

GOALS AND PERFORMANCE MEASURES

Department Goal: Promote the health, safety, and welfare of domestic animals and of the general public.						
Communitywide Result Link: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Safe <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Healthy <input type="checkbox"/> Livable <input type="checkbox"/> Prosperous <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Well-Governed Community						
1. Performance Measure: Average response time to priority service calls.						
11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Actual Results	13-14 Actual Results	14-15 Actual Results	15-16 Adopted	15-16 Actual Results	16-17 Target
20 minutes	22 minutes	18 minutes	17 minutes	19 minutes	12 minutes	19 minutes
<p>What: This measure tracks the average amount of time in minutes between when a priority service call (e.g. loose aggressive animals, injured/ill animals at large, law enforcement assistance, etc.) is dispatched to an officer and their arrival on scene. Priority calls are defined as those involving immediate danger or risk to a person (Priority 1), immediate risk or suffering of an animal (Priority 2), and other calls of a general urgency such as assistance requests from other public safety agencies (Priority 3).</p> <p>Why: Animal Services' average response time to priority service calls is a direct measurement of our ability to promptly address critical situations in which animals present a threat to the public safety or in which domestic animals are in immediate need of assistance.</p> <p>How are we doing? The average response time of 12 minutes for 29 high priority calls from July 1, 2015 through June 30, 2016 exceeds the adopted average response time of 19 minutes. The FY 2016-17 target was set at 19 minutes, but, based on the average results over the past three years the result will likely be less. Correlated comparison data from other jurisdictions is not available for this performance measure.</p>						
2. Performance Measure: Percentage of countywide dog population that is licensed.						
11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Actual Results	13-14 Actual Results	14-15 Actual Results	15-16 Adopted	15-16 Actual Results	16-17 Target
34%	37%	39%	39%	38%	38%	39%
<p>What: This measure compares the actual number of licensed dogs in the County of San Luis Obispo to total dog population based on US Census Bureau county population figures entered into the American Veterinary Medical Association (AVMA) pet ownership calculator. (https://www.avma.org/KB/Resources/Statistics/Pages/US-pet-ownership-calculator.aspx?PF=1)</p> <p>Why: Dog licensing is required by ordinance, protects the public by ensuring all licensed dogs are vaccinated for rabies, and helps reunite animals with their owners when lost. Revenue generated through licensing fees also helps offset costs incurred by the County and contracting cities as a result of having to provide services related to community-wide impacts of pet ownership.</p> <p>How are we doing? The average percentage of dogs licensed throughout FY 2015-16 compared to the estimated total dog population for the County was 38% (24,094 / 62,686) and on target with the adopted levels. The FY 2016-17 target of 39% (using a county population rate of 279,083 and estimated licenses of 24,250) resulted in licensing rates that will remain relatively consistent with the current and previous year levels at 39%.</p> <p>In comparison, licensing rates calculated using the same methodology above for other comparable counties is: Contra Costa – 28%, Santa Barbara – 34%, Santa Clara – 17%, Ventura – 45%, Kern – 17%, and Monterey – 13%. (http://www.cdph.ca.gov/HealthInfo/discond/Pages/LocalRabiesControlActivities.aspx).</p>						
3. Performance Measure: Live animal outcome rate.						
11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Actual Results	13-14 Actual Results	14-15 Actual Results	15-16 Adopted	15-16 Actual Results	16-17 Target
81%	80%	89%	91%	87%	93%	90%
<p>What: The percentage of animals discharged from Animal Services' shelter alive. The Live Animal Outcome Rate quantifies the proportion of sheltered animals which experience a positive discharge result (such as return to owner, adoption, or rescue) versus those with negative discharge types (eg. Euthanasia, escape, or died in kennel)</p> <p>Why: This measure reflects Animal Services' success in achieving a humane outcome for impounded animals through reunification (reuniting lost pets with their owners) and in placing adoptable animals into new homes.</p>						

How are we doing? Data from FY 2015-16 reports a live outcome rate of 93% (3,008 live outcomes versus a total of 3,253 total outcomes). More specifically, dogs experienced a live outcome rate of 93% during FY 2015-16, and the rate for cats during the same period was 92%. This favorable trend is attributed to the combined impact of a generally lower animal intake rate coupled with the positive effects of the shelter-neuter-return (SNR) program implemented by Animal Services in cooperation with local animal rescue groups. Through this program, health community cats are altered and then returned to the areas from which they originated, thereby reducing pet overpopulation rates while also avoiding an unnecessary cycle of cat impounds and euthanasians. Animal Services will continue the program and expects its efforts will result in maintaining a successful live outcome targeted rate of 90% for FY 2016-17.

For reference, the last live animal outcome rates published by the State of California Rabies Control (2014) reflect results for the following California counties during calendar year 2014: Contra Costa – 69%, Santa Barbara – 82%, Santa Clara – 68%, Ventura – 91%, Kern – 43%, and Monterey – 46% (<http://www.cdph.ca.gov/HealthInfo/discond/Pages/LocalRabiesControlActivities.aspx>).

4. Performance Measure: Percentage of customer survey respondents who rated their overall contact and exposure to Animal Services as “satisfactory” or “excellent.”

11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Actual Results	13-14 Actual Results	14-15 Actual Results	15-16 Adopted	15-16 Actual Results	16-17 Target
88%	96%	96%	Data not available	100%	81%	100%

What: Animal Services distributes random quarterly mailings of customer service satisfaction surveys to approximately 300 members of the public having had contact with the Division’s field services, shelter, or administrative operations. This rating reflects the number of respondents scoring their overall experience as being “satisfactory” or “excellent”.

Why: It is our goal to consistently provide quality service to the county’s citizens, promote public health and welfare, and ensure our facility is safe and clean. This survey assists Animal Services in identifying areas for improvement or those of particular success.

How are we doing? Of the customer surveys received, Animal Services had a satisfactory or excellent service rating of 81% from respondents in FY 2015-16. Overall, the small sample size (37 responses from nearly 300 surveys mailed out) was lower than received in previous years. The Division will analyze the potential for other methods of surveying, in addition to the current method of mailing customer surveys, to increase survey participation. The Division remains committed to a high level of service and will continue to monitor survey feedback as a means of improving client services. Reflective of that commitment, Animal Services is projecting a satisfaction rate of 100% for FY 2016-17. While a 100% satisfaction rate may not be achievable, this target aligns consistently with Division’s effort to remain responsive to community needs.

Correlated comparison data from other jurisdictions is not available for this performance measure.

5. Performance Measure: Kennel operation expenditures per animal kennel day.

11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Actual Results	13-14 Actual Results	14-15 Actual Results	15-16 Adopted	15-16 Actual Results	16-17 Target
\$9.10	\$10.63	\$13.67	\$11.16	\$17.81	\$13.75	\$19.97

What: This measure tracks the total kennel operation costs divided by total “animal kennel days of care.”

Why: Monitoring and promotion of cost effective kenneling functions encourages responsible fiscal management of shelter operations.

How are we doing? Based upon expenses and length of stay for animals for FY 2015-16, Animal Services cost per kennel day was substantially below adopted levels for FY 2015-16. This reduction was the result of salary savings resulting from position vacancies in kennel staffing along with a modest decrease in day stay rates compared to previous reporting periods (62,339 days compared to the three-year average of 63,380). Animal Services is projecting a target of \$19.97 for FY 2016-17 to reflect updated kennel operation costs of \$1,266,000 against a projection of 63,380 days (based on a three-year average of kennel day stays).

Correlated comparison data from other jurisdictions is not available for this performance measure.

GOALS AND PERFORMANCE MEASURES

The San Luis Obispo County Department of Child Support Services is exclusively funded by the State Department of Child Support Services, which is under the umbrella of the Federal Office of Child Support Enforcement. Each year, the State must report statewide rankings of Child Support departments based on five Federal performance measures. For the last Federal fiscal year (FFY), the County's DCSS ranked number one in the state. The reporting period for the five measures runs from October 1 through September 30 of the following year, a Federal fiscal year (FFY). The current status and comparison, from FY 2013-14 to FY 2014-15, of each performance measure has been noted, however, the actual published results for FFY 15-16 will not be made available until after February 2017.

<p>Department Goal: To ensure that children receive the support benefits they are entitled to as quickly as possible.</p> <p>Communitywide Result Link: <input type="checkbox"/> Safe <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Healthy <input type="checkbox"/> Livable <input type="checkbox"/> Prosperous <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Well-Governed Community</p>						
<p>1. Performance Measure: Percentage of child support cases with a court order for child support.</p>						
11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Actual Results	13-14 Actual Results	14-15 Actual Results	15-16 Adopted	15-16 Actual Results	16-17 Target
95.3%	97.4%	96.9%	96.7%	96.9%	Not Available Until early 2017	96.7%
<p>What: Support orders are the legal documents which establish child and medical support. These orders establish how much the absent parent should pay for the support of the children and what obligations the parent has to provide medical support.</p> <p>Why: Establishment of support orders defines the financial and medical obligation of the absent parent and provides a legal basis for enforcement.</p> <p>How are we doing? In FFY 2014-15, 96.7% (3,714 of 3,839) of our cases had a court order for support. San Luis Obispo County ranked among the top two counties in the state for percent of child support cases with a court order established. The statewide average is 89.4%. In comparison to the percentage of established court orders by June 30, 2015 at 96.1%, there were 95.8% established by June 30, 2016, a slight decrease from the previous year. Actual published results for FFY 2015-16 will not be made available until after February 2017.</p>						
<p>Department Goal: To improve the standard of living for families we serve by ensuring a high percentage of current child support collections.</p> <p>Communitywide Result Link: <input type="checkbox"/> Safe <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Healthy <input type="checkbox"/> Livable <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Prosperous <input type="checkbox"/> Well-Governed Community</p>						
<p>2. Performance Measure: Percentage of current support collected.</p>						
11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Actual Results	13-14 Actual Results	14-15 Actual Results	15-16 Adopted	15-16 Actual Results	16-17 Target
75.2%	77.8%	78.9 %	78.4%	78.9%	Not Available Until early 2017	78.9%
<p>What: This is the monthly court ordered amount paid by the absent parent compared to monthly court ordered amount owed by the absent parent. This reflects the total amount of current support collected by our department over the course of the FFY.</p> <p>Why: To ensure children receive the financial support to which they are legally entitled.</p> <p>How are we doing? In FFY 2014-15, the department collected 78.4% (\$11,046,733 of \$14,085,488) of current support owed. San Luis Obispo County ranked among the top two counties in the state for collection of current support. The statewide average is 66.5%. The total percentage of current support collected on of June 30, 2015 was 78.2%, compared to this year on June 30, 2016, collections of current support were at 79%, increase by 8/10 of a percent. Actual published results for FFY 2015-16 will not be made available until after February 2017.</p>						

3. Performance Measure: Percentage of child support cases in which past due support is owed and payment is received during the Federal Fiscal Year.

11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Actual Results	13-14 Actual Results	14-15 Actual Results	15-16 Adopted	15-16 Actual Results	16-17 Target
77.1%	79.5%	81.9%	82.1%	81.9%	Not Available Until early 2017	82.2%

What: When the monthly court order amount is not paid, it becomes past due support. This measures the number of cases in which a collection of past due support was received during the Federal Fiscal Year.

Why: To ensure children receive the financial support to which they are legally entitled.

How are we doing? In FFY 2014-15, payment of past due support was collected in 82.1% (2,674 of 3,256) of cases in which past due support was owed. This performance represents a record high for the department. San Luis Obispo County ranked 1st in the state in collection of payment for past due support. The statewide average is 66.2%. Caseworkers utilize a report which target cases that owe arrears and have not paid during the FFY. They solicit and assist the absent parent with making payment by phone or on-line. The total percentage of past due support collected on of June 30, 2015 was 78.9%, compared to this year on June 30, 2016 collections of past due support were at 79.6%, up by 7/10 of a percent. Actual published results for FFY 2015-16 will not be made available until after February 2017.

4. Performance Measure: Maintain a customer satisfaction rating of 4.5 or better.

(This measure is being added in FY 2016-17.)

11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Actual Results	13-14 Actual Results	14-15 Actual Results	15-16 Adopted	15-16 Actual Results	16-17 Target
New Measure	New Measure	New Measure	New Measure	New Measure	4.0	4.5

What: The State Department of Child Support Services implemented a statewide survey on November 1, 2015 where all local child support agencies were required to measure the level of customer satisfaction based in five service areas: Courtesy & Professionalism, Quality, Efficiency & Problem Solving, Timeliness and Accessibility. Each area is rated on a five point scale with 1 being extremely dissatisfied and 5 being extremely satisfied.

Why: To identify the areas of needed improvement to consistently provide the level of service to meet the needs of our community.

How are we doing? November 2015 was the first month the statewide survey was available to our customers for various interactions at the local level via office visits, telephone interactions and court proceedings. A total of 165 survey responses were received from customers during the period of November 2, 2015 through June 30, 2016, with an average satisfaction rating of 4.0. Participant numbers have continued to decline over the 8 month period, which in turn has had a negative effect on the average rating. Satisfied customers are less likely to repeat taking the survey and negative surveys have a larger impact on results. The results from the survey are reviewed daily for appropriate action and follow up to improve customer service.

5. Performance Measure: Total child support dollars collected per \$1.00 of total expenditure.

(This measure is being deleted in FY 2016-17.)

11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Actual Results	13-14 Actual Results	14-15 Actual Results	15-16 Adopted	15-16 Projected	16-17 Target
\$3.01	\$3.24	\$3.35	\$3.34	\$3.35	Not Available until early 2017	delete

What: This is an efficiency measure relating to the cost effectiveness of collection activities, measuring the total child support dollars collected per \$1.00 of total expenditure.

Why: To ensure that the cost collection ratio is reasonable as compared to other counties within the state.

How are we doing? Our cost effectiveness essentially remains at the FFY 2013-14 levels for FFY 2014-15. The actual results for FFY 2014-15 ended at \$3.34 collected per \$1.00 of total expenditure, compared to FFY 2013-14 at \$3.35 collected per \$1.00 of expenditure. The statewide average for FFY 2014-15 was \$2.51. In light of our focus on improving customer service, this performance measure will be deleted in FY 2016-2017.

GOALS AND PERFORMANCE MEASURES

Department Goal: Quickly respond to calls for help, in order to begin providing assistance as rapidly as possible.						
Communitywide Result Link: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Safe <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Healthy <input type="checkbox"/> Livable <input type="checkbox"/> Prosperous <input type="checkbox"/> Well-Governed Community						
1. Performance Measure: Average time elapsed from receiving a request for assistance until the <u>first</u> unit arrives on scene:						
(a) To calls in areas designated Urban.						
(b) To calls in areas designated Suburban.						
(c) To calls in areas designated Rural.						
(d) To calls in areas designated Remote.						
(e) To calls in areas designated Undeveloped.						
11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Actual Results	13-14 Actual Results	14-15 Actual Results	15-16 Adopted	15-16 Actual Results	16-17 Target
New Measure FY 13-14	New Measure FY 13-14	(a) 7 min/84% (b) 8 min/92% (c) 15 min/98% (d) 20 min/100% (e) 30 min/100%	(a) 7 min/84% (b) 8 min/89% (c) 15 min/97% (d) 20 min/98% (e) * Not available	(a) 7 min/82% (b) 8 min/90% (c) 15 min/85% (d) 20 min/80% (e) 30 min/75%	(a) 7 min/73% (b) 8 min/54% (c) 15 min/85% (d) 20 min/87% (e) 30 min/83%	(a) 7 min/90% (b) 8 min/90% (c) 15 min/85% (d) 20 min/80% (e) 30 min/75%
What: This measure evaluates the department's ability to provide assistance within acceptable time frames.						
Why: Research has shown that the longer it takes emergency responders to arrive at the scene of an emergency, the less successful they will be in rendering aid, saving lives, and protecting property and the environment.						
How are we doing? FY 2013-14 was the first year during which data was analyzed according to this performance measure, which is based on the community demographic for the location of the call. Response times were previously analyzed according to the staffing level at the responding station. Success for these performance measures is based on meeting or exceeding the performance time target, on a percentage of calls equal to or greater than the percentage target. For example, success on measure (a) for calls in areas designated Urban, requires first units to arrive within seven minutes or less, on 90% or more of calls. Response times are tracked and reported on a calendar year (CY) basis, for the calendar year ending during the fiscal year (FY) reported. FY 2015-16 projected results, therefore, are from calls in CY 2015.						
In CY 2015, data shows the department failed to meet this performance measure for calls in areas designated as Urban or Suburban, while meeting or exceeding the performance measure for calls in areas designated as Rural, Remote or Undeveloped. Performance on the first two types of calls dropped significantly compared to prior years, and the department is reviewing call data in an attempt to determine why this occurred. In spite of these declines, the department supports keeping the higher targets for FY 2016-17. Ongoing strategies employed to reduce response times include improving dispatch procedures, utilizing Mobile Data Computers and related technology, reviewing and updating maps used for dispatch, fine-tuning details of response plans, and improving communications between responders and dispatchers. The department will soon institute a system to review response times which fall below performance standard levels, in order to determine causes, and to make mid-year adjustments.						
The governing body of a local fire protection organization determines the level of fire/rescue service provided to the public; there are no mandated Federal or State service level requirements regarding response times, staffing levels and expected outcomes. There are however, recognized industry service level standards recommended to achieve successful service delivery. The performance targets listed above are consistent with existing response time standards adopted on state and national levels, and are consistent with County policy recommendations. Additional information on performance standards, and details on the community demographic for all areas of the county, can be found in the department's 2012 Strategic Plan/Service Level Analysis (Chapter 7), which is available at www.calfireslo.org . There are no results available with comparable counties for comparison.						

2. Performance Measure: Average time elapsed from receiving a request for assistance until the second unit arrives on scene:

- (a) To calls in areas designated Urban.
- (b) To calls in areas designated Suburban.
- (c) To calls in areas designated Rural.
- (d) To calls in areas designated Remote.
- (e) To calls in areas designated Undeveloped.

11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Actual Results	13-14 Actual Results	14-15 Actual Results	15-16 Adopted	15-16 Actual Results	16-17 Target
New Measure FY 13-14	New Measure FY 13-14	(a) 11 min/92% (b) 13 min/89% (c) 18 min/97% (d) 28 min/99% (e) 45 min/100%	(a) 11 min/94% (b) 13 min/78% (c) 18 min/99% (d) 28 min/100% (e) * Not available	(a) 11 min/90% (b) 13 min/90% (c) 18 min/85% (d) 28 min/80% (e) 45 min/75%	(a) 11 min/86% (b) 13 min/60% (c) 18 min/88% (d) 28 min/92% (e) 45 min/82%	(a) 11 min/90% (b) 13 min/90% (c) 18 min/85% (d) 28 min/80% (e) 45 min/75%

What: This measure evaluates the department's ability to provide assistance within acceptable time frames.

Why: Research has shown that the longer it takes emergency responders to arrive at the scene of an emergency, the less successful they will be in rendering aid, saving lives, and protecting property and the environment.

How are we doing? FY 2013-14 was the first year during which data was analyzed according to this performance measure, which is based on the community demographic for the location of the call. Response times were previously analyzed according to the staffing level at the responding station. Success for these performance measures is based on meeting or exceeding the performance time target, on a percentage of calls equal to or greater than the percentage target. For example, success on measure (a) for calls in areas designated Urban, requires second units to arrive within eleven minutes or less, on 90% or more of calls. Response times are tracked and reported on a calendar year (CY) basis, for the calendar year ending during the fiscal year (FY) reported. FY 2015-16 projected results, therefore, are from calls in CY 2015.

In CY 2015, data shows the department failed to meet this performance measure for calls in areas designated as Urban or Suburban, while exceeding the performance measure for calls in areas designated as Rural, Remote or Undeveloped. Performance on the first two types of calls dropped significantly compared to prior years, and the department is reviewing call data in an attempt to determine why this occurred. In spite of these declines, the department supports keeping the higher targets for FY 2016-17. Ongoing strategies employed to reduce response times include improving dispatch procedures, utilizing Mobile Data Computers and related technology, reviewing and updating maps used for dispatch, fine-tuning details of response plans, and improving communications between responders and dispatchers. The department will soon institute a system to review response times which fall below performance standard levels, in order to determine causes, and to make mid-year adjustments.

The governing body of a local fire protection organization determines the level of fire/rescue service provided to the public; there are no mandated Federal or State service level requirements regarding response times, staffing levels and expected outcomes. There are however, recognized industry service level standards recommended to achieve successful service delivery. The performance targets listed above are consistent with existing response time standards adopted on state and national levels, and are consistent with County policy recommendations. Additional information on performance standards, and details on the community demographic for all areas of the County, can be found in the department's 2012 Strategic Plan/Service Level Analysis (Chapter 7), which is available at www.calfireslo.org. There are no results available with comparable counties for comparison.

Department Goal: Reduce damage, injuries and deaths caused by fires and other incidents.

Communitywide Result Link: Safe Healthy Livable Prosperous Well-Governed Community

3. Performance Measure: Average dollar value, per thousand population, of all property damaged or destroyed by fire in the area protected by the department over a period of five years.

11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Actual Results	13-14 Actual Results	14-15 Actual Results	15-16 Adopted	15-16 Actual Results	16-17 Target
\$30,930	\$28,845	\$28,901	\$30,340	No more than \$30,000	\$24,350	No more than \$30,000

What: This measure evaluates the department's ability to protect property, one of its primary missions, based on a five year rolling average.

Why: Reducing property losses from fires enhances the safety and health of the community.

How are we doing? Property losses are tracked and reported on a calendar year (CY) basis, for the calendar year ending during the fiscal year (FY) reported. FY 2015-16 results, therefore, are from CY 2015. The rate of property loss reported for FY 2015-16 decreased significantly compared to the four prior years. The department's success with this measure is attributed to a number of ongoing programs, including public education, improved fire codes and code enforcement activities, fire inspections and development plan reviews, and efforts to reduce fire hazards in order to prevent fires. Success in this measure can also be attributed to the department's ability to quickly respond to fires.

Total dollar value, per thousand population, of all property damaged or destroyed by fire in the area protected by the department for FY 2015-16, was \$11,646. Each result shown is the mean dollar value of those losses (over the five year period ending with that CY). In order to compare results to nationwide data, our numbers are then converted to a number per thousand population. The five-year average of the total value divided by per thousand population for FY 2015-16 is \$24,350. This is substantially less than our goal of no more than \$30,000, however a major decrease in one year does not identify a trend. Therefore, the target for FY 2016-17 remains the same.

\$24,350 represents a decrease of 19.74% compared to FY 2014-15. Fire loss details for the year included: vehicle fires \$888,750; structure fires \$193,300; total fire losses \$1,082,050. Nationwide fire related property losses totaled \$11.6 billion in 2014, or \$35,978 per thousand population. The department's performance remains well below nationwide losses, as it has for several years.

Calculations are based on records maintained by the department's Fire Prevention Bureau and the National Fire Protection Administration. Population numbers used are for County Fire jurisdictions only. There are no results available with comparable counties for comparison.

4. Performance Measure: Average number of deaths, per ten thousand population, from fire-related causes within the area protected by the department over a period of five years.

11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Actual Results	13-14 Actual Results	14-15 Actual Results	15-16 Adopted	15-16 Actual Results	16-17 Target
0.840	0.065	0.044	0.027	0	.054	0

What: This measure evaluates the department's ability to protect lives, one of its primary missions, based on a rolling five year average.

Why: Reducing deaths caused by fires enhances the safety and health of the community.

How are we doing? Our target for this performance measure will always be zero deaths per year. Sadly, this target is rarely achieved, and we find ourselves trying to get as close to zero as possible.

There were two fire related deaths in FY 2015-16. There had not been a fire related death in County Fire jurisdictions since 2010. Fire related deaths are tracked and reported on a calendar year (CY) basis, for the calendar year ending during the fiscal year (FY) reported. FY 2015-16 results, therefore, are from CY 2015. Each result shown is the mean number of deaths over the five-year period ending with that CY. In order to compare results to nationwide data, our numbers are then converted to a number per ten thousand population. The five-year average of deaths divided by per ten thousand population for FY 2015-16 is 0.054. This number represents an increase of 97.42% compared to FY 2014-15. While this performance measure reflects a substantial increase in 2015-16, it is worth noting that this measure utilizes a five-year rolling average.

The department's efforts to reduce fire-related deaths include a number of ongoing programs, including public education, improved fire codes and code enforcement activities, fire inspections and development plan reviews, and efforts to reduce fire hazards in order to prevent fires. Any reductions in this measure can also be attributed to the department's ability to quickly respond to fires, as noted in the response time performance measures above.

Nationwide fire-related deaths totaled 3,275 in CY 2014 (the last year with data available), or 0.102 deaths per ten thousand population. Regardless of statistics and past history, even a single fire-related death is too many. The department's performance remains well below nationwide losses, as it has for several years.

Calculations are based on records maintained by the department's Fire Prevention Bureau and the National Fire Protection Administration. Population numbers used are for County Fire jurisdictions only. There are no results available with comparable counties for comparison.

Department Goal: Manage the Department efficiently, cost-effectively, and responsibly.

Communitywide Result Link: Safe Healthy Livable Prosperous Well-Governed Community

5. Performance Measure: Number of full-time emergency responders per thousand population.

11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Actual Results	13-14 Actual Results	14-15 Actual Results	15-16 Adopted	15-16 Actual Results	16-17 Target
0.80	0.90	0.88	0.88	0.90	.86	0.90

What: This measure evaluates the number of emergency responders employed by the department.

Why: The number of emergency responders per thousand population is useful when evaluating two questions. First, do we have enough emergency responders to successfully deliver services to the community. Second, are our emergency responders being utilized as efficiently as possible, in order to keep labor costs as low as possible.

How are we doing? For FY 2015-16, the department utilized 79 full-time equivalent emergency responders, for a rate of 0.86 per thousand population. This is 4% (.04 FTE/thousand) less than the FY 2015-16 target. The population used to calculate the rate per thousand is in the unincorporated area of the county protected by County Fire. This excludes the communities of Templeton, Cambria, San Miguel, Santa Margarita and Cayucos as they have their own fire departments. This population information is obtained at the State Department of Finance website www.dof.ca.gov. Nationally recognized standards identify 1.0 to 1.5 firefighters per thousand population as the optimum staffing level for a community such as ours. In 2015, the National Fire Protection Association estimated that nationally there were 1.07 career firefighters per thousand population. For the coming year, the target remains at 0.90, which is in line with prior years and which is consistent with increased staffing at Shandon Station 51 beginning in FY 2014-15, and with increased staffing at Cambria Station 10 beginning in FY 2015-16. We will continue to re-evaluate this target in order to ensure the department is able to comply with increasing national training and service delivery standards and with local increases in service requests. There are no results available with comparable counties for comparison.

6. Performance Measure: Annual cost of department operations, on a per resident basis.

11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Actual Results	13-14 Actual Results	14-15 Actual Results	15-16 Adopted	15-16 Actual Results	16-17 Target
\$161.85	\$163.65	\$165.49	\$170.54	No more than \$178.00	\$180.08	No more than \$213.00

What: This measure evaluates what it costs the department to operate, in terms of total operating cost, on a per resident basis. The number of residents is calculated for County Fire jurisdictions only. Capital Outlay is not considered an operating expenditure and has not been included. Costs that have been offset with revenue sources (grants, etc.) have also been excluded.

Why: Controlling operating costs is an important factor in the department's efforts to manage the department efficiently and cost-effectively.

How are we doing? The department's operating costs have steadily increased every year since FY 2009-10, with a jump in costs in our FY 2014-15 actual and FY 2015-16 projected amounts. For FY 2014-15, the target was increased to \$175.00 per capita, based on the expectation of minor cost increases. Actual expenses for FY 2014-15 were \$170.54 per capita, an increase of 4.4 percentage points over the FY 2013-14 actual amount. This increase was the result of changes to the compensation rates charged by Cal Fire, the State agency that provides fire service to the county under contract.

Actual expenses for FY 2015-16 were \$180.08 per capita, an increase of \$9.54 or 5.6 percentage points over FY 2014-15 actual expenses. The primary factor in this change came about because the increases in FY 2015-16 were in effect for the full year, instead of the six months they were in effect during FY 2014-15. We anticipate an additional salary increase will occur in FY 16-17, when the state minimum wage is set to increase again. In anticipation of that increase, the target for FY 2016-17 has been increased to \$213.00 per capita. There are no results available with comparable counties for comparison.

7. Performance Measure: Portion of the cost of department operations which is paid for with non-General Fund support dollars.

11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Actual Results	13-14 Actual Results	14-15 Actual Results	15-16 Adopted	15-16 Actual Results	16-17 Target
33%	34%	33%	30%	No less than 35%	31%	No less than 35%

What: This measure evaluates the department's ability to fund operations from sources other than the General Fund.

Why: The department is committed to fulfilling its mission in an efficient and cost-effective manner, providing maximum value per tax dollar. This is more important than ever during the current economically challenging times.

How are we doing? The department consistently brings in revenues that offset 30% to 35% of its expenditure budget, which would otherwise be funded by the General Fund. For FY 2015-16, department revenue is \$6,951,783, which results in a rate of 31% which is an increase over FY 2014-15 Actual Revenue. Revenues and expenditures from specially-funded programs, such as additional staffing at Carrizo Plain Station 42, are excluded from these calculations. While these programs do produce revenue and offsetting expenditures, they are not part of the department's General Fund budget. Revenues come from many sources, but are primarily from grants and reimbursements for firefighting activities paid by other government agencies. Specific types and amounts of revenues are subject to significant change from year to year. It should be noted that achieving this target in future years will only be possible if Federal and State monies remain available for grant programs and fire-fighting cost reimbursements, which is not guaranteed. There are no results available with comparable counties for comparison.

GOALS AND PERFORMANCE MEASURES

Department Goal: To promote public safety through the efficient and appropriate use of investigations and criminal sanctions so as to deter criminal activity, protect society and punish criminal conduct.

Communitywide Result Link: Safe Healthy Livable Prosperous Well-Governed Community

1. Performance Measure: Crime rate for state and local law enforcement agencies that serve county populations over 100,000 in the State of California.

11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Actual Results	13-14 Actual Results	14-15 Actual Results	15-16 Adopted	15-16 Actual Results	16-17 Target
Crime rate lower than 80% of counties statewide serving populations of 100,000 or more (2011)	Crime rate lower than 74% of counties statewide serving populations of 100,000 or more (2012)	Crime rate lower than 69% of counties statewide serving populations of 100,000 or more (2013)	Crime rate lower than 69% of counties statewide serving populations of 100,000 or more (2014)	Crime rate lower than 73% of counties statewide serving populations of 100,000 or more (2015)	Crime rate lower than 69% of counties statewide serving populations of 100,000 or more (2015)	Crime rate lower than 73% of counties statewide serving populations of 100,000 or more (2016)

What: This measure tracks the number of serious crimes reported each year to all law enforcement agencies in counties within the State of California with a population of 100,000 or more, inclusive of both incorporated and unincorporated areas.

* Beginning FY 2011-12 the data source for this performance measure changed. The previous source, *Preliminary Report-Crime in Selected California Jurisdictions*, was replaced by *California Criminal Justice Profile Statewide and by County*, both produced annually by the California Department of Justice. As advised by the California Department of Justice (DOJ) on November 20, 2012, due to staffing and budgetary constraints, *Preliminary Report-Crime in Selected California Jurisdictions* will no longer be published. (Last data release for this report was calendar year 2010.)

Why: This compares the number of serious violent (homicide, forcible rape, robbery and aggravated assault), property (burglary and motor vehicle theft) and arson offenses in the incorporated and unincorporated areas of those counties with a total population of 100,000 or more. Inclusive data for statewide comparisons as opposed to benchmark counties is the most accurate way to capture countywide law enforcement reporting data.

How are we doing? Calendar year 2015 statistical crime data was released by the State of California Department of Justice Office of the Attorney General in July 2016. These recent DOJ statistics reported for calendar year 2015 based upon expanded reporting criteria reflect that of the 35 counties in the State of California with a population of 100,000 or more, San Luis Obispo County ranked eleventh (lower crime rate than 69% of counties statewide), with a total of 1,114.7 serious violent, property, and arson offenses per 100,000 population. This figure is lower than the statewide rate of 1,387.1 per 100,000 population. As a point of reference, San Luis Obispo County ranked seventh among 35 counties in years 2010 and 2011, ninth in 2012, eleventh in 2013 and 2014, and has consistently ranked below the statewide average in years 2008 through 2015.

Department Goal: To maximize the efficient use of criminal justice system resources by promptly and effectively handling cases.

Communitywide Result Link: Safe Healthy Livable Prosperous Well-Governed Community

2. Performance Measure: Percentage of misdemeanor cases brought to final disposition within 90 days of arraignment.

11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Actual Results	13-14 Actual Results	14-15 Actual Results	15-16 Adopted	15-16 Actual Results	16-17 Target
93.5%	94.5%	Data Unavailable	Data Unavailable	93%	83.9%	Pending data

What: The percentage of the approximately 15,000 annual misdemeanor criminal cases which are brought to a final disposition within 90 days of arraignment as tracked by the "90-day case aging" report generated by the District Attorney's Office and the Court.

Why: To determine prosecution efficiency.

How are we doing? The 90-day case aging report includes all misdemeanor cases handled by this office to provide for a more complete accounting of disposition rates.

Following the District Attorney's Office's implementation of the Karpel case management system (CMS) in November 2013, the capturing and reporting of case handling data had been difficult to achieve. While new system reports had been developed, issues remained with San Luis Obispo County Superior Court's warrant and court case update interfaces which were both necessary to establishing verifiable case aging data.

Progress this calendar year with the Superior Court's much anticipated warrant interface, installed in March 2015 and enhanced in November 2015, now captures aged cases in which warrants have been issued. The complex judgment order interface, intended to automatically update the status of charge dispositions in the District Attorney's Office Karpel case management system, has experienced several rounds of testing and necessitates further coordination with Superior Court to unify the order in which case charges are entered. With standardization estimated to be completed within the first quarter of FY 2016-17, the case disposition update function may then be fully implemented and allow for immediate case disposition results.

FY 2015-16 projected and FY 2016-17 target performance projections were previously unavailable due to delays in obtaining verifiable data. FY-end 2015-16 data captured in July 2016, taking into consideration the lack of an operational automated judgment exchange and requiring manual case disposition entry by District Attorney legal clerk staff, reflects a 90-day case aging percentage of 83.9%. While results in previous years was significantly improved, future disposition rates are expected to increase as manual data entry lags will be eliminated with integration of the judgment exchange. San Luis Obispo County Superior Court's reorganization in late 2014 and the implementation of designated arraignment/early disposition program court, as well as the District Attorney's successful Misdemeanor Diversion Program (MDP) are all expected to have a positive impact on results once the remaining judgment interface integration is complete and more accurate aged data becomes available.

Department Goal: Continue to enhance law enforcement collaborative investigation efforts and communications.

Communitywide Result Link: Safe Healthy Livable Prosperous Well-Governed Community

3. Performance Measure: Number of established cooperative efforts and standardized communication methods with law enforcement.

(This measure is being deleted in FY 2016-17)

11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Actual Results	13-14 Actual Results	14-15 Actual Results	15-16 Adopted	15-16 Actual Results	16-17 Target
19	23	26	31	28	31	deleted

What: Pooling of investigative resources between and among agencies provides for collaboration and countywide leadership. Additionally, cooperative efforts have produced outside law enforcement funding by way of State and Federal grants, some of which are listed below. (The Real Estate Fraud efforts additionally include collaboration with the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI), California Department of Real Estate and California Department of Corporations.)

Why: Successful multi-agency investigative cooperative efforts qualified the District Attorney for State and Federal funding. Inter-agency communications also provide opportunities to take a State leadership role in technological innovation and make for better efficiency and effectiveness in investigations.

How are we doing?

State and Federal grants and subsidies have been obtained through District Attorney and other law enforcement agency collaboration efforts involving:

1. Domestic Violence Task Force
2. First Responder Group for Elderly and Dependent Adults
3. Child Abduction Investigation Program
4. Sheriff's Special Operations Unit (gang and narcotics)
5. Environmental Enforcement Group
6. Worker's Compensation Fraud
7. Anti-Gang Coordinating Commission
8. Real Estate Scam and Fraud Exposure (RESAFE)
9. Sexual Assault (Closed) Case Review Team
10. Domestic Violence Death & Elder Death Review
11. Adult Abuse Prevention Council (AAPC)
12. Adult Services Policy Council (ASPC)
13. Cal Poly Safety Committee
14. Suspected Abuse Response Team (SART) Advisory Board
15. Forensic Coordinating Team
16. Criminal Justice Administrators Association
17. California Identification (CAL-ID) Board
18. Crime Stoppers Program
19. San Luis Obispo County Commission on Aging
20. Child Abuse Prevention Council (SLO-CAP)
21. San Luis Obispo County Behavioral Health Board
22. Children's Services Network (CSN)

- 23. Human Trafficking Task Force
- 24. School Resource Officer Team
- 25. Child Abuse Interview Team (CAIT)
- 26. California Men's Colony Citizens' Advisory Committee
- 27. Commercial Sexual Exploitation of Children (CSEC)
- 28. Community Safety Team
- 29. Central Coast Fraud Association
- 30. Batterers Intervention Program Policy Committee
- 31. California Crime Victims Assistance Association Board

The District Attorney's Office continues to work cooperatively with a number of community and law enforcement partners in an ongoing dedicated effort to protect the rights and ensure the safety of the citizens of San Luis Obispo County. Additional opportunities for lending expertise and availing resources to further community and multi-agency collaborative initiatives are, and will continue to be, ongoing and viewed as critically important for protecting and enhancing public safety.

The reported improved results over the past several years are a positive reflection of the District Attorney's Office's emphasis on increasing communication and improving coordinated inter-agency efforts. Having achieved a continuum of successful performance, both locally and when compared to comparable county interaction, this measure will be tracked internally beginning in FY 2016-17 and replaced by a different yet equally meaningful measure of the department's performance.

Department Goal: To promote a community approach to juvenile crime which blends the effective use of treatment or diversion programs with the appropriate use of criminal sanctions so as to rehabilitate the juvenile and deter criminal activity.

Communitywide Result Link: Safe Healthy Livable Prosperous Well-Governed Community

4. Performance Measure: Number of juvenile criminal prosecution petitions reviewed and filed annually.

11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Actual Results	13-14 Actual Results	14-15 Actual Results	15-16 Adopted	15-16 Actual Results	16-17 Target
658	726	298 (Data Previously Reported as Unavailable)	274 (Data Previously Reported as Unavailable)	750	257	250

What: This measures the number of new juvenile criminal petitions, probation violations and miscellaneous cases filed with the Superior Court per year. A juvenile petition is defined as a Superior Court document charging an individual under 18 years of age with a criminal offense enumerated within the standard California codes (such as the Penal Code and Health and Safety Code). Not adhering to the terms and conditions of these sustained petitions results in probation violations and subsequent District Attorney Office action.

Why: This measure is important to track as it represents juvenile criminal activity within the county; i.e., cases which cannot be handled through probation diversion programs. Fewer petitions filed means fewer juvenile criminal prosecutions were necessary for serious crimes.

How are we doing? Upon the implementation of the office's case management system in November 2013, the Workload Statistics Report, which was the means for capturing data used in this reporting, was eliminated. While new reporting was in development, issues related to the direct filing exchange with Superior Court resulted in previously incomplete juvenile petition information for FY's 2013-14 and 2014-15.

Without verifiable performance data for the previous two annual reporting cycles, FY 2015-16 projected estimations were based upon the last reported actual results in FY 2012-13 and prior. Recent data extractions by Information Technology staff have enabled previously unavailable actual results for FY 2013-14 and FY 2014-15 to be reported, as well as FY 2015-16 results to become available. Keeping in mind that this newly reportable data may have slight error due to incomplete transference of information at data conversion from the old Legacy to new Karpel system, as well as decreases due to the exclusion of Neglected Child cases, the overall decline in the number of juvenile criminal prosecution petitions reviewed and filed annually is noticeably significant. Likely the most direct impact was brought about by the passage of Prop 47 in November 2014 in which the majority of juvenile felony offenses, i.e., grand theft, burglary, and drug possession, were reclassified as misdemeanor offenses and handled without filing criminal petitions. A climate shift from delinquency prosecution to graduated sanctions and restorative justice have led to informally handling cases with assigned Probation personnel outside of the courtroom setting and providing for a lesser restrictive method of punishment. Juvenile cases handled by the District Attorney's Office now typically reflect the more serious juvenile offenses which fall outside of the Prop 47 parameters or those cases in which the juvenile failed to successfully complete their diversion program obligations.

Juvenile diversion programs, which the DA participates in jointly with the Probation Department, continue to be the primary objective designed to identify, divert and rehabilitate juvenile offenders before their crimes reach the level requiring a criminal petition.

Department Goal: To provide prompt restitution recovery services to victims who receive non-sufficient funds (NSF) checks, and to victims of other consumer fraud and environmental crime.

Communitywide Result Link: Safe Healthy Livable Prosperous Well-Governed Community

5. Performance Measure: Bad check restitution recovery.

11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Actual Results	13-14 Actual Results	14-15 Actual Results	15-16 Adopted	15-16 Actual Results	16-17 Target
69%	114%	88%	91%	100%	90%	90%

What: Percentage of recovery on bad check cases processed by the Bad Check Unit.

Why: The higher the collection percentage is, the more effective the restitution recovery program.

How are we doing? Continued diligent efforts toward victim recovery have proven effective in collections as evidenced by annual results that exceed private agency rates which typically range from 33% to 55%. This is reflected in FY 2015-16 actual results in which 604 cases were submitted for payment; 63 were rejected and returned to victims, and 541, or 90%, experienced restitution recovery (541 of 604). The check complaints rejected and returned to victims were due to matters surrounding civil disputes, direct payment having already been received by the victim, or forgery requiring law enforcement investigation, and thus, would not fall under the purview as recoverable by the Bad Check Unit.

A high performance percentage continues to exist for FY 2015-16 amidst a market-driven decline in checks submitted to the Bad Check Unit for collection. While fewer checks are being used by consumers and correspondingly fewer checks submitted to the program for collection, the Bad Check Unit continues to focus resources toward collection efforts of non-prosecutable checks and checks in which the statute has expired, assisting prosecution efforts by targeting outstanding warrant cases of bad check defendants, as well as providing continued public assistance through their small claims and consumer issues advisory.

Comparable Bad Check Unit performance data had previously been requested from Ventura, Humboldt, Kern, Butte, Kings, and Solano counties. Ventura and Humboldt, the only counties which provided comparable data, reported only on the number of checks submitted to their program, not on the effectiveness of their collection recovery efforts. In FY 2015-16, Humboldt County's Bad Check Program reported 123 checks received for collection; Ventura County's Bad Check Program reported 672 checks received for collection. Butte and Kern Counties have discontinued their Bad Check Unit, and due to staffing and/or programmatic limitations, no comparative results were available from the other counties.

6. Performance Measure: Average restitution recovery period from case opening.

11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Actual Results	13-14 Actual Results	14-15 Actual Results	15-16 Adopted	15-16 Actual Results	16-17 Target
57 Days	52 Days	53 Days	49 Days	52 Days	43 Days	50 Days

What: The average number of business days required to recover restitution for victims of bad check crime.

Why: The more rapid the case initiation and restitution recovery, the more prosperous and safe the community.

How are we doing? Each bad check case begins with processing a 30 day notice to the check writer, followed by continued contact and investigation by bad check staff, concluding with the bad check writer's participation in an intervention course or face possible prosecution, if necessary. FY 2015-16 results indicate a recovery period of 43 days which signals a marked improvement over FY 2014-15 actual results by 6 days, or a 12% reduction. Recovery period performance was enhanced during FY 2015-16 through establishing a standard for shorter case review time, as well as increased phone call contact with the check writer by Bad Check Unit staff for collections on non-prosecutable cases.

While comparable performance data had previously been requested from Ventura, Humboldt, Kern, Butte, Kings, and Solano counties, all of which operate Bad Check Units, Butte and Kern Counties have since discontinued their programs. Due to staffing and/or programmatic limitations, however, no comparative average restitution recovery period results were available from the other counties.

Department Goal: Assisting victims to recover from the aftermath of crime and minimizing the inconvenience to witnesses involved in the criminal justice system.

Communitywide Result Link: Safe Healthy Livable Prosperous Well-Governed Community

7. Performance Measure: In crimes against persons filed, the percentage of crime victims who are contacted for services within eight business days of referral to Victim Witness.

11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Actual Results	13-14 Actual Results	14-15 Actual Results	15-16 Adopted	15-16 Actual Results	16-17 Target
85%	86%	85%	87%	100%	93%	97%

What: Victim/Witness advocates provide a wide variety of services to crime victims including information about their legal rights, case information and updates, court escort and support during hearings, assistance with state compensation claims, restraining order assistance and many other services. This measure tracks timeliness of Victim/Witness outreach in cases charged by the District Attorney so that services can be provided and successful prosecutions maximized. Many other victims are assisted in crimes that are still under investigation by local law enforcement, or are under review for criminal charging by the DA, or cannot be charged by the DA for a variety of reasons.

Why: Empirical research supports that prompt intervention and support with crime victims after a crime occurs reduces crime victims' confusion, frustration and emotional trauma and improves the victim's satisfaction with the criminal justice system.

How are we doing: During FY 2015-16, Victim/Witness advocates assisted 4,334 victims in crimes against persons cases charged by our office, and 93% of those victims were contacted for services within the eight day target for outreach. Due to additional staffing providing for more efficient and effective caseload handling, FY 2015-16 results show an improved percentage over previous years for outreach to victims within an eight business day period. While no legal response time mandate has been issued or is available by the California Governor's Office of Emergency Services (Cal OES), Victim/Witness advocates are committed to improving their responsiveness to victims. To that end, beginning in FY 2014-15 every effort was made to make victim contact within 24 to 72 hours upon notification of the crime. Victim/Witness advocates were markedly successful during FY 2015-16 as 80% (3,474 of 4,334) of victims were contacted within 72 hours (three business days).

Comparative response time inquiries to other members of the California Crime Victims Assistance Association (CCVAA), such as Santa Barbara, Ventura and Napa Counties, indicates that they, too, attempt to respond to their victims within 72 hours of notification that a crime has occurred. This standard is a significant improvement for the division and exhibits the advocates' continued dedication to minimizing the trauma and negative impacts of crime.

8. Performance Measure: Percentage of local crime victim compensation claims verified and recommended for approval by the Victim/Witness Claims Unit that are also approved by the State for payment to victims and service providers.

11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Actual Results	13-14 Actual Results	14-15 Actual Results	15-16 Adopted	15-16 Actual Results	16-17 Target
100%	100%	96%	94%	97%	Data Unavailable	97%

What: The Victim/Witness Division contracts with the State Victim Compensation & Government Claims Board to provide claim verification at the local level, thereby expediting claim benefits and improving the prompt repayment of out-of-pocket losses resulting from crime to the victim.

Why: With the availability of local victim compensation claims verification services, victims have a local contact and the required documentation from local providers is more readily obtained. This results in a higher percentage of claim awards than if those claims had not been handled locally.

How are we doing? Annual data typically includes victim compensation claims received and reviewed, along with eligibility determination errors as stated by Audits and Investigations during post-process review. Recent FY 2014-15 annual performance reporting from the State of California Victim Compensation and Government Claims Board (VCGCB) for San Luis Obispo County reflects a claims verified and approved rate of 94% (400 of 427). Twenty-seven applications processed during this period were denied by VCGCB of which two were duplicates and 25 remain subject to appeal. While the approval rate declined slightly from the previous fiscal year (96% to 94%), the average processing time improved from 23 days in FY 2013-14 to 16 days in FY 2014-15. The San Luis Obispo County Victim/Witness Division continues to reach out to victims and service providers to inform eligible victims of the program and local assistance available to them. With FY 2015-16 results unavailable at this time, projections reflect an error rate of 3% which is just marginally short of the 100% accuracy rate for the hundreds of claims that are submitted for review and payment by the Victim/Witness claims staff for approval by the State.

Contacted for comparative data information, the California Victim Compensation Program (CalVCP), which is administered by VCGCB, indicated that they were unwilling to share performance statistics of other claims units.

Department Goal: To increase the criminal justice efficiency response to crime victims and witnesses.

Communitywide Result Link: Safe Healthy Livable Prosperous Well-Governed Community

9. Performance Measure: Percentage of civilian witnesses who receive mailed subpoenas and which subpoenas are confirmed by Victim/Witness.

11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Actual Results	13-14 Actual Results	14-15 Actual Results	15-16 Adopted	15-16 Actual Results	16-17 Target
94%	96%	96%	97%	96%	94%	96%

What: For a subpoena to have legal effect it must be personally served or mailed and its receipt confirmed. This measure tracks the percentage of mailed subpoenas that are confirmed by Victim/Witness in an effort to save law enforcement the time and expense of personally serving subpoenas.

Why: This demonstrates how cost effectively we confirm the receipt of mailed subpoenas to civilian witnesses. Based on the 2,927 civilian subpoenas that were mailed and then confirmed by telephone rather than personally served, the estimated savings to the County in FY 2015-16 was approximately \$300,000. By confirming and managing court appearances of subpoenaed witnesses, Victim/Witness personnel significantly reduce loss of work time by witnesses when their court appearances are delayed or no longer required. This enhances the public's confidence in the criminal justice system and its local government.

How are we doing? FY 2015-16 results indicate that 94% (2,741 of 2,927) of civilian witnesses who received subpoenas were contacted by Victim/Witness and receipt of their subpoenas confirmed. For FY 2015-16, the percentage of subpoenas mailed and receipt confirmed decreased slightly in comparison to previous years due to a myriad of possible issues, including incorrect reporting information, data input errors, and/or witness relocation. Such consistently high performance percentages are indicative of an ongoing commitment by Victim/Witness staff to reduce the inconveniences and costs associated with court appearances and to improve the efficient operations of criminal court hearings by ensuring, to the extent possible, that civilian witnesses appear at the date, time and place that they are required to testify. A 100% confirmation of mailed subpoenas is not feasible due to incorrect addresses or lack of availability of correct witness contact information.

Comparable performance data was requested from the similarly sized counties of Marin, Butte and Santa Cruz, all of which indicated that confirmation of mailed subpoenas statistics are neither accumulated nor measured.

10. Performance Measure: The annual number of victims that receive direct, coordinated services and the coordination of subpoenaed witnesses.

11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Actual Results	13-14 Actual Results	14-15 Actual Results	15-16 Adopted	15-16 Actual Results	16-17 Target
3,801 victims; 11,090 subpoenaed witness court appearances	3,870 victims; 10,449 subpoenaed witness court appearances	4,489 victims; 12,711 subpoenaed witness court appearances	6,236 victims; 8,400 subpoenaed witness court appearances	4,000 victims; 10,750 subpoenaed witness court appearances	4,334 direct victims; 6,952 total direct victims (4,334) and assisted family members (2,618); 8,174 subpoenaed witness court appearances	7,500 victims; 9,000 subpoenaed witness court appearances

What: The number of crime victims assisted by the Victim/Witness Division and the number of subpoenaed witnesses notified.

Why: The California Constitution was amended in November of 2008 granting California crime victims a substantial number of Constitutional and statutory rights that are provided by Victim/Witness personnel. That same amendment defined more broadly the definition of victim, increasing the number of victims per case. For that reason, we saw an increased demand for victim services in FY 2010-11 that has held steady in subsequent years. Assistance to crime victims and the coordination of subpoenaed witnesses in criminal cases enhances public safety and confidence in the criminal justice system. The coordination of subpoenaed witnesses continues to be an essential responsibility of the District Attorney's Victim/Witness Division as it promotes efficient criminal court operations and increases citizens' satisfaction with their experiences with the criminal justice system.

How are we doing? FY 2015-16 annual results indicate a continued decrease in subpoenaed witnesses for court appearances, due largely in part to recent sentencing and incarceration changes brought about by the passage of Proposition 47 (2014). This legislation has impacted the department by reducing the felony caseload by approximately 500 cases per year while increasing the misdemeanor caseload by a similar number. Unlike felony cases in which a larger number of subpoenas are typically issued at or near the initial filing date, subpoenas in misdemeanor cases are prepared near the trial phase, which by their very nature occur less frequently and, thusly, result in fewer subpoenas to be issued. The decrease in subpoenas is also a reflection of the implementation of the felony and misdemeanor Early Disposition Program (EDP), the Misdemeanor Diversion Program (MDP), and elimination of direct filing by local law enforcement.

FY 2015-16 results reflect consistency with FY 2014-15 actual results in the number of victims assisted by the Victim/Witness Division. Factors most likely responsible for this overall two year increase are attributable to the manner in which data is now input and counted by the new Karpel case management system, as well as victims of property crime cases now being included in this statistics collection. As Marsy's Law additionally includes victims' family members as victims of crime, that population has been added to the statistic for additional detail and clarification.

Comparable performance data was requested from the similarly sized counties of Marin, Butte and Santa Cruz, all of which indicated that confirmation of mailed subpoenas statistics are neither accumulated nor measured.

GOALS AND PERFORMANCE MEASURES

Department Goal: Coordinate emergency planning efforts of government and community based organizations to ensure a consistent, countywide response to emergency situations and compliance with regulatory requirements.

Communitywide Result Link: Safe Healthy Livable Prosperous Well-Governed Community

1. Performance Measure: Number of deficiencies received during biennial and other Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) evaluations related to compliance with regulations involving nuclear power plant related emergency plans and procedures.

11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Actual Results	13-14 Actual Results	14-15 Actual Results	15-16 Adopted	15-16 Actual Results	16-17 Target
0	0	0	0	0	0	0

What: The Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) evaluates various nuclear power plant emergency exercises at least every two years. These evaluations are conducted to ensure local, State and Federal agencies can adequately protect public health and safety and are in compliance with regulatory requirements. (The term Deficiency has recently been re-titled as Level I Finding by FEMA. This will be reflected in the future).

Why: A zero deficiency rating by FEMA is a statement that emergency planning, training, and coordination within San Luis Obispo County is at the level necessary to provide for protection of public health and safety.

How are we doing? Emergency response exercises that demonstrate compliance with regulations are conducted at least every two years, with the next FEMA Evaluated Exercise in the fall of FY 2016-17. The County maintains emergency plans and procedures, training efforts and ongoing coordination with State and local agencies on a year round basis and these efforts were the focus for FY 2015-16. There was one FEMA Evaluated Medical Drill in FY 2015-16 that resulted in no deficiencies.

2. Performance Measure: Number of Areas Requiring Corrective Action (ARCA) received during biennial and other Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) evaluations related to compliance with regulations involving nuclear power plant related emergency plans and procedures.

11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Actual Results	13-14 Actual Results	14-15 Actual Results	15-16 Adopted	15-16 Actual Results	16-17 Target
1	0	0	0	0	0	0

What: Areas Requiring Corrective Action (ARCA) are issues that are identified during a FEMA evaluated exercise that require improvements in the County’s response, plans or training. Although ARCAs do not indicate a decreased level of public health and safety, they shed light on areas the County can improve upon. (Areas Requiring Corrective Action has recently been re-titled as Level II Finding by FEMA. This will be reflected in the future).

Why: To ensure County plans, procedures, and training continually meet and exceed ever expanding federal regulations.

How are we doing? Emergency response exercises that demonstrate compliance with regulations are conducted at least every two years, with the next FEMA Evaluated Exercise in the fall of FY 2016-17. The County maintains emergency plans and procedures, training efforts and ongoing coordination with State and local agencies on a year round basis and these efforts were the focus for FY 2015-16. There was one FEMA Evaluated Medical Drill in FY 2015-16 that resulted in no ARCAs.

3. Performance Measure: Percentage of survey respondents rating the overall effectiveness of our emergency management coordination efforts for cities, school districts, public safety, and other local agencies.

11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Actual Results	13-14 Actual Results	14-15 Actual Results	15-16 Adopted	15-16 Actual Results	16-17 Target
80%	80%	80%	100%	90%	86%	90%

What: This measures the effectiveness of our coordination efforts with various local agencies.

Why: This feedback is important so that we can continually improve our coordination efforts.

How are we doing? OES annually surveys partner agencies to measure the effectiveness of coordination efforts. For FY 2015-16, fourteen responses (out of 48 sent) were received reporting a 86% overall average rating of good to excellent. Additional surveys are being requested and future reports will include a larger feedback baseline response.

4. Performance Measure: Percentage of survey results rating training done by the Office of Emergency Services as “good” to “excellent”.

11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Actual Results	13-14 Actual Results	14-15 Actual Results	15-16 Adopted	15-16 Actual Results	16-17 Target
94%	97%	95%	97%	95%	96%	95%

What: The County Office of Emergency Services incorporates a variety of training programs for both County employees and members of other jurisdictions and organizations involved with emergency response.

Why: Survey results are a reflection of the effectiveness of the training as determined by the training participants.

How are we doing? Surveys are distributed at each training that OES facilitates. To date we have received 44 feedback documents returned to OES, with 96% reported good to excellent results. Regarding the evaluation forms that individuals fill out, there is a rating above “excellent” which is “superior.” For these reporting purposes the higher rating of superior was counted as excellent. We will change the forms to be consistent with our rating system of excellent being the top ranking category. Training sessions are conducted or coordinated by the Office of Emergency Services (OES) staff on subjects ranging from overviews of emergency response procedures to proper equipment use and other resources. The received feedback indicates that in general the training provided by OES is effective.

5. Performance Measure: General Fund support costs per capita for emergency management services (excluding nuclear power planning activities).

11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Actual Results	13-14 Actual Results	14-15 Actual Results	15-16 Adopted	15-16 Actual Results	16-17 Target
34¢	56¢	32¢	52¢	57¢	48¢	68¢

What: This measure provides a baseline for comparing the costs of emergency services to other like agencies.

Why: In order to demonstrate that emergency management costs are reasonable for the value and services received.

How are we doing? During FY 2015-16, the County Office of Emergency Services came in below projected General Fund support costs. A primary reason for this was staffing vacancies not allowing staff to concentrate on projects supported by General Fund. Concentration was focused on nuclear power plant revenue offset projects. Comparable counties budgets, on average, were estimated \$1.65 in General Fund support per capita for emergency management services during FY 2015-16. Target costs for OES for FY 2016-17 are based upon the ongoing need for a focus on general emergency planning needs and requirements in order to maintain effective non-nuclear power plant emergency planning and preparedness efforts.

GOALS AND PERFORMANCE MEASURES

Department Goal: Provide an efficient and cost effective alternative to incarcerating adult felons and misdemeanants through the enforcement of court orders and support of successful completion of term of probation, thus enhancing public safety.

Communitywide Result Link: Safe Healthy Livable Prosperous Well-Governed Community

1. Performance Measure: Cost avoided by supervising felons on probation instead of sending them to state prison.

11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Actual Results	13-14 Actual Results	14-15 Actual Results	15-16 Adopted	15-16 Actual Results	16-17 Target
\$64,850,386	\$68,866,197	\$86,661,327	\$73,707,854	\$69,203,845	\$65,440,645	\$74,644,018

What: This calculation yields an estimate of the state cost avoided by supervising felons in the community and providing appropriate services rather than sending them to state prison. This estimate is obtained by multiplying the number of felony probationers by the average annual cost to incarcerate an inmate in state prison minus the average annual cost for Probation to supervise these probationers.

During FY 2013-14, the method of categorizing the number of felony probationers changed, requiring a revision in the values previously reported. The new categorization for felony probationers is: the number of adult felony probationers, excluding those on warrant. Additionally, our calculations for FY 2013-14 and FY 2014-15 utilize the more recent estimate of \$58,800 as the annual cost to incarcerate an inmate in state prison, per the Governor’s budget for FY 2014-15 (compared to \$48,900 in prior years).

Why: To demonstrate that Probation is a cost effective alternative to state incarceration.

How are we doing? The value of cost avoidance to the state is largely driven by the number of felony offenders placed on probation. For example, if the number of felony probationers increases, the resulting cost avoided value is higher. Additionally, the number of felony level probationers is a key factor in determining Adult Division costs as the Division aims for appropriate, evidence-based, officer-to-probationer caseload ratios.

Implementation of Public Safety Realignment (AB 109) in late 2011 caused a slow increase in the use of probation as an alternative to state incarceration. This increasing trend was expected to continue; however, in late 2014, Proposition 47 was enacted, which allowed for the re-classification and re-sentencing of several types of crimes from felonies to misdemeanors. Since enactment, locally, the number of active felony level probationers had decreased from a high of 1,725 at the end of FY 2013-14 to 1236 at the end of FY 2015-16. In the same time periods, the number of active misdemeanor level probationers had increased from 682 to 841.

Adult Division operational costs for FY 2015-16 nominally increased compared to the previous fiscal year due to further shifting of officers from Juvenile Services into the Adult Division per efforts to reduce officer-to-probationer caseload ratios and the re-allocation of the Anti-Gang Coordinator contract to the Adult Division.

By fiscal year end, the number of offenders on felony level probation was lower than had been projected for fiscal year. Thus, our FY 2015-16 actual result, \$65,440,645, is nominally lower than our adopted value of \$69,203,845.

Comparison data with other counties is not available.

2. Performance Measure: Percentage of felons who were sent to state prison.

11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Actual Results	13-14 Actual Results	14-15 Actual Results	15-16 Adopted	15-16 Actual Results	16-17 Target
N/A	11.1%	9.9%	10.9%	9.0%	11.3%	11.0%

What: The proportion of the felony probation case closures in the time period that were sent to state prison.

Why: This measure allows us to evaluate the success of our programs in keeping offenders out of prison. If offenders do not go to prison during their term of probation, it indicates that the department has successfully provided an alternative to incarceration, facilitated the resocialization of the offenders, and has ensured public safety.

How are we doing? During FY 2015-16, the percentage felons sent to state prison edged higher to 11.3% (66 out of 586), compared to FY 2014-15 at 10.9% (64 out of 589). The result for FY 2015-16 is slightly higher than the target set for the year, 9.0%. Because the annual result has been approximately 11.0% for the last four years, the department has modified its FY 2016-17 target to from 9.0% to 11.0%.

The effort to develop and strengthen strategies to reduce the percentage of felony probationers who are sent to prison is continuous. The Adult Division applies the evidence-based practices of utilizing risk assessment tools and is strengthening its use of risk-appropriate levels of supervision. In conjunction with increased attention on case management planning and referral to appropriate community services, the Division regularly works with partner agencies to strengthen program coordination.

Data definitions continue to differ between counties and the state, thus comparison data is not available.

3. Performance Measure: Percentage of Post Release Community Supervision (PRCS) offenders that returned to prison.

11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Actual Results	13-14 Actual Results	14-15 Actual Results	15-16 Adopted	15-16 Actual Results	16-17 Target
N/A	12.1%	8.7%	15.7%	15.0%	12.9%	15.0%

What: PRCS offenders are adult felons who were sentenced to state prison for a non-violent, non-serious, non-sex offense and who have been released from State prison to be supervised by the County Probation Department. This offender population is categorized separately from the felony probationer population. This measure focuses on the proportion of the PRCS case closures in the time period that were returned to state prison.

Why: This measure allows us to evaluate the success of our programs in keeping offenders out of prison, with particular attention to the PRCS population as this is a new population under the County's supervision. If offenders do not return to prison, then the department has successfully facilitated the resocialization of offenders, and ensured public safety.

How are we doing? During FY 2015-16, 8 out of 62 offenders – or 12.9% - were sent to prison for new felony convictions. This is a lower percentage compared to last fiscal year, 15.7%, and this year's target, 15.0%.

The majority of PRCS offenders (64%) are assessed as medium-high or high risk to recidivate, which equates to an estimate that 60% will be convicted of new crimes. Thus, compared to risk level, the Adult Division continues to do well with PRCS offenders. The Division provides intensive supervision, with low officer-to-offender caseload ratio, for PRCS offenders and works very closely with partner agencies to provide treatment services, re-entry planning, and individualized, supportive case management.

Note: Random variation, or fluctuations, does occur when counting few occurrences in a small population.

Data definitions continue to differ between counties and the state, thus comparison data is not available.

Department Goal: Provide efficient and cost effective alternatives based on evidence informed practices to address juvenile delinquency.

Communitywide Result Link: Safe Healthy Livable Prosperous Well-Governed Community

4. Performance Measure: Percentage of juveniles who were diverted from the court system.

11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Actual Results	13-14 Actual Results	14-15 Actual Results	15-16 Adopted	15-16 Actual Results	16-17 Target
60%	71%	83%	78%	70%	82%	70%

What: The percentage of the total number of new referrals to the Probation Department that were diverted from a formal filing in the Court system.

Why: The Probation Department screens juvenile crime reports and considers the risks and needs of each juvenile offender. This allows the Probation Department to divert the lower risk offenders out of the court system and limit the juveniles' exposure to higher risk and more criminally sophisticated juveniles in the system. Diversion also increases the likelihood that the low risk juvenile offenders will not be removed from their homes, as no court petition is filed on them. This outcome is a good way of measuring the efficacy of the Probation Department's prevention and intervention programs for low risk juvenile offenders in the community. It also insures that limited resources are being used appropriately on the most dangerous offenders. A 2007 study analyzing the social return on investment in youth intervention programs by Wilder Research and the University of Minnesota showed a return on investment of \$4.89 for every \$1 spent on youth intervention programs.

How are we doing? Over the years, the Department has refined how the diversion rate data is defined and collected from our case management system, resulting in some fluctuation. Eighty-two percent (267 out of 324) of juvenile referrals in FY 2015-16 were diverted from the Juvenile Court system. The FY 2015-16 diversion rate exceeded the rate adopted for this year.

Risk assessment tools are used to divert referred youth to informal probation and alternative programs and services, rather than process the youth through the formal Court system. Additionally, Juvenile Services continues to work with prevention programs such as SAFE System of Care and The Link as well as provide intervention services through Youth in Action and community school-based probation officers.

Comparison data from other counties is not available.

<p>Department Goal: Provide an efficient and cost effective supervision of juvenile offenders through the enforcement of court orders and support of successful completion of term of probation, thus enhancing public safety.</p> <p>Communitywide Result Link: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Safe <input type="checkbox"/> Healthy <input type="checkbox"/> Livable <input type="checkbox"/> Prosperous <input type="checkbox"/> Well-Governed Community</p>						
<p>5. Performance Measure: Percentage of juveniles under court ordered supervision who were able to remain in their homes.</p>						
11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Actual Results	13-14 Actual Results	14-15 Actual Results	15-16 Adopted	15-16 Actual Results	16-17 Target
90%	86%	88%	87%	80%	84%	80%
<p>What: The percentage of juveniles on court ordered supervision who remained in their homes or with relatives.</p> <p>Why: When a juvenile is ordered to be supervised by the Probation Department, a goal of the Department is to ensure the juvenile remains in his or her home. Keeping juveniles in their home and community not only saves the County money, it also allows families to remain intact and address delinquency issues in a multi-systemic approach. The Department of Social Services estimates that the County share for Probation placements for FY 2015-16 will be \$757,613.</p> <p>How are we doing? In FY 2015-16, 84% (91 out of 109) of juveniles on probation remained at home, or with relatives. This rate is higher than the adopted rate of 80% for the fiscal year, but is slightly lower than last fiscal year's result of 87% (115 out of 132).</p> <p>The Probation Department uses a risk and needs assessment tool to support determination of which juveniles are appropriate for probation supervision while remaining in their home. The Division targets supportive, evidence-based programming to help youth remain at home. The Division also continues to refine its evidence based practices, such as it included cognitive-based Forward Thinking Journaling as part of graduated sanctions and expanding the provision of cognitive-behavioral types of treatment programs.</p> <p>Comparison data with other counties is not available.</p>						
<p>Department Goal: Support crime victims by collecting court-ordered restitution from offenders.</p> <p>Communitywide Result Link: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Safe <input type="checkbox"/> Healthy <input type="checkbox"/> Livable <input type="checkbox"/> Prosperous <input type="checkbox"/> Well-Governed Community</p>						
<p>6. Performance Measure: Cost to collect victim restitution, fines and fees.</p>						
11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Actual Results	13-14 Actual Results	14-15 Actual Results	15-16 Adopted	15-16 Actual Results	16-17 Target
\$.33 for every dollar collected	\$.38 for every dollar collected	\$.39 for every dollar collected	\$.43 for every dollar collected	\$.40 for every dollar collected	\$.37 for every dollar collected	\$.40 for every dollar collected
<p>What: Cost to collect court-ordered victim restitution, fines and fees, as a ratio of expenditure to revenue.</p> <p>Why: This is an efficiency measure demonstrating cost effectiveness of collecting criminal debt internally while maintaining confidentiality of sensitive victim identification information.</p> <p>How are we doing? In FY 2015-16, we collected \$3,273,105 at an expense of \$1,188,279. Our year-end actual result was \$.37 expended for every dollar collected – three cents better than the adopted target for the year. The Probation Department collected 13% more in restitution, fines and fees, in FY 2015-16, than it did in FY 2014-15 (revenue, \$2,891,364; expense, \$1,237,028). This is the second year that the amount collected has increased compared to the previous year, after a period of decline during the economic downturn. Additionally, the Department launched its new collections data system in mid-year, which will help enable greater efficiencies.</p> <p>Other counties currently do not track or report this outcome. As a comparison, the average cost of collection for private collectors to collect civil debt is approximately \$.50 for every dollar collected. And, the cost for private collectors to collect delinquent criminal debt is approximately \$.65 for each dollar collected, plus additional expenses.</p> <p>Comparison data from other counties is not available.</p>						

GOALS AND PERFORMANCE MEASURES

Department Goal: To provide cost effective Public Defender services.						
Communitywide Result Link: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Safe <input type="checkbox"/> Healthy <input type="checkbox"/> Livable <input type="checkbox"/> Prosperous <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Well-Governed Community						
1. Performance Measure: Annual number of cases reversed based on the allegation of inadequate defense.						
11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Actual Results	13-14 Actual Results	14-15 Actual Results	15-16 Adopted	15-16 Actual Results	16-17 Target
0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<p>What: Counties are mandated to provide public defender services for people who are unable to afford a private attorney. The number of cases that are overturned based upon an inadequate defense measures the effectiveness of public defender services in terms of the meeting the constitutional right to an adequate defense.</p> <p>Why: Providing an adequate defense is a constitutional right and promotes justice. Cases that are overturned because of an inadequate defense ultimately are more costly to taxpayers.</p> <p>How are we doing? The target was met in FY 2015-16 and is expected to do so again in FY 2016-17. Defense services provided by San Luis Obispo Public Defender attorneys meet legally required standards each year and are expected to continue to do so. Data from comparable counties is not available for comparison.</p>						
2. Performance Measure: Per capita costs for public defender services.						
11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Actual Results	13-14 Actual Results	14-15 Actual Results	15-16 Adopted	15-16 Actual Results	16-17 Target
\$21.97	\$21.97	\$19.47	\$21.46	\$21.50	\$21.10	\$23.28
<p>What: This measure shows the per capita gross costs to provide public defender services, based on budgeted amounts.</p> <p>Why: We are measuring per capita gross public defender costs in an effort to capture efficiency data.</p> <p>How are we doing? Costs for public defender services have averaged around \$21 per capita over the last five years. In FY 2015-16 actual costs ended the year at \$21.10 per capita, slightly below the target of \$21.50, as expenses were essentially right on budget. No major unanticipated expenses were encountered during the budget year.</p> <p>The FY 2016-17 target is set to increase to \$23.28 or 10% compared to the FY 2015-16 actual result. The FY 2016-17 target assumes a budgeted expense increase of \$668,565 or 11% based on a 2% CPI increase for contract law firms and \$267,000 of new resources added to provide additional resources to the primary public defender firm and the first conflict public defender firm, in part due to the increase in staff hours driven by the Superior Court's recent calendar reorganization and the creation of an early disposition court in 2014. It also assumes a 1% increase in countywide population over the course of the year, based on the average annual rate of increase over the prior four years.</p> <p>The actual result for FY 2015-16 of \$21.10 per capita is based on the actual expenses for public defender activities totaling \$5,936,981 and a 2015 year population of 281,401 (Source: U.S. Census Bureau). Although costs per capita have trended higher over the last few years, San Luis Obispo County's costs continue to be lower than comparison counties, in some cases much lower*: Marin: \$36.51, Monterey: \$25.53, Napa: \$30.12 Santa Barbara: \$24.62, Santa Cruz: \$33.58. It's worth noting that San Luis Obispo County's per capita costs are 9% lower than our neighbors directly to the north and south, Monterey and Santa Barbara.</p> <p>* Note that results for comparable counties are based on FY 2015-16 budgeted or projected expenditures (depending on what was available in published documents from each county), not actual expenditures. These figures are used because, as is the case each year, counties have not completed the process of closing their books for the fiscal year when the survey for this performance measure is taken.</p>						

GOALS AND PERFORMANCE MEASURES

<p>Department Goal: Perform all mandates of the Office of Sheriff-Coroner, investigate crime, enforce laws, prevent criminal activities, maintain a safe and secure jail, provide security for the courts, plan for and implement emergency response for disasters and acts of terrorism.</p> <p>Communitywide Result Link: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Safe <input type="checkbox"/> Healthy <input type="checkbox"/> Livable <input type="checkbox"/> Prosperous <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Well-Governed Community</p>						
<p>1. Performance Measure: Crime rate compared to California law enforcement agencies serving populations between 250,000 and 499,999.</p>						
11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Actual Results	13-14 Actual Results	14-15 Actual Results	15-16 Adopted	15-16 Actual Results	16-17 Target
Crime rate lower than 80% of comparable counties	Crime rate lower than 60% of comparable counties	Crime rate lower than 80% of comparable counties	Crime rate lower than 60% of comparable counties	Crime rate lower than 60% of comparable counties	Crime rate lower than 60% of comparable counties	Crime rate lower than 60% of comparable counties
<p>What: This measure tracks the number of serious crimes reported each year for all law enforcement agencies (i.e., police departments, sheriff departments, and cities that contract for law enforcement). Based on the January 2016 population table provided by the California Department of Finance, San Luis Obispo County has grown to over 277,000 people. This puts the county in the Group 1 population subset of 250,000 to 499,999. Based on proximity and/or size, our comparable counties are Monterey, Santa Barbara, Santa Cruz, Placer and Marin.</p> <p>Why: This compares the crime rate for serious violent crimes, property crimes and arsons reported by the San Luis Obispo Sheriff's Office to that of the other identified comparable Sheriff's Offices that serve populations of 250,000 or more.</p> <p>How are we doing? Sheriff's Office personnel are trained to be very proactive in crime reduction strategies through crime prevention programs, community presentations, patrols, school programs, security surveys, summer camps and rural patrol, as well as aggressive prosecutions through specialized investigative units. Based on the 2014 statistics from the Federal Bureau of Investigator's Uniform Crime Reporting, the San Luis Obispo County crime rate was lower than four of the five comparable counties. The 2014 data from the FBI is the most current data available. The total number of violent crimes, property crimes and arsons reported for San Luis Obispo County and comparable counties are: Marin 709; Monterey 1,606; San Luis Obispo 1,494; Placer 1,897; Santa Barbara 1,854 and Santa Cruz 2,002.</p>						
<p>2. Performance Measure: Percentage of high priority, life threatening calls for service that receive a 10 minute response time in the Coast Station area of the county.</p>						
11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Actual Results	13-14 Actual Results	14-15 Actual Results	15-16 Adopted	15-16 Actual Results	16-17 Target
71%	68%	65%	71%	70%	69%	70%
<p>What: This measures the percentage of calls from the time the first patrol unit is dispatched to the call to arriving at the scene that are under 10 minutes in response time. The Coast Station area extends from Avila Beach and up the coastline to the Monterey County line. This area encompasses Patrol Beats 1, 2 and 3 which covers 565 square miles and a population of approximately 44,000.</p> <p>Why: Timely response is critical to successful resolution of a life threatening call for service. Even though there are no national standards for this measure, the Sheriff's Office considers this to be an important issue for the public.</p> <p>How are we doing? The average response time for the Coast Station was 10:31 minutes for July 2015 through June 2016. The Coast Patrol received 115 high priority calls and of those calls 79 or 69% were responded to in the targeted 10-minute time frame. While this is an average response time for the entire coast area, it includes responses to very remote portions of the county with low populations. Response times are based on the location of the closest available unit at the time the call is dispatched. Because the location of any unit in a beat area changes based on call volume, time of day and number of cars in a beat, times will vary in any given month or year.</p>						
<p>3. Performance Measure: Percentage of high priority, life threatening calls for service that receive a 15 minute response time in the North Station area of the county.</p>						
11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Actual Results	13-14 Actual Results	14-15 Actual Results	15-16 Adopted	15-16 Actual Results	16-17 Target
66%	69%	62%	79%	70%	65%	70%
<p>What: This measures the percentage of calls where the response time from when the first patrol unit is dispatched to when the unit arrives at the scene is 15 minutes or less. The North Station area covers inland north county from Santa Margarita to Monterey and Kern County lines. This area encompasses Patrol Beats 4 and 5 which covers 2,105 square miles and a population of approximately 26,000.</p> <p>Why: Timely response is critical to successful resolution of a life threatening call for service. Even though there are no national standards for this measure, the Sheriff's Office considers this to be an important issue for the public.</p>						

How are we doing? The overall average response time for the North Station was 16:29 minutes for July 2015 through June 2016. This patrol station has the largest geographical area, but is the least populated area of the three patrol stations. The North Station received 156 high priority calls and of those calls 101 or 65% were responded to in the targeted time. Response times are based on the location of the closest available unit at the time the call is dispatched. Because the location of any unit in a beat area randomly changes based on call volume, time of day and number of cars in a beat, times will vary in any given month or year. Since FY 2010-11 the response times have been below the targeted time, partially due to the addition of four deputies (1-Resident Deputy/Creston, 1- K9 Deputy, and 2- Deputies North Sub-Station) at the North Station which were funded through temporary/alternative funds which expired last fiscal year. This is the first year since adding the deputy positions that the targeted time has not been met. When comparing the volume of high priority calls to the same time period last year, it shows there was a 24% increase in high priority calls this fiscal year. This increase has been partially responsible for the rise in response times.

4. Performance Measure: Percentage of high priority, life threatening calls for service that receive a 10 minute response time in the South Station area of the county.

11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Actual Results	13-14 Actual Results	14-15 Actual Results	15-16 Adopted	15-16 Actual Results	16-17 Target
75%	78%	84%	82%	82%	76%	80%

What: This measures the percentage of calls where the response time from when the first patrol unit is dispatched to when the unit arrives at the scene is 10 minutes or less. The South Station area extends from the City of San Luis Obispo and Avila Beach, south to the Santa Barbara County line and east to unpopulated areas of the Los Padres National Forest. This area encompasses Patrol Beats 6 and 7 which covers 620 square miles and a population of approximately 41,000.

Why: Timely response is critical to successful resolution of a life threatening call for service. Even though there are no national standards for this measure, the Sheriff's Office considers this to be an important issue for the public.

How are we doing? The average response time for the South Station was 10:21 minutes in July 2015 through June 2016. This patrol area has a growing population and deputies at the South Station respond to more calls for service than the other two stations. The South Station received 261 high priority calls and of those calls 197 or 76% were responded to in the targeted time. Response times are based on the location of the closest available unit at the time the call is dispatched. Because the location of any unit in a beat area changes based on call volume, time of day and number of cars in a beat, times will vary in any given month or year. Of the calls for service that units were not able to respond to in the 10-minute response guideline: 51% were to the Nipomo area. The longer response times to the Nipomo area could be reduced by placing a sub-station in South County. This is an area of the County that has increased in population and activity over the years. When comparing the volume of high priority calls to this same time period last year, it shows there was a 28% increase in high priority calls this fiscal year. This increase has been partially responsible for the rise in response times.

5. Performance Measure: Arrest rate for crimes classified as homicide.

11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Actual Results	13-14 Actual Results	14-15 Actual Results	15-16 Adopted	15-16 Actual Results	16-17 Target
100%	50%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

What: Using national and state Uniform Crime Reporting (UCR) data collected by the FBI and Department of Justice (DOJ) this measure shows the percentage of homicide investigations that result in an arrest by the Sheriff's Office.

Why: Arrest/Clearance rates are indicative of effectiveness.

How are we doing? The department had two homicides and three cleared homicides between July 1, 2015 and June 30, 2016, for a clearance rate of 100%.

The most recent FBI UCR data available at this time for percent of offenses cleared by arrest is from 2014. For population groups between 250,000 and 499,999 the clearance rate reported by FBI was 56.6%. The most recent DOJ UCR data available at this time for clearance rate is from 2015 which was reported as 61.5%.

6. Performance Measure: Arrest rate for crimes classified as forcible rape.

11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Actual Results	13-14 Actual Results	14-15 Actual Results	15-16 Adopted	15-16 Actual Results	16-17 Target
42%	40%	17%	56%	56%	67%	56%

What: Using national and state Uniform Crime Reporting (UCR) data collected by the FBI and DOJ, this measure shows the percentage of forcible rape investigations that result in an arrest by the Sheriff's Office. *Please Note: UCR clearance is indicative of the status of the offender not the status of the case.*

Why: Arrest/Clearance rates are indicative of effectiveness.

How are we doing? Twelve rapes were reported during the period from July 1, 2015 through June 30, 2016. During that same time frame eight rape cases were cleared. Often times the clearance of a rape will fall into a different reporting period than the crime itself. Clearance rate for this reporting period is 67%. The national clearance rate for the population groups between 250,000 to 499,999 for 2014 is 36.8%. The statewide clearance rate for 2015 is 41.5%. San Luis Obispo County sometimes has a higher incident of “non-stranger sexual assault” compared to “stranger sexual assault.” With a “non-stranger sexual assault” the victim frequently delays reporting the offense which results in an extreme lack of evidence. These cases take longer to investigate and prosecute, thus affecting the results reported.

Performance Measures 5-8 will be combined in the future as one performance measure which will provide crime totals and clearance rate totals for violent crimes. Homicide, forcible rape, robbery, and aggravated assault are all considered violent crimes and will be included in this total.

7. Performance Measure: Arrest rate for crimes classified as robbery.

11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Actual Results	13-14 Actual Results	14-15 Actual Results	15-16 Adopted	15-16 Actual Results	16-17 Target
53%	52%	80%	64%	64%	50%	64%

What: Using national and state Uniform Crime Reporting (UCR) data collected by the FBI and Department of Justice (DOJ), this measure shows the percentage of robbery investigations that result in an arrest by the Sheriff’s Office. The Penal Code defines robbery as the taking or attempting to take anything of value from the care, custody or control of a person or persons by force or threat of force or violence and/or by putting the victim in fear.

Why: Arrest/Clearance rates are indicative of effectiveness.

How are we doing? Twelve robbery offenses were reported during the period from July 1, 2015 through June 30, 2016. During that same time frame six robbery cases were cleared. This resulted in a clearance rate of 50%.

The national clearance rate for population groups between 250,000 to 499,999 for 2014 was 24.6%. The statewide clearance rate for 2015 was 30.8%. These percentages reflect the most current UCR data available from FBI and DOJ.

8. Performance Measure: Arrest rate for crimes classified as aggravated assault.

11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Actual Results	13-14 Actual Results	14-15 Actual Results	15-16 Adopted	15-16 Actual Results	16-17 Target
77%	80%	74%	82%	82%	80%	80%

What: Using national and state Uniform Crime Reporting (UCR) data collected by the FBI and Department of Justice (DOJ), this measure shows the percentage of aggravated assault investigations that result in an arrest by the Sheriff’s Office. The Penal Code defines aggravated assault as the unlawful attack by person(s) upon another for the purpose of inflicting severe or aggravated bodily injury.

Why: Arrest/Clearance rates are indicative of effectiveness.

How are we doing? There were 351 aggravated assault offenses that occurred during the period from July 1, 2015 through June 30, 2016 and a reported 280 aggravated assault cases cleared. This resulted in a clearance rate of 80%.

The national clearance rate for population groups between 250,000 to 499,999 for 2014 was 47.5%. The statewide clearance rate for 2015 was 54.1%. These percentages reflect the most current UCR data available from FBI and DOJ.

9. Performance Measure: Average monthly number of physical altercations among inmates in the San Luis Obispo County Jail, per 100 inmates.						
11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Actual Results	13-14 Actual Results	14-15 Actual Results	15-16 Adopted	15-16 Actual Results	16-17 Target
1.6	1.7	1.3	1.0	0.9	0.4	1.0
<p>What: This measure tracks our success relative to keeping the Jail safe for inmates, volunteers and County employees. The results is calculated by dividing the average number of assaults per month by the average daily population of the jail and multiplying by 100.</p> <p>Why: Tracking the physical altercation rate at the Jail is important for two reasons: 1) it provides a measure for how safe our facility is and 2) it demonstrates the degree to which we effectively manage a changing inmate population.</p> <p>How are we doing? For July 1, 2015 through June 30, 2016, the total number of altercations was 28 with 32 involved inmates, for an average of two altercations per month. The average daily population housed inside the Jail during that period was 543. Based on this, the Sheriff's Office average number of physical altercations among inmates was 0.4 per 100 inmates in FY 2015-16.</p> <p>The number of staff assaulted by inmates per year has fluctuated over the past four years. Five were assaulted in FY 2012-13, four in FY 2013-14, five in FY 2014-15 and three in FY 2015-16. Staff continues to keep aware of the increased criminal sophistication of inmates due to the implementation of the state-mandated 2011 Public Safety Realignment (AB 109). We continue to update our policies and equipment with the goal of keeping staff better protected from inmate assaults. As always, jail staff work to keep employees, volunteers and inmates safe at all times. Lastly, inmates have a variety of programs to choose from such as, "Non-Violent Communication" or "Alternatives to Violence" which aim towards changing their cognitive behavior which focuses on seeking alternative calm resolutions to conflict. There is no comparison data available from other counties.</p>						
10. Performance Measure: Overtime as a percentage of the Custody Division's salaries budget.						
11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Actual Results	13-14 Actual Results	14-15 Actual Results	15-16 Adopted	15-16 Actual Results	16-17 Target
4.3%	3.2%	3.4%	4.2%	3.0%	4.6%	3.0%
<p>What: This measure tracks the amount of overtime expended annually by the Sheriff's Office to keep the Main Jail, including the Women's Jail, running twenty-four hours a day, seven days a week.</p> <p>Why: Barring unforeseen emergencies/events, overtime costs can be kept in check by employing sound scheduling and management techniques. Tracking our efforts in this area demonstrates the Sheriff's commitment to maximizing the use of limited resources.</p> <p>How are we doing? Overtime hours have increased slightly this fiscal year compared to the prior fiscal year. In FY 2015-16 overtime hours were 14,041 and the cost was \$966,336. The total budget for FY 2015-16 including salaries and benefits was \$21,621,301. This increase is attributed to an increase in vacancies in Jail staffing and the time required for the hiring process. As of June 30, 2016, there were four Correctional Deputies and four Correctional Technician vacant positions. However, the hiring process within the Sheriff's Office requires a more extensive background than any other departments within the County. The process from start to finish can take up to six months, then training can be an additional four to six months. This process has a large impact on overtime within the Custody Division. It is anticipated that overtime will decrease with the vacancies being filled in FY 2016-17.</p>						

GOALS AND PERFORMANCE MEASURES

Department Goal: Implement programs to satisfy or exceed the requirements of the Integrated Waste Management Act as currently written and as amended in the future.

Communitywide Result Link: Safe Healthy Livable Prosperous Well-Governed Community

1. Performance Measure: Percentage reduction of solid waste disposed in regional landfills as required by State law and converted to regional per capita per day disposal rate.

11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Actual Results	13-14 Actual Results	14-15 Actual Results	15-16 Adopted	15-16 Actual Results	16-17 Target
69% 4.6lbs.	71% 4.3 lbs.	68% 4.7 lbs.	67% 4.9 lbs.	68% 4.4 lbs.	66% 5.1 lbs.	68% 4.4 lbs.

What: The measurement of recycling and waste diversion reduction on a per capita (per person per day) basis.

Why: The objective of this program is to extend the life of existing landfills by reducing the amount of solid waste being disposed by 50%. This is a State mandate with a base year of 1990 objective. Effective January 1, 2016, the State requires the recycling of organics (including food waste) according to a multi-year schedule, beginning in April 2016 with certain commercial enterprises.

How are we doing? The San Luis Obispo County region has maintained a healthy diversion rate with the current year being 66%, exceeding the State average of 63% and well above the 50% State mandate. The slight reduction can be attributed to the economic upturn, because disposal rates increase in positive economic environments. Until we implement new programs on a wide-spread basis, such as food waste collection, we will not see appreciable reductions in disposal. The development of the food waste collection program continues to make progress. In the north county, it will be occurring in areas served by Mid-State Solid Waste within the next two years, and is anticipated in unincorporated communities in the south county beginning in 2016.