

GOALS AND PERFORMANCE MEASURES

<p>Department Goal: To ensure the long-term financial stability of the County.</p> <p>Communitywide Result Link: <input type="checkbox"/> Safe <input type="checkbox"/> Healthy <input type="checkbox"/> Livable <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Prosperous <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Well-Governed Community</p>						
<p>1. Performance Measure: Ratio of General Fund backed annual debt service to the annual General Fund budget.</p>						
10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Actual Results	13-14 Actual Results	14-15 Adopted	14-15 Actual Results	15-16 Target
3.5%	3.4%	3.5%	3.2%	3.2%	3.0%	3.0%
<p>What: This measure shows the ratio of the General Fund backed annual debt service to the annual General Fund budget.</p> <p>Why: This measure provides staff, the Board and public with information about the financial health of the County. The current goal is to keep the ratio below 5%. This measure is an industry standard that allows for a comparison amongst governmental entities.</p> <p>How are we doing? A ratio under 5% is considered to be favorable by bond rating agencies. This ratio is projected to remain constant as none of the debt obligations are scheduled to be paid off in FY 2015-16, and no new debt is currently planned.</p>						
<p>Department Goal: To ensure the long-term financial stability of the County.</p> <p>Communitywide Result Link: <input type="checkbox"/> Safe <input type="checkbox"/> Healthy <input type="checkbox"/> Livable <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Prosperous <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Well-Governed Community</p>						
<p>2. Performance Measure: Ratio of total contingencies and reserves to the County's General Fund operating budget.</p>						
10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Actual Results	13-14 Actual Results	14-15 Adopted	14-15 Actual Results	15-16 Target
20.8%	20.5%	20%	24%	24%	27%	20%
<p>What: This measure shows how much money the County has in "savings" relative to our daily, ongoing expenses.</p> <p>Why: The measure provides staff, the Board and public with information on the financial health of the County. Our goal is to have a prudent level of savings that allows us to plan for future needs and "weather" economic downturns. The industry standard target is to have a 20% reserve/contingency as a percent of the operating budget.</p> <p>How are we doing? This measure reflects the total amount of contingencies and reserves that could be accessed by the General Fund (some contingencies and reserves are restricted in use and are not available for use in the General Fund). A ratio of 27% of reserves to ongoing general fund expenses is above the industry standard due to sound fiscal management and capital and infrastructure projects that had been deferred due to the economic downturn. This ratio is expected to decline towards the industry standard in future years as funding for deferred projects is committed.</p>						
<p>Department Goal: To provide high quality staff support in an effort to maximize the effectiveness of the Board of Supervisors.</p> <p>Communitywide Result Link: <input type="checkbox"/> Safe <input type="checkbox"/> Healthy <input type="checkbox"/> Livable <input type="checkbox"/> Prosperous <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Well-Governed Community</p>						
<p>3. Performance Measure: Percentage of Board members who respond to a survey indicating that Administrative Office staff provide satisfactory or better agenda support.</p>						
10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Actual Results	13-14 Actual Results	14-15 Adopted	14-15 Actual Results	15-16 Target
100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
<p>What: The County Administrative Office surveys the Board of Supervisors annually to determine their level of satisfaction with our staff support relative to the accuracy, readability, and overall quality of the agenda reports.</p> <p>Why: The information gained from this survey allows us to continuously improve staff support to the Board.</p> <p>How are we doing? The January 2015 survey consisted of a series of seven questions, with responses ranging from 1 (Unsatisfactory) to 5 (Outstanding), with a score of 3 representing Satisfactory. The Administrative Office received an average score of 3.6. The Administrative Office continues to strive for constant improvement in providing Board members with superior quality agenda support. The next survey is scheduled for January 2016.</p>						

Department Goal: To provide high quality staff support in an effort to maximize the effectiveness of County departments and the Board of Supervisors.
Communitywide Result Link: Safe Healthy Livable Prosperous Well-Governed Community

4. Performance Measure: Average percentage of responses to a survey indicating the Administrative Office staff provides satisfactory or better support services.

10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Actual Results	13-14 Actual Results	14-15 Adopted	14-15 Actual Results	15-16 Target
98%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

What: The County Administrative Office surveys departments annually to determine their level of satisfaction with our staff support relative to accuracy, responsiveness, responsibility, timeliness and trustworthiness.

Why: The information gained from this survey allows us to continuously improve our service to departments and the Board.

How are we doing? Based upon the 513 responses to the survey conducted in March 2015, the Administrative Office is providing satisfactory or better support services to departments as demonstrated by an average score of 4.29 on a 5 point scale. This is an increase from FY 2013-14 that had an average score of 4.11. This survey will next will be conducted in February or March 2016.

Department Goal: To create an environment whereby all employees feel valued and are proud to work for the County.

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

5. Performance Measure: Overall average employee job satisfaction rating (on a 6 point scale).

10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Actual Results	13-14 Actual Results	14-15 Adopted	14-15 Actual Results	15-16 Target
TBD-Survey Delayed	TBD- Survey Delayed	TBD-Survey Delayed	TBD-Survey Delayed	TBD-Survey Delayed	TBD-Survey Delayed	5.0

What: The County Administrative Office administers a survey to all permanent County employees in order to gauge their overall level of satisfaction with their job.

Why: This information is used to help assess our organizational health and identify areas for improvement.

How are we doing? An Employee Engagement and Needs Assessment Survey was performed by the Centre for Organizational Effectiveness in May 2014. Overall, a total of 1,532 responses were received from a possible 2,419 employees, a response rate of 63%. Employees rated their responses on a scale of 1 to 6, where a score of 1 represented Strongly Disagree, 4 representing Somewhat Agree and a score of 6 representing Strongly Agree. Employees ranked their Job/Career satisfaction an average of 4.62, County Leadership an average of 4.72 and Overall Satisfaction 4.96. This indicates the majority of County employees responding are satisfied with their job. Plans for the next Engagement and Needs Assessment are still to be determined.

Department Goal: To create an environment whereby all employees feel valued and are proud to work for the County.

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

6. Performance Measure: Full-time equivalent Administrative Office budget analyst staff per 1,000 county employees.

10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Actual Results	13-14 Actual Results	14-15 Adopted	14-15 Actual Results	15-16 Target
2.49	2.51	2.51	2.45	2.45	2.35	2.35

What: This shows Administrative Office budget staffing per 1,000 county employees.

Why: This data can be compared with other Administrative Offices of similar characteristics to provide one measure of whether we are appropriately staffed for budget preparation and administration.

How are we doing? The total FTE budget analyst staffing levels per 1,000 employees for our comparable counties ranges from a high of 3.68 in Napa County to a low of 1.49 in Monterey County. The average ratio of analysts per 1,000 employees was 2.89 for comparable counties, and 2.35 for San Luis Obispo County.

GOALS AND PERFORMANCE MEASURES

Department Goal: To ensure that training opportunities aimed at creating a competent, results-oriented workforce are made available to County employees.

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

1. Performance Measure: Overall average participant satisfaction rating of training programs offered by the Learning and Development Center.

10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Actual Results	13-14 Actual Results	14-15 Adopted	14-15 Actual Results	15-16 Target
4.6	4.6	4.6	4.3	4.6	4.4	4.3

What: Provides data on participant overall satisfaction with Learning and Development Center (LDC) training courses (on a scale of 1-5 with 1 = "poor" 2= fair, 3=good, 4= very good and 5 = "outstanding"). This is the first level of program evaluation.

Why: This data provides information on how satisfied participants are with the training programs offered by the LDC.

How are we doing? In FY 2014-15, the LDC offered more training classes to more County employees than ever before. A total of 150 classes were offered and, after each class, the LDC sent an e-survey to all participants. The surveys received 529 responses in FY 2014-15, which is a 667% increase over the previous year's 69 responses. Of the responses in FY 2014-15, the average rating for overall satisfaction of training programs offered by the LDC was 4.4, which indicates that participants think the LDC training classes are generally very good.

2. Performance Measure: Percentage of County employees annually impacted by the Learning and Development Center.

10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Actual Results	13-14 Actual Results	14-15 Adopted	14-15 Actual Results	15-16 Target
New Measure	New Measure	New Measure	New Measure	New Measure	New Measure	30%

What: Provides data on the percentage of County employees taking advantage of the courses offered through the Learning and Development Center (LDC), which will be tracked by the LDC staff. This does not include mandatory training.

Why: This data reveals the saturation of LDC teaching into the organization. This can indicate how successfully the center promotes its offerings and can also indicate the quality of the offerings.

How are we doing? This is a new measure for FY 2015-16. In addition to the single year target, the center's long-term goal would be that all employees have taken at least one class within a five-year period.

3. Performance Measure: Percentage of eligible County employees who are impacted by Leadership Academy training.

10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Actual Results	13-14 Actual Results	14-15 Adopted	14-15 Actual Results	15-16 Target
New Measure	New Measure	New Measure	New Measure	New Measure	New Measure	30%

What: Provides data on the percentage of eligible staff members who successfully completed Leadership Academy training.

Why: This data provides information on how well the Learning and Development Center's various academies permeate into the organization, how effective the center is at promoting the academies, and the commitment of upper management to the mission of the center.

How are we doing? This is a new measure for FY 2015-16. The County currently contracts with the Centre for Organizational Excellence to provide leadership training academies for County supervisors, managers and executives. Approximately 450 County employees are eligible for these leadership academies. The Learning and Development Center plans to conduct up to two academies for each group, reaching a target 145 employees each year for the next three years.

GOALS AND PERFORMANCE MEASURES

Department Goal: To levy fair and equitable assessments on taxable property in an accurate and timely manner by using accepted appraisal principles and prevailing assessment practices.

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

1. Performance Measure: Percentage of the assessment roll completed by June 30th of each year.

10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Actual Results	13-14 Actual Results	14-15 Adopted	14-15 Actual Results	15-16 Target
97%	91%	89%	91%	93%	96.3%	97%

What: Measures the percentage of assessments that are appraised before the June 30th deadline.

Why: Incomplete assessments will generate inaccurate tax bills. When assessments are completed after the year-end deadline, the Assessor, and the Auditor-Controller-Treasurer-Tax Collector-Public Administrator must process revised assessments and tax bills. These revisions increase the costs of preparing the assessment roll and the costs associated with property taxes. In addition, property owners are inconvenienced by revisions to their assessments and the associated delays.

How are we doing? For FY 2014-15, the actual results of 96.3% surpassed the adopted percentage by 3.3% and the FY 13-14 actual results by 5.3%. During FY 2011-12 and FY 2012-13 staffing levels were significantly below prior years FTE's and below allocated FTE's due to vacant appraiser positions which was a result of retirements. This, combined with the ongoing impact of Proposition 8 annual reviews, impacted the percentage of roll completion by the June 30 deadline. A large part of the FY 2014-15 completion percentage increase was due to higher staffing levels and the extensive training, which, provided solid understanding of appraisal principles to the new Appraiser Trainees. The combination equipped the appraisal staff to address the backlog items from the previous year while continuing to address the current workload. Six of the Appraiser Trainees have been promoted to Appraiser I's as they have developed the skills and knowledge giving them the ability to work on their own with minimal mentoring. With this promotion the Appraiser I's will continue to address 3,200 backlog items and new work items, which are increasing each year as market levels rise.

The department set the target completion rate at 94% for FY 2015-16. This is now considered to be low due to the greater than expected reduction in backlog by the end of FY 2014-15 and the reduction of Proposition 8 "Decline-In-Value" properties which require reviewing annually. This leaves additional time to complete the current assessment roll by the June 30 deadline. The department is increasing the FY 2015-16 target to 97%.

2. Performance Measure: The number of completed assessments per appraiser on staff.

10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Actual Results	13-14 Actual Results	14-15 Adopted	14-15 Actual Results	15-16 Target
3,603	3,531	3,306	3,359	3,500	3,232	3,300

What: This measurement tracks the workload per appraiser from year to year.

Why: Tracking changes in workload is an indicator of changes in production levels as new procedures or automated systems are introduced, and helps to evaluate the efficiency of departmental procedures and service to the public.

How are we doing? The complexity of the workload and the time spent on public service contact has intensified as real estate market values have slowly and steadily improved. These factors significantly impact the actual number of appraisals that each appraiser is able to complete. With the continuation of complex work items appraisers are spending additional time on each appraisal. This reduces the number of completed assessments per appraiser and will continue with the real estate market fluctuations. The appraisers completed 3,232 triggers each for FY 2014-15.

With properties returning to their base year value. Appraisers had fewer Proposition 8 "Decline in Value" annual reviews to complete, allowing them to spend more time on complex work items as well as the gathering of important market data to support property valuations.

No comparable county information for this performance measure.

Department Goal: To provide high quality services to the public and taxpayers.

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

3. Performance Measure: The number of assessment appeals filed for every 1,000 assessments.

10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Actual Results	13-14 Actual Results	14-15 Adopted	14-15 Actual Results	15-16 Target
2.96	4.6	2.7	3.5	1.2	1.3	1.1

What: When property owners disagree with their property's assessed value, they may file for an Assessment Appeal hearing with the Assessment Appeals Board. The number of real property appeals is used as an indicator of accuracy and equity among assessments. A low number of appeals is associated with a greater degree of accuracy and the property owner's satisfaction with their assessments.

Why: The Assessor strives to make accurate and thorough assessments when property is initially valued in an effort to control the costs associated with producing the assessment roll. This measure enables the department to track accuracy and equity among assessments.

How are we doing? As the real estate market strengthens, property values will be partial and ultimately fully restored to their Proposition 13 factored value. With these changes in property values taxpayers are questioning their assessed valuation. The department excels in providing information to questioning taxpayers and is proactive in reviewing taxpayers' property value, which reduces the filing of an assessment appeal.

During FY 2014-15 the number of active assessment appeals filed was 236. Based upon the most recent California State Board of Equalization's Report of Budgets, Workloads, and Assessment Appeals Activities for Assessor's Offices for 2013-14, San Luis Obispo County continues to have the lowest number of assessment appeals filed among comparable counties (Marin, Monterey, Napa, Placer, Santa Barbara, Sonoma, and Ventura). Ventura County has the highest number of appeals filed for every 1,000 assessments at a rate of 8.51%.

4. Performance Measure: Cost per assessment.

10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Actual Results	13-14 Actual Results	14-15 Adopted	14-15 Actual Results	15-16 Target
\$45.08	\$43.75	\$43.97	\$44.77	\$46.82	\$47.11	\$50.14

What: This measures the cost per assessment by dividing the department's level of General Fund support by the total number of assessments.

Why: The Assessor's Office strives to make the most effective use of all available resources in order to produce assessments at a reasonable cost.

How are we doing? The department adopted an amount of \$46.82 for FY 2014-15. The actual results are \$47.11 which is an increase of .29 cents. This is due to the increase in salary cost due to the negotiated wage increases. The department was able to absorb a portion of the negotiated wage increases through salary savings from vacant positions.

The most recent California State Board of Equalization Report on Budgets, Workloads, and Assessment Appeals Activities for Assessor's Offices in 2013-14 reflects San Luis Obispo County as one of the counties with the lowest cost per assessment among comparable counties Marin (\$46.65), Monterey (\$22.97), Placer (\$44.07), Santa Barbara (\$50.46), Napa (\$56.63), Sonoma (\$35.75), and Ventura (\$31.22). Monterey (\$22.97) and Ventura (\$31.22) were lower than San Luis Obispo County, while Santa Barbara and Napa Counties had the highest cost per assessment amounts at \$50.46 and \$56.63.

For FY 2015-16 the target increase in the cost per assessment is due to salary increases.

GOALS AND PERFORMANCE MEASURES

Department Goal: Provide periodic review of the internal controls of County departments, and service providers to ensure compliance with regulations, policies and procedures; and minimize losses from fraud or misappropriation.

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

1. Performance Measure: Number of reviews, special district audits, trust fund reviews, and grant compliance audits performed for County departments.

10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Actual Results	13-14 Actual Results	14-15 Adopted	14-15 Actual Results	15-16 Target
17	17	20	11	15	12	15

What: The Internal Audit Division reviews various offices, funds, and programs each year. Selection is made based on legal mandates, and measures of risk, such as dollar value, complexity, and/or the existence (or lack) of other checks and balances.

Why: The reviews and audits help to minimize or prevent losses from fraud, waste, and abuse; and from non-compliance with program funding requirements. Since department managers are often unaware of their department's selection for a detailed audit in any particular year, this serves as a deterrent for lax internal controls.

How are we doing? The Audit staff performs cash, departmental, compliance, and State mandated audits; and review and research duties. In addition to audit work, the team also performs public administration duties, prepares and submits the County's Financial Transaction Report to the State and takes the lead in preparing the Comprehensive Annual Financial Report. Audits and other reports prepared by the Audit staff are submitted to the Board of Supervisors and are available to the public for comment. Actual results for FY 2014-15 were lower than the goal primarily due to staff retirements and transitions.

2. Performance Measure: Number of concessionaire, bed tax, or service provider audits completed.

10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Actual Results	13-14 Actual Results	14-15 Adopted	14-15 Actual Results	15-16 Target
16	21	24	18	22	20	11

What: Selected concessionaires, hotels, and contracted service providers are audited on a rotating basis so that they can expect to be studied once every three or four years. Hotels and most concessions pay the County based on percentages of gross receipts, and many contractors are paid based on counts of eligible services provided.

Why: These audits help to ensure the County is receiving all the revenue it is entitled to, and that payments are made for services actually received. In addition, we try to maintain a level playing field so local businesses pay no more or less than their fair share under the law, and are properly compensated when contracting with the County.

How are we doing? In FY 2014-15, Audit staff did not meet the goal for concessionaire and Transient Occupancy Tax audits due to the retirement of a staff member. We believe maintaining an audit presence helps create an even balance in the community. In addition, Audit staff continued to focus on monitoring service providers' compliance with contracts to the County. Our objective is to ensure service providers are properly compensated and the County receives the full spectrum of services purchased. Audits and other reports prepared by the Audit staff are submitted to the Board of Supervisors and available to the public for comment. The decrease in the FY 2015-16 target number of audits reflects the Audit section's plan to focus on areas of higher risk that were identified in the annual risk assessment. Consequently, audit staff will be spending less time on Transient Occupancy Tax audits and more time on service provider compliance audits which are far more complex and require greater amounts of time to complete.

Department Goal: Maintain the financial health of the County by developing effective annual budgets, accurately identifying expenditures, and ensuring recovery of revenues from State and Federal sources.

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

3. Performance Measure: A favorable audit, by the State Controller's Office, of reimbursable costs allocated through the Countywide Cost Allocation Plan, prepared in accordance with Federal regulations.

10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Actual Results	13-14 Actual Results	14-15 Adopted	14-15 Actual Results	15-16 Target
Audit with no exceptions	Audit with no exceptions	Audit with no exceptions	Audit with no exceptions			

What: State and Federal agencies allow for County's overhead cost reimbursement through numerous programs and grants. The Countywide Cost Allocation Plan is a tool used to distribute overhead costs to programs and departments within the County.

Why: The County is reimbursed for overhead costs.

How are we doing? The State Controller's Office performed an audit of the FY 2013-14 County Cost Allocation Plan. There were no findings or adjustments as a result of the audit.

Department Goal: Provide timely and accurate financial information for the public, Board of Supervisors, and County departments.

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

4. Performance Measure: Earn a clean auditor's opinion on the Comprehensive Annual Financial Report (CAFR).

10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Actual Results	13-14 Actual Results	14-15 Adopted	14-15 Actual Results	15-16 Target
1	1	1	1	1	1	1

What: A clean opinion from outside auditors measures the reliability, integrity and accuracy of the information presented in the County financial statements.

Why: Provides assurance to the public, investors and others that the County's financial position is presented fairly and accurately.

How are we doing? The review of the County's financial statements is required to be done and submitted to the State Controller's Office by December 31 following the end of each fiscal year. The external auditors have completed their annual audit of the FY 2013-14 fiscal year's financial statements and have issued unqualified or clean opinions.

Department Goal: Provide high quality, cost effective Auditor-Controller services.

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

5. Performance Measure: Auditor Controller staff per 100 County employees.

10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Actual Results	13-14 Actual Results	14-15 Adopted	14-15 Actual Results	15-16 Target
1.6	1.6	1.6	1.6	1.6	1.5	1.5

What: This shows Auditor Controller staffing levels per 100 county employees.

Why: This data can be compared with Auditor-Controller offices of similar characteristics to provide one measure of whether we are appropriately staffed.

How are we doing? Staffing levels per 100 employees for our comparable counties (5 counties surveyed) ranged from a low of .9 in Monterey County to a high of 1.7 in Marin County. The Auditor’s Office maintains levels slightly above the average of 1.3. Our actual results exceeded our target number due to an increase in the total number of County employees in FY 2014-15. We are also beginning to see a slight increase in the number of full time equivalent employees (FTEs) in our comparable counties for the second year in a row, a sign that the economy is beginning to improve.

Department Goal: 100% of legal mandates should be implemented within established deadlines.

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

6. Performance Measure: Percentage of legal mandates implemented within established deadlines.

10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Actual Results	13-14 Actual Results	14-15 Adopted	14-15 Actual Results	15-16 Target
100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

What: Monitor State and Federal legislation regularly in order to keep updated with changes to current mandates and new mandates.

Why: So that a proactive response to implement changes to current mandates and new mandates is seamless and timely.

How are we doing? During FY 2014-15, we successfully implemented all known legal mandates including the California Supreme Court decision that requires the removal of the Vehicle License Fee Adjustments from the Supplemental factor calculations, complying with the changes made to Chapter 18 of the Accounting Standards and Procedures Manual published by the State Controller, and implementing Education Code Section 2578 requiring prior year restricted money to be transferred from the County Office of Education to the Supplemental Revenue Augmentation Fund. Our staff also implemented new requirements of the Patient Protection Affordable Care Act (PPACA) to monitor employees who are not participants in the County cafeteria plan that work 30 hours or more per week during a given month. Our office will continue to implement all mandates as they develop in FY 2015-16. The number of legal mandates varies from year to year depending on changes at the State and Federal levels.

GOALS AND PERFORMANCE MEASURES

Department Goal: To enhance the public’s trust in county government by measurably demonstrating that we provide efficient, high quality, results oriented services.

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

1. Performance Measure: Percentage of citizens that rate the overall quality of services the County provides as “good” to “excellent”.

10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Actual Results	13-14 Actual Results	14-15 Adopted	14-15 Actual Results	15-16 Target
72%	Triennial Survey	Triennial Survey	72%	Triennial Survey	Triennial Survey	Triennial Survey

What: Measures citizen satisfaction with County services using data from the ACTION for Healthy Communities telephone survey now conducted every three years. Concurrently, the County conducts a Citizen’s Opinion Survey that builds on the data provided in the ACTION for Healthy Communities survey. Both surveys include specific questions designed to solicit information from the public relative to whether they received satisfactory service from County employees.

Why: It is the County’s desire to provide services to our residents that are in line with their expectations. Based on the data gathered from these two surveys, County departments will develop and implement action plans designed to improve the quality of services delivered to the public and we will continue to measure our progress in meeting this goal over time.

How are we doing? The 2013 ACTION telephone survey asked 1,102 randomly selected adults, “How would you rate the San Luis Obispo County government, including major units such as the Sheriff, Social Services, County Planning and Building, Elections Office, Health Department, Assessor, Tax Collector, Roads and the County Board of Supervisors?” “Overall, how would you rate the services provided by San Luis Obispo County government?” 69% of the respondents rated the County as “good” (40%), “very good” (19%) or “excellent” (10%). These results show an increase in those respondents rating County services as “excellent” but demonstrate a slight decline from the 2010 survey in which 72% rated the county as “good” (41%), “very good” (25%) or “excellent” (6%). The 2013 ACTION survey was presented to the Board on December 3, 2013. The survey results are posted on the County’s website: <http://www.slocounty.ca.gov>. The next ACTION telephone survey is planned for FY 2016-17.

2. Performance Measure: Percentage of citizens that indicate their overall impression of County employees (based on their most recent contact) is good or excellent.

10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Actual Results	13-14 Actual Results	14-15 Adopted	14-15 Actual Results	15-16 Target
Survey on hold	Survey on hold	Survey on hold	Survey on hold	Survey on hold	Survey on hold	Triennial Survey

What: The County initiated a Citizen’s Opinion Survey that will be conducted every three years to build on the data provided in the ACTION for Healthy Communities survey. The survey tool includes specific questions designed to solicit information from the public relative to whether they received satisfactory service from County employees.

Why: The information gained from this survey will be used to help us improve customer service to the public. Based on the data gathered from the Citizen’s Opinion Survey, County departments will develop and implement action plans designed to improve the quality of services delivered to the public and we will continue to measure our progress in meeting this goal over time.

How are we doing? During the financial downturn, the Citizen’s Opinion Survey was put on hold as a cost savings measure. The most recent survey was conducted in the Winter of 2007. That survey asked respondents if they had contact with County employees in the past 12 months, and if so, to rate their overall impression of that contact in terms of knowledge, responsiveness and courtesy of County staff. 57% of the respondents had contact in that past year, and of those, 75% rated their overall impression of their contacts with County employees as “good” or “excellent”. The next Citizen’s Opinion Survey is scheduled for 2016.

GOALS AND PERFORMANCE MEASURES

Department Goal: Create, process, maintain, and/or update records and documents (i.e., Board of Supervisor minutes and records, real property and vital records, voter registration, etc.) in a timely and accurate manner to ensure compliance with local, state, and federal laws.

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

1. Performance Measure: Percentage of documents received by mail which are examined and recorded, or returned within two business days.

10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Actual Results	13-14 Actual Results	14-15 Adopted	14-15 Actual Results	15-16 Target
96%	99%	99%	99.5%	100%	99.5%	100%

What: This measure tracks the processing time of official records (e.g. deeds, reconveyances) received in the mail.

Why: Tracking the time it takes to process official records helps to measure how prompt our customer service is to the public, County departments, State, and Federal agencies, and enables us to ensure we are complying with law that requires recordation within two days of receipt of specific documents, which are sent to us by express delivery.

How are we doing? FY 2014-15 amounts fell slightly below targeted levels. Recording levels for FY 2014-15 have increased by 5% (approximately 3,100 documents) compared to FY 2013-14 levels. The department has faced heavy staffing shortages in the last half of FY 2014-15, along with an 8% increase in recording volumes in the same time period. At the start of FY 2015-16, the department is almost fully staffed and with our ongoing focus on additional training for staff, we continue to strive towards achieving our goal of 100% in the future when recording levels increase. No comparable county data is available.

Department Goal: To provide easily accessible self-help options for services when possible.

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

2. Performance Measure: Number of citizens who completed transactions with the County Clerk-Recorder without the need to contact the office directly or be physically present in the office.

	10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Actual Results	13-14 Actual Results	14-15 Adopted	14-15 Actual Results	15-16 Target
Online Voter Registration: Percentage of total voter registrations completed online per year.	New Measure	New Measure	26% (11,614)	16% (3,015)	35% (11,550)	22% (6,609)	30% (9,900)
Certified Vital Records Requests without physical appearance: Percentage of total vital requests completed with a credit card through fax per year.	New Measure	New Measure	13% (1,403)	16% (1,902)	15% (1,500)	14% (1,529)	15% (1,600)
Online Polling Place Look-Up: Number of visits to the online polling place look-up per election.	New Measure	New Measure	9,317	2,877	7,000	3,052	4,000
Online Voter Registration Status Look-Up: Number of visits to the online voter registration status look-up per election.	New Measure	New Measure	10,004	1,469	9,000	2,322	5,500

What: These measures track the use of Clerk-Recorder services available remotely.

Why: When customers can complete transactions and obtain information online without contacting the office via telephone or in person, the customer benefits in convenience as well as time and cost savings. Tracking this measurement will help identify the benefits to our customers as well as allow better allocation of staff and the need for temporary election employees during the busiest times of the year.

How are we doing? Online Voter Registration: On September 19, 2012, the Secretary of State went live with online voter registrations. This allowed voters immediate access to register to vote and, on the last day to register for the November 2012 General Election. San Luis Obispo County received over 1,000 online registrations from voters who would have missed the deadline if they had used more traditional methods. Online voter registrations result in an 80% decrease of staff time per online registration, a savings of approximately 410 hours of staff time per year. FY 2012-13 results reflect only nine months of availability. FY 2014-15 amounts are below adopted amounts due low voter interest and turn out in the November General Election. FY 2015-16 target amounts factor in the difference in registration numbers between a Gubernatorial election and a Presidential election. In the current fiscal year, 25% is equivalent to 8,250 online registrations per year; however, the actual number of registrations will fluctuate dependent on the registration activity of each election. No comparable county data is available.

Vital Records Requests without office appearance: For the past several years, customers have been able to request a vital record copy by faxing an application for the record; however, the only method for payment incurred a \$7.00 service charge for the customer. While this allowed customers to receive a copy of a vital record in a 24-48 hour turnaround, it was an expensive option for customers. In April 2011, the Clerk-Recorder implemented a credit card payment processing system which decreased the convenience fee for the customers to \$1.49 (nearly an 80% decrease from the previous fee) and consequently, customers are taking advantage of this service more frequently. An additional benefit of accepting more credit card payments for this service is the reduced potential for checks refused due to insufficient funds. The FY 2014-15 actual results reflect steady usage, which is expected to continue. In the current fiscal year, 15% is equivalent to 1,600 requests annually. No comparable county data is available.

Online Polling Place & Voter Registration Status Look Up: The addition of online polling place and voter registration status look up has been a helpful tool for both our staff and the voters. Voters now have the ability to look up their registration status and their polling place without having to call the office during the highest call volume periods and can find the information at their convenience. Reducing calls during election time reduces the need to hire temporary staff to answer phones and saves the cost of activating additional phone lines. The General Election in FY 2014-15 saw an increase in activity from the June election, although not as high as predicted. The FY 2015-16 target reflects increased voter interest in Presidential elections. No comparable county data is available.

FY 2012-13 Results: November 2012 General Presidential Election

FY 2013-14 Results: June 2014 Primary Election

FY 2014-15 Results: November 2014 General Election

FY 2015-16 Results: June 2016 Presidential Primary Election

Department Goal: Ensure the integrity of the San Luis Obispo County election process and encourage the participation of all eligible voters in a cost-effective manner.

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

3. Performance Measure: Cost per vote-by-mail ballot.

10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Actual Results	13-14 Actual Results	14-15 Adopted	14-15 Actual Results	15-16 Target
\$1.77*	\$2.22	\$1.93	\$1.63	\$2.15	\$1.23	\$2.15
\$2.06**						

What: This measures the cost to issue each vote-by-mail (VBM) ballot.

Why: Vote-by-mail ballots have traditionally been very labor intensive to administer and process. Currently, approximately 57% (89,905) of San Luis Obispo County voters choose to permanently vote by mail. Tracking the costs of issuing vote-by-mail ballots allows the department to plan for the budgetary impacts of these ballots accordingly and contributes to efforts of automating and streamlining the process to increase efficiency and keep costs down.

How are we doing? The deployment of technology has had a profound impact on this labor intensive process. Since San Luis Obispo County began implementing technology and introduced efficiencies for the issuance of vote-by-mail ballots, per ballot costs have been reduced from \$4.11 per voter in 1998 to the current \$1.23 per vote-by-mail voter. The FY 2014-15 actual results are lower than adopted amounts due to the decrease in voter turnout. This decrease resulted in less staff time required for processing returned vote by mail ballots and lowered costs per ballot. The higher FY 2015-16 target reflects the increase in vote by mail costs for the party specific ballots necessary for a Presidential Primary Election, as well as costs from Senate Bill 29 which will allow ballots postmarked before or on election day to be counted if the ballots are received by the registrar of voters within three days after the election. There are no comparable county data at this time.

FY 2010-11 Results: * August 2010 Special SD 15 General Election ** November 2010 General Election

FY 2011-12 Results: June 2012 Presidential Primary Election

FY 2012-13 Results: November 2012 General Presidential Election

FY 2013-14 Results: June 2014 Primary Election

FY 2014-15 Results: November 2014 General Election

FY 2015-16 Results: June 2016 Presidential Primary Election

4. Performance Measure: Average cost per registered voter in the County.						
10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Actual Results	13-14 Actual Results	14-15 Adopted	14-15 Actual Results	15-16 Target
\$2.21* \$3.49**	\$3.77	\$4.79	\$3.90	\$4.25	\$4.20	\$3.80

What: This measures the cost of conducting a countywide election per registered voter.

Why: Measuring the cost of conducting countywide elections per registered voter enables the Clerk-Recorder to have a better understanding of the overall costs of conducting an election and to identify means to conduct elections in the most cost effective manner possible.

How are we doing? The department continues to maintain its commitment to providing the best election experience in the most cost effective manner. The FY 2014-15 actual cost for the November 2014 General Election is slightly below adopted amounts due to lower than anticipated voter turnout, which requires less staff hours for processing. The FY 2015-16 target reflects lower costs associated with the lower voter turnout typical during a Primary Election and still factors in the increased ballot printing costs necessary for party specific ballots necessary for the federal races. No comparable county data is available at this time.

FY 2010-11 Results: * August Special SD 15 General Election ** November 2010 General Election
 FY 2011-12 Results: June 2012 Presidential Primary Election
 FY 2012-13 Results: November 2012 General Presidential Election
 FY 2013-14 Results: June 2014 Primary Election
 FY 2014-15 Results: November 2014 General Election
 FY 2015-16 Results: June 2016 Presidential Primary Election

5. Performance Measure: Voter Participation Rate.						
10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Actual Results	13-14 Actual Results	14-15 Adopted	14-15 Actual Results	15-16 Target
43.41%* 69%**	48.59%	80%	41.46%	70%	58.42%	60%

What: This measures San Luis Obispo County voter turnout in elections.

Why: Measurements of voter turnout are an indicator of whether people participate in their government and have a stake in their future. The Clerk-Recorder measures voter turnout to target populations and geographical areas where more voter education may be needed and to ensure that we have efficiently assigned staff and resources to assist voters.

How are we doing? Many factors impact voter turnout. Turnout is always highest in a Presidential General Election and lowest in a gubernatorial Primary Election and special elections. Voter file maintenance is critical to ensure that election files are current and up-to-date, thereby giving a more accurate picture of voter turnout. The Clerk-Recorder is committed to encouraging voter participation and educating the public on deadlines for voter registration and the process to obtain a vote-by-mail ballot for each election. The department's commitment to mail voter information pamphlets/vote by mail applications at the earliest possible date, and the posting of information and polling place lookup on the internet, assists voters in being informed and contributes to the County's high rates of voter turnout. The office has also made an effort to utilize social media, such as Facebook and Twitter, to notify citizens of upcoming deadlines and other voter information. These efforts to encourage voter turnout are reflected in the County's voter turnout, which averages around 10% higher when compared to the Statewide voter turnouts for any given election. Voter turnout is 58.42% (87,705 ballots cast), which is below adopted levels for FY 2014-15. Voter participation statewide was only 42%, so despite County levels being lower than projected, San Luis Obispo County still averaged 16% higher than the State as a whole. The target of 60% voter turnout (90,083 ballots cast) for FY 2015-16 is on par with previous Presidential Primary Elections.

FY 2010-11 Results: * August 2010 Special SD 15 General Election ** November 2010 General Election
 FY 2011-12 Results: June 2012 Presidential Primary Election
 FY 2012-13 Results: November 2012 General Presidential Election
 FY 2013-14 Results: June 2014 Primary Election
 FY 2014-15 Results: November 2014 General Election
 FY 2015-16 Results: June 2016 Presidential Primary Election

GOALS AND PERFORMANCE MEASURES

<p>Department Goal: Provide helpful, courteous, responsive service to County departments and the public while accommodating all reasonable requests.</p> <p>Communitywide Result Link: <input 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: Percentage of customer satisfaction surveys which rate department performance as “excellent” or “good.”</p>						
10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Actual Results	13-14 Actual Results	14-15 Adopted	14-15 Actual Results	15-16 Target
100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
<p>What: This measure tracks the satisfaction survey results collected from customers who are served in person, through the mail, or over the Internet.</p> <p>Why: Customer satisfaction levels are measured and tracked to identify areas in which the department can improve its level of service to the public.</p> <p>How are we doing? In FY 2014-15, the department received 38 completed customer satisfaction surveys from the public service counter. All 38 survey responses, or 100%, rated the service as “excellent” or “good.” The department continues to fine-tune the services provided to the public by enhancing the Tax Collector’s website and the Taxes on the Web system to increase the percentage of department services available 24/7. The Property Tax Management System allows taxpayers the ability to manage all of their assessments in one transaction and to “go green” by using the paperless billing. Staff continually cross-train to enhance their knowledge and skills, which increases the level of service available to the public. The projected result for FY 2015-16 remains that 100% of customer satisfaction surveys will indicate that the department’s performance is “excellent” or “good.”</p>						
<p>Department Goal: Manage County funds on deposit in the County Treasury to meet three goals, in order of priority: 1) ensure the safety of principal, 2) provide liquidity to meet the funding needs of participants, and 3) earn an appropriate and competitive yield.</p> <p>Communitywide Result Link: <input type="checkbox"/> Safe <input type="checkbox"/> Healthy <input type="checkbox"/> Livable <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Prosperous <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Well-Governed Community</p>						
<p>2. Performance Measure: Percentage of time in which the net yield of San Luis Obispo County Treasury investments falls within 0.5% of the yield earned by the State of California Local Agency Investment Fund (LAIF).</p>						
10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Actual Results	13-14 Actual Results	14-15 Adopted	14-15 Actual Results	15-16 Target
100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
<p>What: The investment yield (return on investments minus all administrative and banking costs) of the County Treasury Pool is compared to the yield of the State of California investment fund, LAIF. The LAIF is utilized as a standard benchmark for investment yield by most California counties as an indicator that investment portfolios are following the market. The LAIF has a fund balance of over \$60 billion, or about 100 times the size of the County Treasury investment pool. Further, the LAIF is a pure investment fund, whereas the County Treasury’s investment pool must also act as an operating fund, covering the daily operating liquidity needs of participating County departments and agencies. This performance measure is based on achieving a relative net yield within 0.5% of the LAIF.</p> <p>Why: Net investment yield is the third priority for the County Treasury investment pool, after safety and liquidity. Achieving this standard means the County is effectively maximizing its income from investments.</p> <p>How are we doing? The County Treasury net yield was within the targeted variance of 0.5% compared to the LAIF net yield in FY 2014-2015. The County Treasury continues to explore ways to reduce costs and aggressively search for options to obtain better yields without jeopardizing safety and liquidity.</p>						
<p>3. Performance Measure: Maintain an “AAA/V1” credit rating by Fitch Ratings for the Treasury Combined Pool Investments.</p>						
10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Actual Results	13-14 Actual Results	14-15 Adopted	14-15 Actual Results	15-16 Target
“AAA/V1”	“AAA/V1”	“AAA/V1”	“AAA/V1”	“AAA/V1”	“AAA/V1”	“AAA/V1”
<p>What: This measure tracks the County Treasury’s success in meeting its safety and liquidity goals for the Treasury investment pool. Fitch Ratings, Inc. (Fitch) is a nationally recognized statistical rating organization that provides an independent evaluation of the investment pool, and its ability to protect the principal and provide liquidity, even in the face of adverse interest rate environments. The target is to achieve the highest available rating.</p> <p>Why: Credit ratings are an objective measure of the County’s ability to pay its financial obligations as well as meet safety and liquidity goals for the County Treasury investment pool.</p>						

How are we doing? Fitch has assigned their highest rating to the County Pool since FY 1994-95. The investment pool's "AAA" rating "reflects the fund's vulnerability to losses as a result of defaults based on the actual and prospective average credit quality of the fund's invested portfolio." The pool's "V1" volatility rating "reflects low market risk and a capacity to return stable principal value to meet anticipated cash flow requirements, even in adverse interest rate environments." Most recently, on July 13, 2015, Fitch affirmed the County Pool's "AAA/V1" rating.

Department Goal: Ensure public funds on deposit in the County Treasury are properly managed, safeguarded and controlled, and that accounting is proper and accurate.

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

4. Performance Measure: Percentage of time that "no findings" is the result of the quarterly cash procedures audit, the annual County Treasury audit, and the annual investment policy compliance audit ordered by the County Treasury Oversight Committee.

10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Actual Results	13-14 Actual Results	14-15 Adopted	14-15 Actual Results	15-16 Target
100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

What: The County Treasury is audited in several ways throughout the year to ensure accurate and proper accounting, and that proper procedures and internal controls are in place and being followed. Each quarter, the Certified Public Accountants firm contracted by the County conducts an unannounced cash procedures audit of the County Treasury. Annually, this outside firm conducts an audit of the County's financial records, including those of the County Treasury. Also annually, the County Treasury Oversight Committee (CTOC) causes an audit to be conducted of the County Treasury's compliance with the approved Investment Policy. The CTOC is comprised of the County Auditor-Controller, a representative from the Board of Supervisors, a qualified member of the public with expertise in finance, and representatives of the schools which have monies deposited in the County Treasury. The CTOC also monitors the County Treasury investment pool's reporting throughout the year. These audits protect the public by ensuring that public funds are properly managed, safeguarded and controlled, and that accounting is proper and accurate. This measure tracks the results of these audits.

Why: Internal and external audits certify that public funds on deposit in the County Treasury are properly managed, safeguarded and controlled, and that accounting is proper and accurate.

How are we doing? The above audits have consistently resulted in no findings or recommendations. During FY 2014-15, the quarterly unannounced audits of the Treasury were conducted on September 5, 2014, December 8, 2014, March 26, 2015, and June 30, 2015. All of these audits resulted in no findings or recommendations. The annual audit for FY 2014-15 will be conducted in October 2015. It is anticipated that this audit will result in no findings or recommendations.

Department Goal: Process tax payments promptly and accurately to provide timely availability of funds to the government agencies for which taxes are collected.

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

5. Performance Measure: Percentage of annual current secured property taxes owed that is not collected.

10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Actual Results	13-14 Actual Results	14-15 Adopted	14-15 Actual Results	15-16 Target
3.2%	2.2%	1.37%	1.14%	2.0%	1.08%	1.2%

What: This measures the percentage of current secured property taxes that are owed but not collected.

Why: This measure demonstrates the County's compliance with legal mandates that require the collection of property taxes.

How are we doing? In FY 2013-14, San Luis Obispo County had uncollected current secured taxes of \$5,149,127, or 1.14%. The State average for FY 2013-14 (the last year for which statistics are currently available) was 1.3%. For FY 2014-15 the County had uncollected current secured taxes at the end of the fiscal year totaling \$5,183,970 or 1.08%. The lowest level of uncollected taxes in over 20 years. The lower levels of delinquency are attributed to continued improvements in taxpayer communications and the improving economy. It is anticipated that the percentage of taxes uncollected in San Luis Obispo County will continue to be lower (better) than the state average in FY 2015-16.

Department Goal: Continually enhance, improve, and increase usage of online systems, which provide 24/7 access to tax information, options for electronic tax payments, and paperless billing, thereby improving service and providing more environmentally friendly processing.

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

6. Performance Measure: Percentage of tax payments made electronically.

10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Actual Results	13-14 Actual Results	14-15 Adopted	14-15 Actual Results	15-16 Target
New	New	30.2%	32.9%	33.0%	35.5%	37.0%

What: The Tax Collector's website provides extensive information, and allows for electronic commerce with the community.

Why: Electronic payments are more environmentally friendly, saving taxpayers and the department paper, ink, and mail transportation, as well as processing costs. For this reason, the department intends to continue to improve systems and encourage use of electronic payments over time. The ability to locate information and transact business online 24/7 is an important tool to improve the quality of service to the community. This measure reflects progress in usage of online services to better serve the community.

How are we doing? The public has continually requested that online services be made available and the department has worked to fulfill these requests. Improvements to the designs of the tax bills in FY 2014-15 made electronic payment options more obvious, resulting in more electronic payments than expected. The department continues to use press releases, billing inserts and individual taxpayer communications to make taxpayers aware of the services available and the options for electronic payments, including free e-checks. Usage of such services, including the use of electronic payments, continues to increase.

Department Goal: Expediently investigate and administer the estates of deceased county residents when there is no executor or administrator to protect estate assets in the best interests of the beneficiaries, creditors, and the County.

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

7. Performance Measure: Percentage of referrals to the Public Administrator that are completed with an initial investigation report, and a decision to accept or decline, within 15 business days.

10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Actual Results	13-14 Actual Results	14-15 Adopted	14-15 Actual Results	15-16 Target
80%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

What: Measures the processing time for cases referred to the Public Administrator when no one is willing or able to manage a decedent's estate administration.

Why: California Probate Code section 7620 states that the Public Administrator shall act "promptly" in regards to making decisions on case acceptance. This measure demonstrates the County's compliance with this legal requirement and the expediency with which the County protects estate assets.

How are we doing? All cases referred to the Public Administrator are investigated and a decision to accept or decline the case is made within 15 business days. Each estate investigation begins immediately upon notification. The procedure involves extensive investigation of assets, locating family members or beneficiaries, locating trusts or wills if they exist, and securing assets that may be subject to misappropriation. In FY 2014-15, 18 estate referrals were investigated. In 12 of those estate investigations, either an heir or other responsible person was located to administer the estate, or it was determined that there were no estate assets to administer. The remaining 6 estates were accepted for administration by the Public Administrator pursuant to California Probate Code. In FY 2014-15, all of these 18 estate referrals were investigated and determined within the 15 business day policy. The Public Administrator expects to promptly investigate and determine estate administrations within 15 business days throughout the FY 2015-16.