs

Risks:
- Inability to match and leverage unprecedented levels of Federal Funds
  (Bipartisan Infrastructure Law, Inflation Reduction Act, US Dept Interior Appropriations funding in 2023)
Governor’s Recommended Budget

**Agency**
- General Funds: $9,810,611 (44%)
- Federal Funds: $5,519,902 (25%)
- Other Funds: $6,893,370 (31%)

**Funds across Programs**
- MLRR Other Funds (Fees): $4,384,797 (20%)
- MLRR General Fund: $2,834,349 (13%)
- GS&S Federal Funds: $5,519,902 (25%)
- GS&S Other Funds: $2,508,573 (11%)
- GS&S General Funds: $6,976,262 (31%)

**Personal Services/Service and Supplies**
- Service & Supplies (less Pass through): $11,374,937 (51%)
- Capital Outlay: $10,074,974 (51%)

Goal: IT Modernization to develop online permitting and payment system (ePermitting)

Structure: General Fund to configure and build system. Fees modified (earliest 2025) to maintain system.
- Includes Vendor Contract and two staff positions (Project Manager & IT Systems Support Specialist)

Results: Key Performance Measure (KPM) #4 – Percent of mine sites inspected and #5 – Customer Service

Revenue Sources:
- General Fund: $2,000,000

Solid business case built at legislative direction, using enterprise guidance, and leveraging existing state resources.
Policy Option Package 104: Consolidated Mining Permitting

Goal: Streamline Consolidated Mining Permitting. Consolidated Mining Permit requires inter-agency coordination and groundwork for future Consolidated Mining Permit.

Structure: FTE increase from 0.75 to 1.0. Funded via cost recovery

Results: Key Performance Measure (KPM) #5 – Customer Service

Revenue Sources:
- MLRR Other Fund (Cost Recovery): $239,308

Consolidated Mining Permitting is a complex multi-agency process led by DOGAMI requiring coordination and communication.
Policy Option Package 106: Infrastructure Permit Support

Goal: State agencies and mining industry anticipate increased need for aggregate materials in support of construction and infrastructure projects under State and Federal Infrastructure Investment.

Structure: General Fund request for LD positions to address workload and reduce permit timelines for all
• Includes two staff positions (Interagency Coordinator & Permit Reviewer)

Results: Key Performance Measure (KPM) #4 – Percent of mine sites inspected and #5 – Customer Service

Revenue Sources:
• General Fund: $422,700

Short-term infrastructure spending will place additional pressure on application processing, potentially disrupting business as usual and long-term program improvements.
Policy Option Package 107: Unpermitted Surface Mining

Goal: Protect State resources. Current staff capacity limits enforcement to only the most egregious transgressions.
- State takes responsibility for protecting its resources
- Active permittees do not fund this compliance activity
- Allows existing staff to focus on permits/renewals

Structure: General Fund request for LD positions to address workload and level the playing field for compliant operators
- Includes two staff positions (Mining Compliance Coordinator & Permit Reviewer)

Results: Key Performance Measure (KPM) #4 – Percent of mine sites inspected and #5 – Customer Service

Revenue Sources:
- General Fund: $411,649

~20% of MLRR staff time is spent responding to complaints and compliance issues around unpermitted or non-compliant mining operations.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bill #</th>
<th>BILL SUMMARY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SB5510</td>
<td>Relating to the financial administration of the State Department of Geology and Mineral Industries; declaring an emergency. Appropriates moneys from General Fund to State Department of Geology and Mineral Industries for biennial expenses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB222</td>
<td>Relating to payments to State Department of Geology and Mineral Industries by credit card. Authorizes State Department of Geology and Mineral Industries to accept payments by credit card and to add fee to credit card transactions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB538</td>
<td>Relating to state agencies' acceptance of credit cards as payment. Permits state agency to accept credit card as payment for charge or fee state agency imposes or collects for goods or services state agency provides to individual who is member of public and to add surcharge to amount person tenders to offset fees charged to state agency for accepting credit card as payment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Budget Summary

2023-25 Governor’s Request Budget seeks to:
• Maintain the agency strength in geological mapping and hazard mitigation
• Build IT infrastructure to enhance customer service and agency efficiency
• Enable critical infrastructure projects while protecting Oregon’s resources
To: Chair, Vice-Chair, and members of the DOGAMI Governing Board

From: Christina Appleby, Legislative Coordinator

Date: February 21, 2023

Regarding: Agenda Item 6 – Legislative Update

Christina Appleby, Legislative Coordinator, will give a Legislative Update.

Proposed Board Action: The Board will not be asked to take an action on this item.
Staff Report and Memorandum

To: Chair, Vice-Chair, and members of the DOGAMI Governing Board

From: Jonathan Allan, Coastal Geomorphologist

Date: February 21, 2023

Regarding: Agenda Item 7 – Technical Presentation: A Brief History of Nearly Everything About the DOGAMI Coastal Program

Jonathan Allan, Coastal Geomorphologist, will give a technical presentation on a Brief History of Nearly Everything About the DOGAMI Coastal Program.

Proposed Board Action: The Board will not be asked to take an action on this item.
To: Chair, Vice-Chair, and members of the DOGAMI Governing Board

From: Sarah Lewis, MLRR Program Manager

Date: February 21, 2023

Regarding: Agenda Item 8 – MLRR Update

Sarah Lewis, MLRR Program Manager, will provide an update on MLRR and report on the following topics:

1) Permit Status Summary
2) Grassy Mountain Project Update

Proposed Board Action: The Board will not be asked to take an action on this item.
Map shows aggregate/non-aggregate active permitting applications, site visits in the last 6 months, and renewals due in last 3 months.

Table 1: Permit Status Summary (as of 2/15/2023)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Apr - Jun 2022</th>
<th>Jul - Sep 2022</th>
<th>Oct – Dec 2022</th>
<th>Jan – Feb 2023</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Permits</td>
<td>Apps</td>
<td>Permits</td>
<td>Apps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Surface Mining</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Permits</td>
<td>872</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>874</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exclusion Certificates</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sites Closed</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stormwater (DEQ)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1200A Permits</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WPCF 1000 Permits</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Exploration</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oil &amp; Gas Wells</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Geothermal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well Permits</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prospect Wells</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The average processing time for an application completed during the last year was 11 months.

Table 2b: Permit Applications received since last update (11/15/2022):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site ID#</th>
<th>Application Type</th>
<th>Permit Type</th>
<th>Date Received</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10-0229</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>OP</td>
<td>12/22/2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03-0227</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>OP</td>
<td>1/5/2023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-0073</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>EC</td>
<td>1/11/2023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-0073</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>EC</td>
<td>1/11/2023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07-0163</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>OP</td>
<td>1/25/2023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07-0174</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>OP</td>
<td>2/9/2023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07-0150</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>OP</td>
<td>2/9/2023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-0064</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>EC</td>
<td>2/9/2023</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2c: Permits Issued since last update (11/15/2022):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site ID#</th>
<th>Application Type</th>
<th>Permit Type</th>
<th>Date Received</th>
<th>Date Issued</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>09-0122</td>
<td>Transfer</td>
<td>OP</td>
<td>1/31/2022</td>
<td>12/1/2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-0052</td>
<td>Transfer</td>
<td>OP</td>
<td>7/12/2022</td>
<td>12/15/2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22-0158</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>EC</td>
<td>11/3/2022</td>
<td>12/16/2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04-0017</td>
<td>Transfer</td>
<td>OP</td>
<td>4/1/2021</td>
<td>12/21/2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-0073</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>EC</td>
<td>1/11/2023</td>
<td>1/11/2023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-0145</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>OP-LE</td>
<td>10/21/2021</td>
<td>1/19/2023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-0063</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>XP</td>
<td>4/29/2022</td>
<td>2/10/2023</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Location of potential (green dots) and active (pink dots) compliance actions from Table 3. Size of circle indicates number of violations per site.

Table 3a: Compliance Summary – Active Actions by Type (as of 2/15/2023)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Compliance Item</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>2023</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jun</td>
<td>Sep</td>
<td>Dec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Payment of Fees</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exploring Without a Permit</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mining Without a Permit</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mining Outside Permit Boundary</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Approval</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failure to Comply with Order</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permit Boundary Survey Map</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boundary Marking Violation</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permit Condition Violation</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reclamation Security</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failure to Reclaim Timely</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 3b: Compliance Summary – Active Department Orders by Type (as of 2/15/2023)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Order Types</th>
<th>Administrative Orders (change since last report)</th>
<th>Environmental/Permit Orders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Notice of Violation</td>
<td>27 (+1)</td>
<td>24 (+3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suspension Order*</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCP Referral</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notice of Civil Penalty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Order</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consent Order</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demand Warning</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notice of Intent</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demand to Recover</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notice of Action</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 3c: Compliance Summary – Active Suspension Orders (as of 2/22/2023. No changes since last update)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Suspended</th>
<th>Date Suspended</th>
<th>Reason for Suspension</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23-0234</td>
<td>08-Apr-12</td>
<td>Legacy issue needs resolution. Issued in 2012 for non-payment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-0020</td>
<td>15-Sep-08</td>
<td>Legacy issue needs resolution. Issued in 2008, bond increase required 2007, bond cancellation received 2011.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01-0029</td>
<td>25-Apr-22</td>
<td>Permitted, were operating, Mining in advance of permit approvals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*06-NP0002</td>
<td>21-Mar-21</td>
<td>No permit, were operating. SO will remain indefinitely, no mining allowed without a permit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-0183</td>
<td>9-Aug-19</td>
<td>No Permit - Floodplain site exceeded 5 acres, in permitting since ~2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*10-0223</td>
<td>28-Jul-17</td>
<td>No Permit - First Civil Penalty for MWOP resulting in Consent Order</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-0116</td>
<td>10-Mar-22</td>
<td>No Permit, were operating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-0157</td>
<td>14-Apr-22</td>
<td>No Permit, were operating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-0011</td>
<td>14-Apr-22</td>
<td>Permitted, were operating, were discharging significant quantities of turbid stormwater to the Siuslaw River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24-0091</td>
<td>22-Apr-22</td>
<td>Permitted, were operating, are now operating in a limited area, potential impacts to Category 1 Habitat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27-0001</td>
<td>4-Feb-21</td>
<td>No Permit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*29-0040</td>
<td>11-Mar-21</td>
<td>Permitted, trespassed onto ODF land, action ongoing since ~2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34-0011</td>
<td>4-Dec-19</td>
<td>Permitted, no land use acknowledged at transfer, County reported operations to DOGAMI</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Non-Payment of Renewal Fee – Civil Penalty Fact Pattern Matrix (*as of 2/22/2023*)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Site Type ID</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
<th>Days in violation (total)</th>
<th>Late Pay History</th>
<th>Mitigating Factors, Other Considerations (status)</th>
<th>Penalty Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>32-0040</td>
<td>11/30/22</td>
<td>24 (84)</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>$24,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>20-0129</td>
<td>10/31/22</td>
<td>54 (164)</td>
<td>4/22 yr</td>
<td>~1-2 mos.</td>
<td>$54,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>02-0005</td>
<td>9/30/22</td>
<td>85 (145)</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>$85,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>36-0062</td>
<td>9/30/22</td>
<td>85 (145)</td>
<td>1/8 yr</td>
<td>&gt;60 days</td>
<td>$85,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>31-0007</td>
<td>8/31/22</td>
<td>115 (175)</td>
<td>11/13 yr</td>
<td>2-9 mos.</td>
<td>$115,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>20-0166</td>
<td>7/31/22</td>
<td>239 (299)</td>
<td>2/3 yr</td>
<td>&lt; 60 days Paid at the end of the NOV deadline the last two years</td>
<td>$239,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>17-0056</td>
<td>4/30/22</td>
<td>239 (299)</td>
<td>2/3 yr</td>
<td>2-5 mos.</td>
<td>$239,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>31-0005</td>
<td>2/28/22</td>
<td>300 (360)</td>
<td>1/3 yr</td>
<td>2-6 mos.</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>12-0074</td>
<td>10/31/21, 3/9/22</td>
<td>69 (129)</td>
<td>1/3 yr</td>
<td>2-5 yr</td>
<td>Penalty waived in 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>18-0033</td>
<td>10/31/21</td>
<td>419 (479)</td>
<td>2/3 yr</td>
<td>~3 mos.</td>
<td>$419,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>36-0062</td>
<td>9/30/21</td>
<td>85 (145)</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>$85,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>29-0074</td>
<td>9/30/21</td>
<td>53 (113)</td>
<td>1/3 yr</td>
<td>1 mo.</td>
<td>$53,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>29-0040</td>
<td>8/31/21</td>
<td>480 (540)</td>
<td>2/3 yr</td>
<td>4-13 mos.</td>
<td>$480,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>01-0111</td>
<td>7/31/21</td>
<td>511 (571)</td>
<td>0/3 yr</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>$511,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>23-0269</td>
<td>6/30/22</td>
<td>368 (428)</td>
<td>0/3 yr</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>$368,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>18-0099</td>
<td>5/31/21</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>0/3 yr</td>
<td>STILL OWE RENEWAL</td>
<td>$572,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>23-0267</td>
<td>5/31/21</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>1/3 yr</td>
<td>~9 mos.</td>
<td>$398,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>33-0082</td>
<td>9/7/21</td>
<td>39 (99)</td>
<td>0/3 yr</td>
<td>~5 mos.</td>
<td>$39,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>20-0170</td>
<td>9/21/21</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0/3 yr</td>
<td>Staff recommended reversal on extenuating circumstances</td>
<td>$53,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>25-0049</td>
<td>3/31/21</td>
<td>157 (217)</td>
<td>0/3 yr</td>
<td>~1-2 mos.</td>
<td>$157,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Board Delegated Approval Authority to State Geologist on 6/25/2021.*
ENGAGe Winter 2023

Exploration, Non-aggregate, Gas/oil, Aggregate, Geothermal

DOGAMI Permitting Timelines

Just a reminder: DOGAMI continues to experience an unprecedented volume of applications, inquiries, complaints, and compliance actions resulting in an ongoing increase in processing and response times. Thank you for your patience as we continue with our increased workload.

These are some things that you can do to help the application process along:

• Set up a pre-application meeting with our staff to discuss your permitting project and potential complications you may encounter.
• If you are amending your permit or interested in past information about a site, request a copy of the site file via a Public Records Request (PRR). Please note there may be a fee for a PRR submitted by anyone other than the current permittee.
• Submit applications that are as administratively complete and technically sound as possible to prevent or reduce necessary revisions. Contact DOGAMI staff if you have questions.

To increase efficiency of communications:

• Send detailed questions via email if possible – the more details you give, (generally) the better and faster we can get back to you or route your inquiry to the appropriate resource.
• Consolidate communications as much as possible so your questions can be answered all at once rather than via multiple calls/emails. Always include the DOGAMI Site ID# if applicable.

DOGAMI strives to process permit applications as quickly as possible to facilitate applicant/permittee compliance with Oregon law. We appreciate your patience and understanding.

Important Reminders about Permit Closures!

DOGAMI requires advanced notice before your renewal is due for closure requests. If you are not planning on renewing your permit for the next year, make sure you are giving us proper notice: EC – 30 days, OP/XP – 6 months recommended. More time is always better as we must review for compliance issues in order to close.

Operating Permit Holders – It is important to remember that reclamation is often a multi-year process. Review your reclamation plan to confirm what is required for reclamation and closure for your site. Contact the department with any questions or concerns early on to ensure a smoother process. Closing an Operating Permit is a much bigger, multi-step process than simply a closure request*. If you’re interested in closing your permit, head to our website and review the closure forms and checklists. There is even an FAQ now! *The permit must be maintained, including keeping renewals paid and current, until final site closure is approved.

Contact Us at 541-967-2039 email: mlrr.info@dogami.oregon.gov
Website: www.oregongeology.org/mlrr
Oregon Department of Geology and Mineral Industries
Mineral Land Regulation & Reclamation
229 Broadalbin St. SW, Albany, OR 97321
Meet Your DOGAMI Support Staff:

**Becky Johnson** is MLRR's Office Operations Assistant and has been with DOGAMI since 2018. While her educational background is in natural resources, GIS, and environmental sciences, her employment background is in customer service. She is most often the voice at the other end of the line when you call into our office with your questions. Becky is the main support staff in charge of annual permit renewals and administering Public Records Requests and Exclusion Certificates. She even writes this newsletter 😎😎. She's also involved in the aggregate permitting process and is the primary admin support for the chemical process mining program. Her favorite part of working for DOGAMI is making her coworkers laugh, creating connections with customers, and learning new information!

**Telicia Hixson** is MLRR's wonderful Intern. She currently attends Oregon State University where she earned a B.S. in Biology and is now working on a Professional Science Master's degree in Environmental Science, with a focus in aquatic ecology 🐟🐟. For the past several years she has been working in healthcare but decided to make a career change in 2021 to her field of study. Telicia’s duties include assisting the program with office operations and permit processing. She will also be identifying and developing a special project in support of her Professional Science Master’s Program.

**ReNeea Lofton (pronounced Ruh–Nee–Uh)** has been with DOGAMI since 2010. While her current title is Permit Coordinator, she has worn many different hats over the course of her tenure with DOGAMI. ReNeea's education is in biology with an employment background in natural resource administration and accounting. She is MLRR’s go-to for Exploration, Oil/Gas, and Geothermal permitting. ReNeea's favorite part of the job is that it marries two of her passions – protecting the environment and meeting new people! She loves having formed more positive working relationships than she can count, and the work also satisfies her obsession with details 🧐🧐.

---

**Staffing Changes: Saying Good-Bye to Cathy Cross:**

Cathy Cross has been essential to DOGAMI for the past 30 years. She was the face of the MLRR program front office and the voice at the other end of the phone for most of her tenure. Her knowledge of reclamation securities and process history was unmatched - and we miss it every day! She was an integral part of keeping many of our processes running smoothly. In October, Cathy announced that she was retiring and 2022 would be her last year with DOGAMI. In spite of the many tears shed and protests of dismay, we sincerely wish Cathy the absolute best in her retirement and hope that she never has to look at another mail merge again! We hope she comes to visit often.

*MLRR is already in the final stages of the recruitment for this position! Stay tuned for a future introduction!*

---

If you’d like to receive our newsletters via email, sign up for our listserv at: listserv.osl.state.or.us/mailman/listinfo/mlrr.newsletter
Staff Report and Memorandum

To: Chair, Vice-Chair, and members of the DOGAMI Governing Board

From: Jason McClaughry, Interim GS&S Program Manager

Date: February 21, 2023

Regarding: Agenda Item 9 – GS&S Update

Jason McClaughry, Interim GS&S Program Manager, will provide an update on the GS&S program.

Proposed Board Action: The Board will not be asked to take an action on this item.
February 22, 2023
Agenda Item 9 – GS&S Update

This is a report of Geological Survey and Services Program activities since the last presentation to the Board on December 1, 2022. Staff remain focused on working on existing projects, closing out others, and developing new project ideas and concepts to explore, within DOGAMI’s mission. Our current active grant load is 18 non-lidar grants (8 FF, 10 OF) and 7 Lidar projects. Potential grant opportunities continue to grow in the areas of: 1) landslide inventory and risk reduction; 2) post-wildfire landslide and debris flows; 3) channel migration and flood zone analysis; 4) natural hazard risk assessments; 5) earthquake hazard analysis; 6) tsunami inundation model analysis and coastal geomorphology; and 7) geologic mapping in support of groundwater and mineral resource evaluation.

Publications
Since the last board update December 1, 2022, 2 new publications have been released by the GS&S Program (Figure 1). These publications are summarized in Table 1.

Figure 1. Chart showing DOGAMI publication output since 2018.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Publication Series</th>
<th>Publication Series No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Open-File Report</td>
<td>O-23-01</td>
<td>Landslide Inventory and Risk Reduction, Wasco County, Oregon</td>
<td>2023</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Recently released DOGAMI publications**


**What’s in this report?** This study evaluates new tsunami modeling results completed for both distant and local tsunamis for the Umpqua River estuary. The goal is to examine the interaction of tsunamis with fluctuating (dynamic) tides (as opposed to modeling using a fixed tidal elevation such as mean higher high water), average riverine flow, and friction to provide an improved understanding of tsunami effects along the river and in the Ports of Winchester Bay and Reedsport. These data are then used to develop maritime tsunami guidance to assist all vessels operating offshore of the mouth of the Umpqua River and within the estuary.

**Figure 2.** Location map of the Umpqua River Estuary showing key place names and model domain.
Landslide Inventory and Risk Reduction of the North and Central Portions of Wasco County, Oregon, by William J. Burns, Nancy Calhoun, Jon Franczyk, Jason D. McClaughry, and Katherine Daniel (Figure 3).
https://www.oregongeology.org/pubs/ofr/O-23-02/p-O-23-02.htm

What’s in this report? Landslides are common throughout Oregon due to the combination of high precipitation, steep slopes, landslide-prone geologic units, and frequent earthquakes. In June 2020, the Oregon Department of Geology and Mineral Industries (DOGAMI) received a grant from the Federal Emergency Management agency (FEMA) through the Risk MAP program as a Cooperating Technical Partner (CTP) (Cooperative Agreement EMS-2020-CA-00010) to perform regional landslide inventory mapping of the north and central portions of Wasco County, Oregon. A share of this funding was passed through to Wasco County Planning and Oregon Department of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD) to work on risk reduction activities. The purpose of this project was to provide detailed information about the landslide hazards in this area and perform continued landslide risk reduction.

Figure 3. Map of Wasco and neighboring counties in north-central Oregon and the project area (outlined in red).
Upcoming 2023 DOGAMI publications

- Geologic Map of the Mill Creek Area, Hood River and Wasco Counties, McClaughry, GMS 128.
- Geologic Map of the Athena Quadrangle, Umatilla County, McClaughry, GMS 129.
- Geologic Map of the Milton Freewater and Bowlus Hill Quadrangles, Umatilla County, McClaughry, GMS 130.
- Tillamook County Multi-Hazard Risk Assessment, Williams, OFR.
- Bandon Beat the Wave, Gabel, OFR
- Benton Co. Multi-Hazard Risk Assessment
- Cottage Grove Multi-Hazard Risk Assessment,
- Statewide Building Footprints update https://www.oregongeology.org/pubs/dds/p-SBFO-1.htm
- HAZVU updates https://www.oregongeology.org/hazvu/index.htm

Grants

The following grant opportunities have been received or are in the process of being developed. They support DOGAMI’s mission to provide earth science information to make Oregon safe and prosperous.

Grants received

1. **Ecola State Park Multi-hazard Risk Assessment ($124,910.00, Other Funds)**
   - Fulfills goals for *Key Performance Measure 1 – Hazard and Risk Assessment Completion*
   - Focus Areas: Lidar collection, landslide hazard mapping, and coastal assessment of Ecola State Park.
   - Project period 2023-2025
   - *Funded and IAA with State Parks completed.* Award funds lidar collection and data analysis.

2. **DLCD Multi-hazard Risk Assessments ($120,560.00, Other Funds)**
   - Fulfills goals for *Key Performance Measure 1 – Hazard and Risk Assessment Completion*
   - Focus Areas: Douglas, Linn, and Polk Counties
   - Project period 2023-May 31, 2024.
   - *Funded and IAA with DLCD completed.* Polk - $32,744.00, Linn - $44,593.00, Douglas - $43,223.

Grant applications (pending decision or in process)

3. **RDPO Regional Disaster Preparedness Organization (RDPO)**
   - Fulfills goals for *Key Performance Measure 1 – Hazard and Risk Assessment Completion*
   - Grant application submitted requesting $81,491.00 (Other Funds)
   - Focus Areas: The project will assist the Regional Disaster Preparedness Organization, Washington County, and Columbia County in understanding the landslide hazard which threatens their portions of the Portland Region. The scope of work we propose is aimed at regional landslide inventory mapping.
   - Project period 2023 through 2024
   - *Proposal submitted October 24, 2022, waiting for funding decision.*

   - Grant application submitted requesting $66,301.00 (Federal Funds). Total project with match $132,603.00
• Focus Areas: This grant proposes to fund a project to scan, archive, and make publicly available historic scanned assay reports, mine maps, Oregon Bureau of Mines and Geology files, and historic Agency photographs.
• Project period June 1, 2023 to May 31, 2024
• Proposal submitted October 12, 2022, waiting for funding decision.

   • Fulfills goals for *Key Performance Measure 2 – Geologic Map Completion*
   • Grant application submitted requesting $500,000.00 (Federal Funds). Total project with match $1,000,000.00
   • Focus Areas: Geologic mapping in Umatilla and Harney Counties to support ongoing concerns about water scarcity, to investigate mineral resource potential, and to better understand geologic hazards.
   • Project period June 1, 2023 to May 31, 2024
   • Proposal submitted January 12, 2023, waiting for funding decision.

   • Fulfills goals for *Key Performance Measure 2 – Geologic Map Completion*
   • Grant application submitted requesting $330,000.00 (Federal Funds). A match is not required; DOGAMI will contribute $179,646.00 in staff time, supplies, and equipment for a total project $509,646.00.
   • Focus Areas: Advanced geologic mapping and mineral resource evaluation (lithium) of the northern sector of the McDermitt caldera, Malheur County, southeastern Oregon.
   • Project period June 1, 2023 to May 31, 2026

7. **Proposal to the National Tsunami Hazard Mitigation Program (NTHMP) ($501,664 Federal Funds)**
   • Fulfills goals for *Key Performance Measure 1 – Hazard and Risk Assessment Completion*
   • Focus Areas: Supports existing staff conducting outreach related activities with DOGAMI staff collaborating with OEM and local communities; support for undertaking periodic updated to the Oregon tsunami clearinghouse; refine our tsunami evacuation road routing capabilities for Oregon communities; complete “Beat the Wave” tsunami evacuation brochures for coastal communities in Lincoln and Coos County; undertake new probabilistic tsunami inundation modeling for the northern Oregon coast; update the tsunami maritime evacuation map brochure developed for ports and harbors; evaluate the locations and number of vertical evacuation structures (VES) and or types of route improvement needed to mitigate loss of life in select Oregon coastal communities; provide support for a hosting an Oregon coast tsunami workshop for emergency managers, first responders and community leaders; provide support to attend a training exercise at the Tsunami Warning Center in Palmer, Alaska.
   • This grant does not require a funding match and can charge a full indirect rate.
   • Next step, seek legislative approval, prepare proposal, proposal submitted May, 2023.
   • Project period September 1, 2023 to August 31, 2024.

8. **FEMA Cooperating Technical Partners (CTP) proposals (~$1,016,880.00)**
   • Fulfills goals for *Key Performance Measure 1 – Hazard and Risk Assessment Completion*
• Focus Areas: Supports existing staff conducting projects including: Clackamas County Vulnerability Assessment, Clatsop County Geohazard Mapping, Coos County Geohazard Mapping, Jackson County Geohazard Mapping, Outreach and Community Engagement related to geologic mapping and water scarcity.
• This grant program does not require a funding match and can charge a full indirect rate.
• Next step, seek legislative approval, prepare proposals, proposals submitted May, 2023.
• Project period October 1, 2023 to 2026.

9. Department of Energy Carbon Sequestration Grant ($343,802 Federal Funds)
• Washington Geological Survey (WGS), with assistance from the Oregon Department of Geology and Mineral Industries (DOGAMI) will lead investigations to greatly increase knowledge of earth resources in the Columbia Basin. Research will identify favorable storage reservoirs for carbon in the Columbia River Basalt Group (CRBG) in Washington and Oregon—the largest by-volume and accessible flood basalt region in the United States. A pilot carbon sequestration project in Wallula, Washington State has already shown that deep and permanent underground storage of carbon dioxide is possible in the CRBG. The work of WGS and DOGAMI will expand on and apply those results to larger regions to prepare for possible commercial-scale projects. The goal of this project is to engage industry, national labs, colleges and universities, and government agencies on the opportunities and challenges related to carbon storage in the Columbia Basin. The project expects to expand collaborations to achieve broader climate resilience goals in the Pacific Northwest by providing important decision support tools to the public. Along the way, the team will connect carbon storage opportunities to communities that are overburdened, impacted, and vulnerable to climate change and foster the clean energy transition.
• Grant application submitted by WGS. DOGAMI is a subrecipient.
$1,000,000 federal with $250,000 non-federal cost share
WGS-prime: $656,198 federal with $180,000 non-federal cost share
DOGAMI-sub: $343,802 federal with $70,000 non-federal cost share
• Focus Areas: This project will focus on the Canoe Ridge and Horse Heaven Hills of Klickitat and Benton Counties, Washington, and Morrow and Umatilla Counties, Oregon,
• Project period June 1, 2023 to September 30, 2025

10. U.S. Geological Survey 3D Elevation Program (3DEP)
• Fulfill goals for Key Performance Measure 3 – Lidar Data Completion
• Proposal to acquire 3DEP compliant LiDAR data in the Willamette Valley covering 7,081 sq. miles and in Deschutes County for 6,741 sq. miles. Proposal submitted November 28, 2022. USGS requested revisions to the original proposal. A revised proposal is being prepared and will be submitted no later than June 1, 2023.

Staffing

Two positions have been filled in GS&S since the last board update December 1, 2022. Dr. Lalo Guerrero has joined DOGAMI as a Natural Resource Specialist 4, Geology Hazards Specialist; Dr. Michael Darin will join the agency as a limited duration Natural Resource Specialist 4, Eastern Oregon Regional Geologist (backfill for staff rotation to Program Manager) beginning March 13th. With the completion of these recruitments GS&S is fully staffed.
Outreach

GS&S continues to be active in many project and non-project outreach activities. One current focus of GS&S outreach is with the Oregon Paleo Lands Institute (OPLI), located in the town of Fossil in Wheeler County (Figure 4). OPLI is a non-profit community organization whose mission is to promote geoscientific education and build social and economic vitality within the gateway communities of the John Day Fossil Beds National Monument. They are sited around the Wheeler High School fossil beds, a publicly accessible dig site, where unique plant fossils from about 25 million years ago can be collected. To support the continuation of OPLI in Fossil, GS&S is collaborating with a Paleontologist from the University of Oregon to develop a community outreach plan. The plan will encompass stakeholder analysis and a community survey, examine public participation in research, and community relationship building. The ultimate goal of the outreach plan is to continue to provide opportunities for student education, enhance the visitor experience, and collect scientific data toward a better understanding of the geology of this part of Oregon.

Figure 4. The Oregon Paleo Lands Institute in Fossil, Oregon
GS&S Program Focus Area: Tsunami and Coastal Erosion Mapping Program

Geologic Survey and Services

Coastal Hazards Program:
The Coastal Hazards Team of the Oregon Department of Geology and Mineral Industries (DOGAMI) has two core focus areas: 1) tsunami modeling, inundation mapping and needed outreach to Oregonians and coastal visitors on tsunami risk, awareness, and response planning; and 2) coastal erosion mapping, coastal flood inundation modeling, and assessing the impacts of extreme storms, sea level rise, and climate change impacts along the Oregon coast. First-generation tsunami mapping initiated by DOGAMI staff in the 1990s resulted in the 1995 adoption of a first-in-the-nation statewide tsunami regulatory line (SB 379), focused on limiting new critical facility development (schools, fire stations, emergency operations centers etc.) within the tsunami zone.

In 2009, DOGAMI obtained a multi-million-dollar grant from NOAA’s National Tsunami Mitigation Program (NTHMP) with the goal of improving tsunami inundation mapping for the Oregon coast. These second-generation tsunami evacuation maps are now readily available for the entire coast. Since 2013, work has focused on tsunami evacuation and maritime modeling, and risk assessments to examine evacuation potential in every community, develop response guidance for ports, harbors and maritime communities (US Coast Guard, commercial and recreational fishing fleets, and the US Navy), and understand the potential impacts of a tsunami on the state of Oregon (i.e., fatalities, injuries, building losses, debris generation).

Funding:
The National Tsunami Hazard Mitigation Program (NTHMP) of NOAA’s National Weather Service (NWS). Since 2003, Oregon has received $8,585,753 in Federal Funds.

NOAA’s Integrated Ocean Observing System (IOOS) via the Northwest Association of Networked Ocean Observing Systems (NANOOS). DOGAMI maintains the Oregon Beach and Shoreline Mapping and Analysis Program (OBSMAP) funded by NANOOS. Oregon has received $788,700

Other funding entities. DLCD, ODOT, OPRD, Geospatial Enterprise Office (GEO), Oregon Sea Grant, Tillamook County, City of Cannon Beach, City of Waldport, USACE, FEMA, USFWS, and NOAA’s Sectoral Applications Research Program (SARP).

Stakeholders and Partners:
Primary stakeholders are the people of Oregon and those non-resident visitors that visit the coast. State partners are DLCD, OEM, ODOT, OPRD, DEQ, and ODFW, as well as local governments (cities, counties, and Tribal Governments). DOGAMI also collaborates with federal agencies including NOAA, USGS, FEMA, USACE, FHA, USFWS and academic institutions such as Oregon State University, the University of Oregon, and the University of Washington.

Looking Forward:
Oregon coastal communities are increasingly under threat from a variety of natural hazards, including coastal erosion, coastal flooding, sea level rise, landslides, earthquakes, and potentially catastrophic tsunamis generated by the Cascadia subduction zone. DOGAMI’s coastal field office with proximity to community stakeholders places us in a unique position to respond to local needs. Our vision is for coastal residents and visitors to be fully prepared for and resilient to Cascadia Subduction Zone induced tsunamis.
Staff Report and Memorandum

To: Chair, Vice-Chair, and members of the DOGAMI Governing Board
From: Ruarri Day-Stirrat, Director & State Geologist
Date: February 21, 2023

Regarding: Agenda Item 10 – Director’s Report

Director Day-Stirrat will deliver his report on the following topics:

1) Agency Update
2) Federal Funding
3) Carbon Sequestration

Proposed Board Action: The Board will not be asked to take an action on this item.