

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.						
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
23 minutes	20 minutes	22 minutes	18 minutes	20 minutes	17 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 17 minutes for 37 high priority calls from July 1, 2014 through June 30, 2015 favorably exceeded the adopted average response time of 20 minutes. The targeted priority call response time for FY 2015-16 is based upon an average of the past three fiscal years.</p>						
2. Performance Measure: Percentage of countywide dog population that is licensed.						
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
33%	34%	37%	39%	36%	39%	38%
<p>What: This measure compares the actual number of licensed dogs in the County of San Luis Obispo to the total dog population as projected from US Census data and 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 percentage of dogs licensed throughout the county in FY 2014-15 compared to the projected total dog population for the County was 39%. There were 24,275 licenses issued through FY 2014-15 versus a calculated dog population of 62,686 (calculated using the AVMA pet ownership calculator based on our county population of 279,083). The FY 2015-16 Target reflects an increase in the estimated number of dogs licensed within the County based on a three year average of actuals.</p> <p>According to the National Animal Interest Alliance (NAIA) – “A Guide to Constructing Successful, Pet-friendly Ordinances” a licensure compliance rate of 30% is the number most often cited by animal control agencies as the high end of the license compliance curve.</p>						
3. Performance Measure: Live animal outcome 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
80%	81%	80%	89%	83%	91%	87%
<p>What: The percentage of animals discharged from Animal Services' shelter alive. The Live Animal Outcome Rate is calculated in accordance with definitions established by Maddies' Fund and the Asilomar Accords.</p> <p>Why: This measure reflects Animal Services' success in reuniting lost pets with their owners and in placing adoptable animals into new homes.</p>						

How are we doing? Through FY 2014-15, the live outcome rate was 91% and was based on a total of 3,286 animals brought into the shelter, of which 3,004 animals were reunited with their owners, adopted to new homes, or placed with rescue agencies. More specifically, dogs experienced a live outcome rate of 94%, cats 90%, and other animals 79% during FY 2014-15. This favorable trend is attributed to the combined impact of a generally lower animal intake rate coupled with the positive effects of the division's recently implemented Shelter-Neuter-Return (SNR) program for community cats and kittens. The updated projected target of 89% for FY 2015-16 is based upon an average of the past three fiscal years.

For reference, the last live animal outcome rates published by the State of California Rabies Control reflect results for the following California counties during calendar year 2013: Contra Costa – 62%, Santa Barbara -75%, Santa Clara – did not report%, Ventura –did not report%, Kern -31%, and Monterey – did not report%. <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”, “above satisfactory” 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
93%	88%	96%	96%	100%	Data not available	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”, “above 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? Surveys were not mailed out during FY 2014-15 due to IT staff not producing the requested report necessary to gather the list of customers and address' for the survey. The projected FY 2015-16 target of 100% will continue to reflect the division's commitment to providing quality animal services to the customers they come in contact with.

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

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
\$8.57	\$9.10	\$10.63	\$13.67	\$8.41	\$11.16	\$17.81

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? During FY 2014-15, the kennel operations incurred expenditures per animal kennel day of \$11.16 (\$713,809.98 / 63,972 days). The variance is primarily due to a drop in the number of live animals brought into the shelter (overall drop of 5%) along with a drop in the amount of time animals spend in shelter (overall drop of 22%) before being adopted, rescued, redeemed, or other outcome.

The division has projected the target for FY 2015-16 to reflect the updated budget amount of \$934,215 (includes the addition of a volunteer coordinator and associated supplies) for kennel operation costs against a projection of 52,457 kennel days (based on a three-year average of continuing decline in kennel stays).

No comparison data is available.

GOALS AND PERFORMANCE MEASURES

The San Luis Obispo County Department of Child Support Services is managed by the State Department of Child Support Services, which is under the umbrella of the Federal Office of Child Support Enforcement. Our performance measures are mandated by the State based on federal requirements and time-frames. The Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) for our reporting runs from October 1 through September 30 of each year. The current status and comparison, from June 30, 2014, of each performance measure has been noted, however, the actual published results for FFY 14-15 will not be made available until after February 2016.

Department Goal: To ensure that children receive the support benefits they are entitled to as quickly as possible.						
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						
1. Performance Measure: Percentage of child support cases with a court order for child support.						
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
94.7%	95.3%	97.4%	96.9%	97.4%	Not Available until early 2016	96.9%
What: Support orders are the legal documents which establish child and medical support. This performance measure calculates the percentage of cases in our caseload with an established court order for child support.						
Why: Establishment of support orders creates the legal basis to enforce obligations for child and medical support. The more court orders established, the more children receive the support to which they are entitled, and the less public aid they are required to rely on.						
How are we doing? In FFY 2013-14, 96.9% (3,696 of 3,814) of our cases had a court order for support. San Luis Obispo County ranked 1 st in percent of child support cases with court orders when compared to other local child support agencies. The statewide average is 89.2%. In comparison to the percentage of established court orders by June 30, 2014 at 95%, there were 96.1% established by June 30, 2015, a 1.1% increase from the previous year. Actual published results for FFY 14-15 will not be made available until after February 2016.						
Department Goal: To improve the standard of living for families we serve by ensuring a high percentage of current child support collections.						
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						
2. Performance Measure: Percentage of current support 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
71.3%	75.2%	77.8%	78.9%	77.8%	Not Available until early 2016	78.9%
What: The total current support collected during the course of the year as compared to the total amount of current support owed during the course of the year. Current support refers to the total dollar amount of the monthly child support obligation enforced by our department.						
Why: So that families and children receive the financial support to which they are legally entitled.						
How are we doing? In FFY 2013-14, the department collected 78.9% (\$11,006,407 of \$13,951,417) of current support owed. This performance represents a record high for the department. San Luis Obispo County ranked 2 nd in percentage of current support collected when compared to other local child support agencies. The statewide average is 64.9%. Distributed collections for FFY 2013-14 increased when compared to the prior year by \$232,164. The total percentage of current support collected as of June 30, 2014 was 78.5%, compared to this year on June 30, 2015, collections of current support were at 78.2%, down by 3/10 of a percent. Actual published results for FFY 14-15 will not be made available until after February 2016.						
3. Performance Measure: Percentage of child support cases in which past due support is owed and payment is received during the Federal Fiscal 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
74%	77.1%	79.5%	81.9%	79.5%	Not Available until early 2016	81.9%
What: This measures the number of cases in which a collection of past due support was received during the Federal Fiscal Year.						
Why: So that families and children receive the financial support to which they are entitled.						

How are we doing? In FFY 2013-14, payment of past due support was collected in 81.9% () (3,124 pf 3,814) 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 collection of payment for past due support when compared to other local child support agencies. The statewide average is 65.8%. We are using a delinquent auto phone dialer to call non-custodial parents who are delinquent with support, and we continue to employ a retired Family Support Officer as temporary help to work special projects aimed at improving performance. The total percentage of payments received on past due support on June 30, 2014 was 79.3%, compared to 78.9% this year on June 30, 2015, down by 4/10 of a percent. Actual published results for FFY 14-15 will not be made available until after February 2016.

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

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
\$2.84	\$3.01	\$3.24	\$3.35	\$3.25	Not Available until early 2016	\$3.35

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 improved in FFY 2013-14 as compared to FY 2012-13, with actual results increasing from \$3.24 collected per \$1.00 of total expenditure to \$3.35, a 3% improvement. The statewide average for FFY 2013-14 was \$2.43. We believe that our FFY 2013-14 target was exceeded due to our collections increasing more than expected, while our expenditures decreased. The total child support dollars collected per \$1.00 of total expenditure was \$3.28 on June 30, 2014, compared to \$3.30 this year on June 30, 2015, increased collection by .02c per \$1.00 spent. Actual published results for FFY 14-15 will not be made available until after February 2016.

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: Safe Healthy Livable Prosperous Well-Governed Community

1. Performance Measure: Average time elapsed from receiving a request for assistance until the first 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.

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 Performance Measure FY 13-14	New Performance Measure FY 13-14	New Performance 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/90% (b) 8 min/90% (c) 15 min/85% (d) 20 min/80% (e) 30 min/75%	(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%

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, would be first units arriving 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 2014-15 actual results, therefore, are from CY 2014.

Since the adoption of this performance measure, we have worked closely with our Emergency Command Center and Pre-Fire Planning staff to develop the methodology needed to accurately report the data. While the process for this has largely been implemented, there are still some fine tuning steps to be taken, including a redesign of the data collection for calls in areas designated as Undeveloped. Consequently, we are unable to report actual results in this category for FY 2014.

In CY 2013 and again in CY 2014, we exceeded our target in almost all areas, and we were very close in meeting those targets as well. We will continue to review our performance with an emphasis on response times in all areas, in an effort to identify any deficiencies and determine if they are performance-based or a result of misinterpretation of data.

Ongoing strategies employed to reduce response times include improving dispatch procedures and technology, reviewing and updating maps used for dispatch, fine-tuning details of response plans, and improving communications between responders and dispatchers.

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 which is available at www.calfireslo.org.

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

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 Performance Measure FY 13-14	New Performance Measure FY 13-14	New Performance 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/90% (b) 13 min/90% (c) 18 min/85% (d) 28 min/80% (e) 45 min/75%	(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%

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, would be other responding units (the second unit on scene) arriving 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 2014-15 projected results, therefore, are from CY 2014.

Since the adoption of this performance measure, we have worked closely with our Emergency Command Center and Pre-Fire Planning staff to develop the methodology needed to accurately report the data. While the process for this has largely been implemented, there are still some fine tuning steps to be taken, including a redesign of the data collection for calls in areas designated as Undeveloped. Consequently, we are unable to report actual results in this category for FY 2014.

In CY 2013 and CY 2014, we exceeded our target in almost all areas, and we were very close to meeting those targets as well. We will continue to review our performance with an emphasis on response times in all areas, in an effort to identify any deficiencies and determine if they are performance-based or a result of misinterpretation of data.

Ongoing strategies employed to reduce response times include improving dispatch procedures and technology, reviewing and updating maps used for dispatch, fine-tuning details of response plans, and improving communications between responders and dispatchers.

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.

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.

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
\$30,968	\$30,930	\$28,845	\$28,901	No more than \$30,000	\$30,340	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? The rate of property loss in FY 2014-15 increased slightly compared to the two prior year, as a result of an unusually large structure fire, which resulted in \$500,000 in property losses. While this increase is regrettable, it only amounts to approximately 1% over the adopted target. 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 2014-15, was \$30,340. Property losses are tracked and reported on a calendar year (CY) basis, for the calendar year ending during the fiscal year (FY) reported. FY 2014-15 results, therefore, are from CY 2014. 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 2014-15 is \$30,340. Since this only slightly exceeded our goal, the target for FY 2015-16 remains the same.

This number represents an increase of 5% compared to FY 2013-14. Fire loss details for the year included: vehicle fires \$539,300; structure fires \$2,198,050; total fire losses \$2,737,550. Nationwide fire-related property losses totaled \$11.5 billion in 2013, or \$35,667 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.

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.

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
0.129	0.840	0.065	0.044	0	0.027	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.

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 2014-15 results, therefore, are from CY 2014. 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 2014-15 was 0.027. This number represents a decrease of 38% compared to FY 2013-14. While this performance measure utilizes a five-year rolling average, it is worth noting that there has not been a single fire-related death in County Fire jurisdictions since 2010.

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 2,855 in 2013 (the last year with data available), or 0.089 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.

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.

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
0.80	0.80	0.90	0.88	0.90	0.88	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 2014-15, the Department utilized 81 full-time equivalent emergency responders, for a rate of 0.88 per thousand population. 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 2014, 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 included in the department's FY 2014-15 budget. In future years, it will be necessary 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.

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

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
\$159.16	\$161.85	\$163.65	\$165.49	No more than \$175.00	\$170.54	No more than \$178.00

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 target 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 the current year were \$170.54 per capita, an increase of 4.4% over the FY 2013-14 actual amount. This increase is the result of recent changes to the compensation rates charged by Cal Fire, the State agency that provides fire service to the county under contract.

Two changes to Cal Fire staffing costs were made in September, after the Board had adopted the County's FY 2014-15 budget: 1) the cost of employee benefits was increased by California Public Employees' Retirement System (CalPERS), and 2) Firefighter wages were increased as a result of collective bargaining spurred by the increase to the State minimum wage. The impact of these salary increases was partially offset by a long fire season, which shifts costs from the County to the State, and resulted in actual results for this measure being well below the projected amount. An additional salary increase is possible in FY 2015-16, when the state minimum wage is set to increase again. In anticipation of that increase, the target for FY 2015-16 to \$178.00 per capita.

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

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
31%	33%	34%	33%	No less than 35%	30%	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 2014-15, the department revenue totaled \$6,440,842, resulting in a rate of 30%. 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 which have been included are from many sources, but 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.

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

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
Crime rate lower than 100% of comparable counties (2010)* - Crime rate lower than 80% of counties statewide serving populations of 100,000 or more	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 75% of counties statewide serving populations of 100,000 or more (2014)	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)

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 reflects the most accurate capturing of countywide law enforcement reporting data.

How are we doing? Calendar year 2014 statistical crime data was released by the State of California Department of Justice Office of the Attorney General in July 2015. Recent DOJ statistics reported for calendar year 2014 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 with a total of 1,098.10 serious violent, property, and arson offenses per 100,000 population, a figure lower than the statewide rate (1,332.40) for all 58 counties. 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 has consistently ranked below the statewide average in years 2008 through 2014.

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.

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
94.8%	93.5%	94.5%	Data Unavailable	93%	Data Unavailable	93%

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, including those with and without assigned DA case numbers, 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 has been difficult to achieve. While new reports have been developed, several issues remain with San Luis Obispo County Superior Court’s warrant and court case update interfaces which are both necessary to establishing verifiable case aging data.

Superior Court’s much anticipated warrant interface, installed in March 2015, now captures aged cases in which warrants have been issued, whereas the Judgment order interface, currently in the testing phase, is intended to automatically update the status of charge dispositions in the District Attorney’s Office Karpel case management system. Full implementation of the warrant and judgment order functions are critical to establishing verifiable case aging data, yet both interfaces are unable to provide retroactive, pre-implementation performance statistics for this reporting period. Capturing this information by manually updating aged cases in the DA’s case management system would be prohibitive due to the number of cases, time and manpower required for entering the backlog of data.

Next fiscal year’s performance projections are believed to be positively impacted by the San Luis Obispo County Superior Court’s reorganization in late 2014 and the implementation of designated arraignment/early disposition program court. Whether Court measures will accomplish their goal of streamlining the process by which a case goes through the system will be reflected in monitoring performance once full interface implementation is complete and verifiable data becomes available in FY 15-16.

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.

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	19	23	26	25	31	28

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 include 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.

While contacts were made with Butte, Marin, Merced, Santa Cruz and Yolo counties, only Marin provided comparable results indicating that they participate in approximately 15 to 20 collaborative efforts, however that number varies from year to year.

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.

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
702	658	726	Data Unavailable	750	Data Unavailable	750

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 is currently in development, issues related to the direct filing exchange with Superior Court have resulted in incomplete juvenile petition information for FY 2014-15. Without this current performance data, FY 2014-15 Projected and FY 2015-16 Target estimations were based on an anticipated slight increase in petitions reviewed and filed annually from last reported actual results available in FY 2012-13. Even though implementation of the direct filing interface was originally scheduled for early December 2014, corrections to case creation and logging of data must further be refined to track juvenile probation violation statistics. Only future case data, however, will be available upon implementation as retroactive data is not retrievable for reporting year-end FY 2014-15 results. 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.

In reaching out to Butte, Marin, Merced, Santa Cruz and Yolo counties for comparable data, Marin County was the only one in which to respond indicating that in FY 2013-14, 209 new juvenile petitions were filed. It should be noted that this figure differs from San Luis Obispo County’s reporting in that it does not include the additional number of subsequent petitions or probation violations filed on existing juvenile probationers.

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.

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%	69%	114%	88%	100%	91%	100%

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

Why: The higher the collection percentage the more effective the 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 2014-15 results in which 748 cases were submitted for payment and the majority, or 580, experienced restitution recovery. The disparity is attributable to check complaints that were rejected and returned to victims due to civil disputes, direct payment having been received by the victim, or forgery requiring law enforcement investigation. 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 performance data has previously been requested from Ventura, Humboldt, Kern, Butte, Kings, and Solano counties, all of which operate Bad Check Units. Ventura, the only county which provided comparable data, now provides reporting only on the number of checks submitted to their program, not on the effectiveness of their collection recovery efforts. In FY 2014-15, Ventura’s Bad Check Program reported having received approximately 50 checks per month, or 600 checks per year. Additionally since the last reporting period, Butte County has discontinued their Bad Check Unit. 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.

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
38 Days	57 Days	52 Days	53 Days	52 Days	49 Days	52 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. Consistency in proven recovery practices reflects FY 2014-15 actual results with an average restitution recovery period of 49 days. Reflecting a slight improvement from FY 2013-14 results, the Bad Check Unit anticipates continued recovery performance while providing public advisement services on small claims and consumer issues.

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 County has since discontinued their program. Ventura, the only county which provided comparable data, no longer gathers rates for collection recovery reporting. Due to staffing and/or programmatic limitations, however, no comparative 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 8 business days of referral to Victim Witness.

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
84%	85%	86%	85%	86%	87%	100%

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 2014-15, Victim/Witness advocates assisted 2,957 victims in crimes against persons cases charged by our office, and 87% of those victims were contacted for services within the 8 day target for outreach. 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 as 81% of victims were contacted within 72 hours (3 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.

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%	96%	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. With statistics now released, FY 2013-14 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 96%. During FY 13-14, 373 applications were processed of which 14 were denied by VCGCB. Justifications for denials ranged from no eligible crime being committed to the claimant being complicit in the crime. None, however, were due to the Victim/Witness Claims Unit's processing errors or incomplete submissions. 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 2014-15 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.

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
93%	94%	96%	96%	96%	97%	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 3,045 civilian subpoenas that were mailed and then confirmed by telephone rather than personally served, the estimated savings to the County in FY 2014-15 was over \$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 14-15 results indicate that 97% (2,940 of 3,045) of civilian witnesses who received subpoenas were contacted by Victim/Witness and receipt of their subpoenas confirmed. These figures are indicative of an ongoing commitment by Victim/Witness staff to reduce the inconveniences and costs associated with court appearances and to enhance 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 direct, coordinated services to victims and the coordination of subpoenaed witnesses.

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
3,962 victims; 11,443 subpoenaed witness court appearances	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	3,870 victims; 10,449 subpoenaed witness court appearances	6,236 victims; 8,400 subpoenaed witness court appearances	4,000 victims; 10,750 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.

How are we doing? FY 2014-15 results indicate a substantial 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 3,000 cases per year while increasing the misdemeanor caseload in a similar manner. 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. 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.

FY 2014-15 results also reflect a noticeable increase in the number of victims assisted by the Victim/Witness Division. Factors most likely responsible for this 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 future data is derived from Karpel and new reporting is brought into use, continued review and comparisons of data will provide for verified results and ensure consistency for future reporting periods.

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.

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
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.

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? At the end of FY 2013-14, County OES coordinated a challenging full scale exercise that was one of the largest exercises held to date. FEMA staff evaluated the County as well as other local and state agencies and identified no deficiencies. Emergency response exercises that demonstrate compliance with regulations are conducted at least every two years, with the next exercise to be held in fall of 2016. There was no full size large scale evaluated exercise held in the 2014-15 fiscal year. However there was one small drill evaluated by FEMA and it had no deficiency. 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 2014-15.

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.

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
0	1	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.

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

How are we doing? At the end of FY 2013-14, County OES coordinated a challenging full scale exercise that was one of the largest exercises held to date. FEMA staff evaluated the County as well as other local and State agencies and identified no ARCAs. Emergency response exercises that demonstrate compliance with regulations are conducted at least every two years, with the next exercise to be held in fall of 2016. There was no evaluated full scale large exercise held in the 2014-15 fiscal year. However there was one small drill evaluated by FEMA and it had no ARCAs. 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 2014-15.

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.

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%	80%	80%	80%	90%	100%	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? For ratings feedback from FY 2014-15 OES of the ten responses received, 100% reported an overall average of rating of good to excellent. While this is a good rating, 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”.							
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	
94%	94%	97%	95%	95%	97%	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? To date we have received 40 feedback documents returned to OES, with 97% 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 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).							
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	
40¢	34¢	56¢	32¢	65¢	52¢	57¢	

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 2014-15, the County Office of Emergency Services came in below projected General Fund support costs. The significant actual versus adopted result for FY 2014-15 is due to salary savings primarily due to a seven month position vacancy and the need to continue to have staff concentrate on nuclear power plant emergency readiness, which is 100% offset with nuclear power plant emergency planning funds. While the primary funding for OES is from nuclear power plant emergency planning, that also helps with readiness for a number of other potential emergencies. Comparable counties budgets, on average, were estimated \$1.63 in General Fund support per capita for emergency management services during FY 2014-15. Target costs for OES for FY 2015-16 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.

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
\$61,147,117	\$64,850,386	\$68,866,197	\$86,661,327	\$94,791,406	\$73,707,854	\$69,203,845

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 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 now allows for the re-classification and re-sentencing of several types of crimes from felonies to misdemeanors. Locally, the number of felony probationers had increased to 1,585 in FY 2013-14, and by end of FY 2014-15 had dropped to 1369. Since Proposition 47 enactment, nearly 300 individuals have dropped from the felony caseload. Approximately 40% of these individuals remain on formal misdemeanor probation, but are not included in the calculation of this measure.

Adult Division operational costs for FY 2014-15 marginally increased due to further shifting of officers from Juvenile Services into the Adult Division per efforts to reduce officer-to-probationer caseload ratios.

The adopted value for FY 2014-15 was based upon the increasing trend of higher felony probation populations seen at that time, without predicting the outcome of the then pending Proposition 47. Thus, our FY 2014-15 actual result, \$73,707,854, is considerably lower than our adopted value of \$94,791,406.

Comparison data with other counties is not available.

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

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
N/A	N/A	11.1%	9.9%	9.0%	10.9%	9.0%

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? The percentage of felony probationers who were sent to prison during FY 2013-14 was 9.9% (64 out of 644); slightly lower than the prior year (11.1%). During FY 2014-15, a similar number of felony probationers were sent to state prison as last year (64 out of 589). However, because the total number of felony probationers is lower due to Proposition 47, the percentage sent to prison is slightly higher than last year, 10.9%.

The effort to develop and strengthen strategies to reduce the percentage of felony probationers who are sent to prison is continuous. The Adult Division has applied 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, as possible, the Division also extends time on probation in attempt to effect change. The Division regularly works with partner agencies to strengthen program coordination.

As currently defined, comparison data is not available.

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

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
N/A	N/A	12.1%	8.7%	12.0%	15.7%	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? The Actual Result for FY 2013-14 was 8.7% (8 out of 92) of PRCS offenders who were sent to state prison. During FY 2014-15, 21 out of 134 offenders – or 15.7% - were sent to prison for new felony convictions, which is higher than the adopted rate for this year. Random variation, or fluctuations, does occur when counting few occurrences in a small population and the Adult Division is still learning how to set appropriate targets.

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

Comparison data with other counties or the state 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.

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
68%	60%	71%	83%	60%	78%	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? This performance measure is a relatively new measure for the Probation Department. The Department is continuing to refine how the data is defined and collected from our case management system; therefore the diversion rate may fluctuate. In FY 2013-14, we achieved an 83% (294 out of 355) rate of diversion from the Juvenile Court System. During FY 2014-15, 78% (240 out of 307) of juveniles referred to Juvenile Services were diverted from the Juvenile Court system, which is better than our adopted rate for this year of 60%.

The number of juveniles referred to Juvenile Services continues to decline: 307 this year compared to 355 last year, due to prevention and early intervention programs, such as the SAFE System of Care, Youth in Action and school-based truancy officers. Once a juvenile is referred to Juvenile Services, the Division uses risk assessment tools to guide the diversion of referred youth, as possible, to informal probation and alternative programs and services, rather than subject youth to the formal Court system. With increasing effective of the early intervention programs, a larger proportion of the referrals received by Juvenile Services are more serious in nature. These youth are less likely to be diverted from the juvenile court system.

Comparison data with other counties is not available.

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.

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

5. Performance Measure: Percentage of juveniles under court ordered supervision who were able to remain in their homes.

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
N/A	90%	86%	88%	80%	87%	80%

What: The percentage of juveniles on court ordered supervision who remained in their homes or with relatives.

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. The average cost for San Luis Obispo County juveniles in out of home placement in FY 2013-14 is \$120,000 per month, or \$1,440,000 annually. 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.

How are we doing? In FY 2013-14, 87.8% (115 out of 131) of juveniles on probation remained at home, or with relatives. In FY 2014-15, 87.1% (115 out of 132) of juveniles remained in their home; higher than the adopted rate of 80%.

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 during this past year.

Comparison data with other counties is not available.

Department Goal: Support crime victims by collecting court-ordered restitution from offenders.

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

6. Performance Measure: Cost to collect victim restitution, fines and fees.

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
\$.32 for every dollar collected	\$.33 for every dollar collected	\$.38 for every dollar collected	\$.39 for every dollar collected	\$.40 for every dollar collected	\$.43 for every dollar collected	\$.40 for every dollar collected

What: Cost to collect court-ordered victim restitution, fines and fees, as a ratio of expenditure to revenue.

Why: This is an efficiency measure demonstrating cost effectiveness of collecting criminal debt internally while maintaining confidentiality of sensitive victim identification information.

How are we doing? In FY 2013-14, we collected \$2,696,700 in fines, fees, and restitution and spent \$1,041,168 to collect this money. This equated to a cost of \$0.39 for every dollar collected in that year. In FY 2014-15, we collected \$2,891,364 at an expense of \$1,237,028. Our year-end actual result was \$.43 expended for every dollar collected; slightly higher than our adopted ratio.

In FY 2014-15, revenues increased 7% over the previous year; possibly demonstrating a stabilization of offenders' ability pay ordered fines, fees and restitution. Over the last five years, revenues had been in decline. Multiple factors contributed to the declining revenues, including lower ability to pay among probationers/offenders due to the economic downturn and changes in some billing structures. Meanwhile operational costs have only marginally increased due to salary increases and continued costs to convert to the new collections data system. The Department expects that the pending new collections data system will help enable greater efficiencies.

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.

GOALS AND PERFORMANCE MEASURES

Department Goal: To provide cost effective Public Defender services.

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

1. Performance Measure: Annual number of cases reversed based on the allegation of inadequate defense.

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
0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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.

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.

How are we doing? We continue to meet our target in FY 2014-15 and expect to do so again in FY 2015-16. 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 similar sized counties is not available for comparison.

2. Performance Measure: Per capita costs for public defender 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
\$20.74	\$21.97	\$21.97	\$19.47	\$20.00	\$21.46	\$21.50

What: This measure shows the per capita gross costs to provide public defender services, based on budgeted amounts.

Why: We are measuring per capita gross public defender costs in an effort to capture efficiency data.

How are we doing? Actual costs for public defender services over the last four fiscal years have exceeded \$20 per capita, except for FY 2013-14. This has mainly been driven by uncontrollable expense from unusually expensive jury trials. These expenses continued to skew this performance measure in FY 2012-13, but did not continue into FY 2013-14. However, FY 2014-15 costs have again exceeded \$20 per capital due to the midyear addition of expense to the primary public defender contract due to an increase in felony caseload, totaling approximately \$153,000, and addition expense added at year end to cover costs for court appointed attorneys. Recognizing that the expense added in FY 2014-15 will be annualized in FY 2015-16, and that all four public defender contracts have been increased by CPI, and assuming a 1% increase in countywide population (based on prior year estimates from the U.S. Census Bureau) the FY 2015-16 target has been set at \$21.50 per capita.

The actual result for FY 2014-15 of \$21.46 per capita is based on the actual expense budget for public defender totaling \$5,990,306 and an estimated 2014 calendar year population of 279,083 (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 our comparison counties, in some cases much lower*: Marin: \$35.83, Monterey: \$23.52, Napa: \$36.00 Santa Barbara: \$23.72, Santa Cruz: \$33.82. 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.

* Note that results for comparable counties are based on FY 2014-15 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.

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>						
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
Crime rate lower than 100% of comparable counties	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 80% 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 2015 population table provided by the California Department of Finance, San Luis Obispo County has grown to over 270,000 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 California Department of Justice's (DOJ) Uniform Crime Reporting, the San Luis Obispo County crime rate was lower than 60% of the comparable counties. The 2014 data from DOJ is the most current data available.</p> <p>The violent crimes and property crimes reported for San Luis Obispo County and comparable counties are: Marin 708; Monterey 1,597; San Luis Obispo 1,491; Placer 1,889; Santa Barbara 1,841 and Santa Cruz 1,987.</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>						
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
65%	71%	68%	65%	69%	71%	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 09:10 minutes for July 2014 through June 2015. The Coast Patrol received 124 high priority calls and of those calls 88 or 71% 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>						
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
38%	66%	69%	62%	66%	79%	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 11:07 minutes for July 2014 through June 2015. This patrol station has the largest geographical area, but is the least populated area of the three patrol stations. The North Station received 126 high priority calls and of those calls 99 or 79% 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. The response times have continued to improve since FY 2010-11 with 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 this fiscal year. Recognizing the improvement in response times, the Resident Deputy/Creston and the K-9 Deputy were funded by the Board of Supervisors as well as a third Deputy as a Resident Deputy/Heritage Ranch. The fourth Deputy position was eliminated. It is anticipated that the continued funding for the 3 Deputy positions will continue to keep the response times down for the largest geographical area and least populated area of our County.

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.

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%	75%	78%	84%	82%	82%	82%

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 09:33 minutes in July 2014 through July 2015. This patrol area has a growing population and deputies here respond to more calls for service than the other two stations. The South Station received 204 high priority calls and of those calls 167 or 82% 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, the calls with the longest response times were to the Nipomo area. The longer response times to the Nipomo area are most likely a result of not having a sub-station in South County that has increased in population and activity over the years.

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

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%	50%	100%	100%	100%	100%

What: Using national and state Uniform Crime Reporting (UCR) data collected by the FBI and 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 one (1) homicide and one (1) cleared homicide between July 1, 2014 and June 30, 2015, 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 2013. For population groups between 250,000 and 499,999 the clearance rate reported by FBI was 54.5%. The most recent DOJ UCR data available at this time for clearance rate is from 2014 which was reported as 64.3%.

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

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
23%	42%	40%	17%	90%	56%	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? Sixteen (16) rapes were reported during the period from July 1, 2014 through June 30, 2015. During that same time frame nine (9) 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 56%. The national clearance rate for the population groups between 250,000 to 499,999 for 2013 is 37.6%. The statewide clearance rate for 2014 is 41.7%. 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.

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

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
35%	53%	52%	80%	60%	64%	64%

What: Using national and state Uniform Crime Reporting (UCR) data collected by the FBI and 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? Fourteen (14) robbery offenses were reported during the period from July 1, 2014 through June 30, 2015. During that same time frame nine (9) robbery cases were cleared. This resulted in a clearance rate of 64%.

The national clearance rate for population groups between 250,000 to 499,999 for 2013 was 23.7%. The statewide clearance rate for 2014 was 30.7%. These percentages reflect the most current UCR data available from FBI and DOJ.

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

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
77%	77%	80%	74%	83%	82%	82%

What: Using national and state Uniform Crime Reporting (UCR) data collected by the FBI and 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 a reported 250 aggravated assault offenses that occurred during the period from July 1, 2014 through June 30, 2015 and a reported 206 aggravated assault cases cleared. This resulted in a clearance rate of 82%.

The national clearance rate for population groups between 250,000 to 499,999 for 2013 was 49.3%. The statewide clearance rate for 2014 was 56.1%. These percentages reflect the most current UCR data available from FBI and DOJ.

9. Performance Measure: Average physical altercation by inmates per month at the San Luis Obispo County Jail.

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
8/(558)	10/(604)	13/(753)	9/(701)	8/(781)	6/(596)	6/(646)

What: This measure tracks our success relative to keeping the Main Jail safe for inmates and County employees. The first number represents the average number of assaults per month. The number to the right (in parentheses) is the average daily population of the jail, which is shown for comparison sake.

Why: It is important to track the physical altercation rate at the Main Jail 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.

How are we doing? For July 1, 2014 through June 30, 2015 the number of altercations was 68 with 76 involved inmates. The average daily population housed inside the Jail for July 1, 2014 through June 30, was 596.

The number of staff assaulted by inmates has fluctuated over the past four years, with six in FY 2011-12, five in FY 2012-13, four in FY 2013-14 and five in FY 2014-15. Staff has an increased awareness of the more criminally sophisticated AB 109 inmates. Policies and equipment are constantly updated with the goal of providing better protection of staff from inmate assaults. There is no comparison data available from other counties. As always, our jail staff is working to keep both inmates and staff safe at all times. Several new programs are provided to the inmates such as “Alternatives to Violence” which provide cognitive behavioral learning focused on seeking peaceful resolutions to conflict.

10. Performance Measure: Overtime as a percentage of the Custody Division's salaries budget.						
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
2.6%	4.3%	3.2%	3.4%	2.5%	4.2%	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? In FY 2014-15 overtime hours were 14,720 and the cost was \$918,157. The total budget for FY 2014-15 including salaries and benefits was \$21,639,264. For FY 2014-15 overtime increased by 24.71%. This increase is attributed to an increase in vacancies in Jail staffing. During this fiscal year there were an average of 6 Correctional Deputy positions, 4 Senior Correctional Deputies, 1 Correctional Sergeant and 6 Correctional Technicians vacant which are in the process of being filled. This is primarily due to several Correctional Technicians promoting within the Sheriff's Office or hired by another Department, along with retirements in Correctional Deputy, Senior Deputy and Correctional Sergeant positions. The equivalent of three full time positions were vacant during the entire FY 2014-15 due to work related injuries or illnesses. These absences require coverage by overtime to insure we meet minimum staffing levels. It is anticipated that overtime will decrease with the vacancies being filled in FY 2015-16. No comparison data is available from other counties.</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: 50% reduction in the percentage of solid waste disposed in regional landfills as required by State law and converted to regional per capita per day disposal 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
69% 4.6 lbs	69% 4.6lbs	71% 4.3 lbs	68% 4.7 lbs.	68% 4.4 lbs.	67% 4.9 lbs	68% 4.4 lbs.

What: Since 2007 the method of measuring success in recycling changed to measuring the waste reduction on a per capita 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.

How are we doing? The County exceeded the State's mandated diversion goal of 50%. The San Luis Obispo County region has consistently maintained a diversion rate of about 68%, exceeding the State average of 65% and well above the 50% State mandate. The County is in line with the State average pound per capita disposed goal of 4.4 lbs. 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 is occurring in areas served by Mid-State Solid Waste and is anticipated in unincorporated communities in the south county beginning in January 2016.