

GOALS AND PERFORMANCE MEASURES

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

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

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

07-08 Actual Results	08-09 Actual Results	09-10 Actual Results	10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Adopted	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Target
Triennial Survey	Triennial Survey	Triennial Survey	72%	Triennial Survey	Triennial Survey	Triennial Survey

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

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

How are we doing? The 2010 ACTION telephone survey asked 1,048 randomly selected adults "How would you rate the San Luis Obispo County government, including major units such as the Sheriff, Social Services, County Planning and Building, Elections Office, Health Department, Assessor, Tax Collector, Roads and the County Board of Supervisors?" Overall, how would you rate the services provided by San Luis Obispo County government?" 72% of the respondents rated the County as "good" (41%), "very good" (25%) or "excellent" (6%). These results are almost identical to the 2007 survey (71%). The 2010 ACTION survey was presented to the Board on October 26, 2010. The survey results posted on the County's web site: <http://www.slocounty.ca.gov>. The next ACTION telephone survey is planned for FY 2013-14.

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

07-08 Actual Results	08-09 Actual Results	09-10 Actual Results	10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Adopted	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Target
75%	Triennial Survey	Triennial Survey	Survey on hold	Survey on hold	Triennial Survey	Survey on hold

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

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

How are we doing? The Citizen's Opinion Survey was most recently conducted in the Winter of 2007. This survey asked respondents if they had contact with County employees in the past 12 months, and if so, to rate their overall impression of that contact in terms of knowledge, responsiveness and courtesy of County staff. 57% of the respondents had contact in that past year, and of those, 75% rated their overall impression of their contacts with County employees as "good" or "excellent". Due to budgetary constraints, the citizen's opinion survey has been put on hold.

GOALS AND PERFORMANCE MEASURES

Department Goal: To ensure the long-term financial stability of the County.						
Communitywide Result Link: <input type="checkbox"/> Safe <input type="checkbox"/> Healthy <input type="checkbox"/> Livable <input type="checkbox"/> Prosperous <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Well-Governed Community						
1. Performance Measure: Ratio of General Fund backed annual debt service to the annual General Fund budget.						
07-08 Actual Results	08-09 Actual Results	09-10 Actual Results	10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Adopted	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Target
2.9%	2.8%	3.5%	3.5%	3.5%	3.4%	3.5%
What: This measure shows the ratio of the General Fund backed annual debt service to the annual General Fund budget.						
Why: This measure provides staff, the Board and public with information about the financial health of the County. The current goal is to keep the ratio below 5%. This measure is an industry standard that allows for a comparison amongst governmental entities.						
How are we doing? A ratio under 5% is considered to be favorable by bond rating agencies. The ratio increased during FY 2009-10 due to the refinancing of Pension Obligation Bonds and a shrinking General Fund. This ratio is projected to remain constant as none of the debt obligations are scheduled to be paid off, and no new debt is currently planned.						
Department Goal: To ensure the long-term financial stability of the County.						
Communitywide Result Link: <input type="checkbox"/> Safe <input type="checkbox"/> Healthy <input type="checkbox"/> Livable <input type="checkbox"/> Prosperous <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Well-Governed Community						
2. Performance Measure: Ratio of total contingencies and reserves to the County's General Fund operating budget.						
07-08 Actual Results	08-09 Actual Results	09-10 Actual Results	10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Adopted	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Target
New Measure	New Measure	17.1%	20.8%	20%	20.5%	20%
What: This measure shows how much money the County has in "savings" relative to our daily, ongoing expenses.						
Why: The measure provides staff, the Board and public with information on the financial health of the County. Our goal is to have a prudent level of savings that allows us to plan for future needs and "weather" economic downturns. The industry standard target is to have a 20% reserve/contingency as a percent of the operating budget.						
How are we doing? This measure reflects the total amount of contingencies and reserves that could be accessed by the General Fund (some contingencies and reserves are restricted in use and are not available for use in the General Fund). It is worth noting that while many of the reserves are technically available to be used by the General Fund, many are planned to be spent on various projects (e.g. new Women's jail, expanded juvenile hall).						
Department Goal: To provide high quality staff support in an effort to maximize the effectiveness of the Board of Supervisors.						
Communitywide Result Link: <input type="checkbox"/> Safe <input type="checkbox"/> Healthy <input type="checkbox"/> Livable <input type="checkbox"/> Prosperous <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Well-Governed Community						
3. Performance Measure: Percentage of Board members who respond to a survey indicating that Administrative Office staff provide satisfactory or better agenda support.						
07-08 Actual Results	08-09 Actual Results	09-10 Actual Results	10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Adopted	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Target
100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
What: The County Administrative Office surveys the Board of Supervisors annually to determine their level of satisfaction with our staff support relative to the accuracy, readability, and overall quality of the agenda reports.						
Why: The information gained from this survey allows us to continuously improve staff support to the Board.						
How are we doing? Based upon results of the survey conducted in September 2011 the Administrative Office is meeting or exceeding the expectations of the Board members.						
Department Goal: To provide high quality staff support in an effort to maximize the effectiveness of County departments and the Board of Supervisors.						
Communitywide Result Link: <input type="checkbox"/> Safe <input type="checkbox"/> Healthy <input type="checkbox"/> Livable <input type="checkbox"/> Prosperous <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Well-Governed Community						
4. Performance Measure: Percentage of departments who respond to a survey indicating the Administrative Office staff provides satisfactory or better support services.						

**Administrative Office
Fiscal Year 2012-13 Proposed Budget**

Fund Center 104

07-08 Actual Results	08-09 Actual Results	09-10 Actual Results	10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Adopted	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Target
100%	N/A	98%	98%	100%	100%	100%

What: The County Administrative Office surveys departments and the Board of Supervisors annually to determine their level of satisfaction with our staff support relative to accuracy, responsiveness, responsibility, timeliness and trustworthiness. The survey was revised to solicit additional feedback in FY 2010-11.

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

How are we doing? Based upon results of the survey conducted in February 2012 the Administrative Office is providing satisfactory or better support services to departments.

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

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

5. Performance Measure: Percentage of employees that indicate in a biannual workforce survey overall satisfaction with their job.

07-08 Actual Results	08-09 Actual Results	09-10 Actual Results	10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Adopted	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Target
Next Survey in FY 2008-09	TBD- Survey Delayed	TBD- Survey Delayed	TBD- Survey Delayed	TBD	TBD- Survey Delayed	TBD- Survey Delayed

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

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

How are we doing? The Employee Opinion survey was last administered in December 2006. Overall, a total of 1,452 usable responses were received – a 63% response rate. Of these, 1,346 employees (93%) indicated their level of agreement with the statement “I am satisfied with my job.” – 53% indicated that they strongly agreed with this statement, 32% somewhat agreed, 7% neither agreed or disagreed, 6% somewhat disagreed, and 2% strongly disagreed. Therefore, 85% of the County employees responding to this statement in the survey indicated they were satisfied with their job. The County’s goal is to sustain this high level of job satisfaction despite the financial challenges facing the County over the next few years, and the expected turnover due to retirement of our aging workforce. However, given staff and resource constraints, administration of the next Employee Opinion survey will be deferred (timing TBD).

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

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

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

07-08 Actual Results	08-09 Actual Results	09-10 Actual Results	10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Adopted	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Target
1.54	1.55	2.45	2.49	2.49	2.51	2.51

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

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

How are we doing? The total FTE budget analyst staffing levels per 1,000 employees for our comparable counties ranges from a high of 3.81 in Napa County to a low of 1.34 in Santa Barbara County. This ratio increased In FY 2009-10 due to a reorganization that resulted in the downgrading of a Principal Analyst position to an Administrative Analyst position. The Principal Analyst position had not been part of this measure, and this restructuring resulted in an annual cost savings of approximately \$50,000. The average ratio of analysts per 1,000 employees was 2.32 for comparable counties, and 2.51 for San Luis Obispo County.

GOALS AND PERFORMANCE MEASURES

<p>Department Goal: To effectively manage the employee benefit programs (health, life, tax savings, etc.) for County employees and retirees.</p> <p>Communitywide Result Link: <input type="checkbox"/> Safe <input type="checkbox"/> Healthy <input type="checkbox"/> Livable <input type="checkbox"/> Prosperous <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Well-Governed Community</p>						
<p>1. Performance Measure: Percentage of payroll coordinators that rate the services provided by the Benefits Coordinator as above satisfactory or better.</p>						
07-08 Actual Results	08-09 Actual Results	09-10 Actual Results	10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Adopted	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Target
91%	100%	100%	94%	100%	100%	100%
<p>What: In the spring of each year, Risk Management conducts a survey of all payroll coordinators to determine their level of satisfaction with the quality of service provided by the Benefits Coordinator. The survey addresses the following critical service areas: timeliness, accuracy, responsiveness, and trustworthiness of information.</p> <p>Why: The Benefits Coordinator is responsible for educating County payroll coordinators on all aspects of employee benefits. The payroll coordinators, in turn, are responsible for disseminating this information to County employees so they can make informed benefit decisions. Regularly surveying our key customers allows us to gauge the quality of our services and make program improvements as needed.</p> <p>How are we doing? In a survey conducted in Spring 2012, 100% of 15 payroll coordinators responding rated the Benefits Coordinator as satisfactory or better.</p>						
<p>Department Goal: To promote a safe work environment for County employees.</p> <p>Communitywide Result Link: <input type="checkbox"/> Safe <input type="checkbox"/> Healthy <input type="checkbox"/> Livable <input type="checkbox"/> Prosperous <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Well-Governed Community</p>						
<p>2. Performance Measure: Rate of work-related illnesses/injuries per 100 employees as compared to other local government agencies in California.</p>						
07-08 Actual Results	08-09 Actual Results	09-10 Actual Results	10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Adopted	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Target
4.15	4.06	3.8	4.5	3.8	4.5	3.6
<p>What: This measure tracks the number of employee illnesses/injuries per 100 employees in comparison to other local government agencies in California. By collecting injury and illness data, we can compare ourselves to statewide average data prepared by the Department of Industrial Relations.</p> <p>Why: This measure helps to track the effectiveness of our Safety Program, which has an impact on the County's budget. An effective safety program limits employee injury and illness, which lowers workers' compensation costs for the County.</p> <p>How are we doing? The County's illness/injury rate is comparable to the private sector and well below the average for local government agencies of 7.5 per 100 employees, as reported by the Department of Industrial Relations. Top management support for the County's Safety Program, (including training, safety equipment purchases, and hazard mitigation efforts) has resulted in the County reducing its injury rate from a high of 10.3 in FY 2001-02 and FY 2002-03 to its lowest rate of 3.8 in FY 2009-10. The current injury rate reflects that the organization may have reached its natural 'floor' for injury rates, and the 0.7 increase in injuries may represent a statistical ebb & flow near the rate floor. Introduction of the Loss Prevention Initiative is intended to lower the natural floor of injury rates, thus the lower targets for FY 2012-13. Results from such an initiative will likely take 1.5 to 2 years to see in the statistics. When looking at FY 2011-12, the expected improvement is seen in the last half of FY 2011-12 which had fewer injuries than the first half, on target for a 10% reduction in injury claims.</p>						
<p>3. Performance Measure: Annual number of serious employee work-related injuries (i.e., death, loss of limb, overnight hospitalization, etc.) as defined by CAL/OSHA.</p>						
07-08 Actual Results	08-09 Actual Results	09-10 Actual Results	10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Adopted	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Target
0	2	1	1	0	0	0
<p>What: The Federal and State Occupational Safety and Health Act (OSHA) requires reporting of all serious work-related injuries which it defines as death, loss of limb, 24 hour hospitalization for other than observation, etc. This measure reports the number of employees who experience a serious work-related injury.</p> <p>Why: This measure helps track the effectiveness of our Safety Program, which has an impact on the County's budget. An effective safety program limits employee injury and illness, which lowers workers' compensation costs for the County.</p>						

**Risk Management
Fiscal Year 2012-13 Proposed Budget**

Fund Center 105

How are we doing? In FY 2011-12, there were no serious employee work-related injuries. The County always endeavors to achieve zero serious injuries each year. Direct comparable-entity comparison data are not available for this measure.

4. Performance Measure: Number of days away from work due to workplace injury.

07-08 Actual Results	08-09 Actual Results	09-10 Actual Results	10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Adopted	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Target
795	942	419	666	750	1,460	675

What: This measure tracks the total number of days that employees are absent during the year due to work-related injuries.

Why: This measure helps to track the effectiveness of our safety and workers' comp programs, which have an impact on the County's budget and the productivity of County employees. Effective safety and workers' comp programs limit employee injury and illness, which lowers workers' compensation costs for the County and reduces the amount of time that County employees are unable to be at work.

How are we doing? The County experienced a significant jump in the number of lost days in FY 2011-12. Resource reallocation within HR and staffing changes at our Third Party Administrator resulted in reduced success in returning employees to work and early closure of claims. Board approval of a Budget Augmentation Request to restore the Return to Work Coordinator position in FY 2012-13 will provide the department the resources needed to reverse this trend. Note that the ground lost on this program will have an impact that extends beyond FY 2011-12 and FY 2012-13. Projections for FY 2012-13 may be over the currently stated target, but specifics won't be known until later in the current fiscal year. Direct comparable-entity comparison data are not available for this measure.

Department Goal: To effectively administer the County's Liability Insurance Program.

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

5. Performance Measure: Number of liability claims filed per \$1 million of payroll.

07-08 Actual Results	08-09 Actual Results	09-10 Actual Results	10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Adopted	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Target
County: .95 EIA average: 1.03	County: .60 EIA average: .98	County: .65 EIA average: .93	County: .57 EIA average: .83	Better than the EIA average	County: .65 EIA average: .77	Better than the EIA average

What: This measure represents a comparison of the number of liability claims filed against local California governments. The California State Association of Counties (CSAC) Excess Insurance Authority (EIA) insures the majority of California public agencies and is the second largest public entity property and casualty pool in the nation.

Why: Tracking the number of liability claims filed per \$1 million of payroll indicates how San Luis Obispo County compares to other counties as determined by the County's annual actuary conducted by Bickmore Risk Services. Keeping liability claims to a minimum has a positive impact on the County's budget because a low number of liability claims contributes to lower liability insurance premiums.

How are we doing? Based on our 2011 actuarial, claim frequency has increased slightly compared to FY 2010-11 levels. The County's liability program is performing well and we remain well below the CSAC-EIA average. The County's number of liability claims per \$1 million of payroll has consistently been below the CSAC-EIA average. Due to continuing loss prevention efforts we anticipate that trend will continue.

6. Performance Measure: Average dollar loss/liability claim.

07-08 Actual Results	08-09 Actual Results	09-10 Actual Results	10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Adopted	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Target
County: \$7,370 EIA average: \$6,520	County: \$9,290 EIA average: \$7,280	County: \$9,460 EIA average: \$7,700	County: \$12,280 EIA average: \$8,990	Better than the EIA average	County: \$10,350 EIA average: \$8,760	Better than the EIA average

What: This measure provides an indication of how much money is being spent on average for liability claims. CSAC-EIA insures the majority of California public agencies and is the second largest public entity property and casualty pool in the nation.

Why: Tracking the average dollar loss per liability claim indicates how San Luis Obispo County compares to other counties as determined by the County's annual actuary conducted by Bickmore Risk Services. Minimizing liability claims costs reduces the amount of General Fund dollars needed to pay claims, and reduces the cost of excess insurance.

How are we doing? Based on the November 2011 actuarial study, average loss per claim decreased from the FY 2010-11 levels but we remain higher on average than the EIA. The County has experienced favorable outcomes in several recent litigated matters, and the program fundamentals are sound. We anticipate reducing our average loss per claim with continued loss prevention efforts.

7. Performance Measure: Dollars of loss per \$100 of payroll for liability claims.						
07-08 Actual Results	08-09 Actual Results	09-10 Actual Results	10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Adopted	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Target
County: .70 EIA average: .68	County: .56 EIA average: .69	County: .62 EIA average: .67	County: .70 EIA average: .67	Better than the EIA average	County: .67 EIA average: .62	Better than the EIA average
<p>What: This measure provides an indication of the total liability dollars spent per every \$100 of the County's payroll. CSAC-EIA insures the majority of California public agencies and is the second largest public entity property and casualty pool in the nation.</p> <p>Why: Tracking the dollars of loss per \$100 of payroll indicates how San Luis Obispo County compares to other counties as determined by the County's annual actuarial conducted by Bickmore Risk Services. Minimizing liability claims costs reduces the amount of General Fund dollars needed to pay claims, and reduces the cost of excess insurance.</p> <p>How are we doing? Based on the November 2011 actuarial, the County's loss rate per \$100 of payroll decreased slightly from the November 2010 levels but we remain above the EIA average. This reflects a higher than average cost per claim. Continued loss prevention efforts should assist in reducing claim severity.</p>						
<p>Department Goal: Administer a cost-effective Workers' Compensation program for County employees.</p> <p>Communitywide Result Link: <input type="checkbox"/> Safe <input type="checkbox"/> Healthy <input type="checkbox"/> Livable <input type="checkbox"/> Prosperous <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Well-Governed Community</p>						
8. Performance Measure: Dollars of loss per \$100 of payroll for Workers' Compensation claims.						
07-08 Actual Results	08-09 Actual Results	09-10 Actual Results	10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Adopted	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Target
County: \$1.55 EIA average: \$2.52	County: \$1.43 EIA average: \$2.25	County: \$1.38 EIA average: \$2.10	County: \$1.27 EIA average: \$2.06	Better than the EIA average	County: \$1.13 EIA average: \$2.08	Better than the EIA average
<p>What: This measure provides a comparison of the County's workers' compensation claims costs relative to the annual workers' compensation payroll costs of other counties in California. CSAC-EIA insures the majority of California public agencies and is the second largest public entity property and casualty pool in the nation.</p> <p>Why: Tracking the dollars of loss per \$100 of payroll for workers' compensation claims indicates how San Luis Obispo County compares to other counties as determined by the County's annual actuarial conducted by Bickmore Risk Services. Minimizing workers' compensation claims costs reduces the amount of General Fund dollars needed to pay claims, and reduces the cost of excess insurance.</p> <p>How are we doing? The County continued to see a decline in its loss rate per \$100 of payroll. We continue to remain below the CSAC-EIA average. Low claim numbers as affected by safety and loss prevention efforts contribute to the decline in dollars lost.</p>						
9. Performance Measure: Number of Workers' Compensation claims per 100 employees.						
07-08 Actual Results	08-09 Actual Results	09-10 Actual Results	10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Adopted	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Target
County: 6.6 Comp Co. avg.: 9.6	County: 6.6 Comp Co. avg.: 9.6	County: 6.6 Comp Co. avg.: 8.1	County: 6.9 Comp Co. avg.: 8.4	Better than the Comp Co. average	County: 7.0 Comp Co. avg.: 9.0	Better than the Comp Co. average
<p>What: This measures the number of workers' compensation claims per 100 employees for a comparison to the level of claims experienced in other California counties. San Luis Obispo County is compared to 19 other counties in the annual Self Insurance Plan Benchmark report produced by TCS Risk Management Services, and more specifically to four counties considered comparable to San Luis Obispo County (Marin, Santa Barbara, Santa Cruz and Sonoma).</p> <p>Why: This measure enables us to compare the level of workers' compensation claims within the County to the claim levels experienced by comparably sized and organized California counties. Claim frequency is an indication of the effectiveness of both our workers' compensation and safety programs, which impacts the County's budget. A low level of workers' compensation claims reduces the County's workers' compensation insurance premiums.</p> <p>How are we doing? The December 2011 TCS reports show the claim frequency for the County has been trending downward for several years, but the trend has leveled off. Additionally, the report shows that the County has the lowest frequency of the four comparably sized and organized counties. Safety and loss prevention efforts contribute to a low level of Workers' Compensation claims.</p>						
10. Performance Measure: Average dollars loss per Workers' Compensation claim.						
07-08 Actual	08-09 Actual	09-10 Actual	10-11 Actual	11-12 Adopted	11-12 Actual	12-13 Target

**Risk Management
Fiscal Year 2012-13 Proposed Budget**

Fund Center 105

Results		Results		Results		Results		Results	
County: \$7,380	County: \$5,440	County: \$5,730	County: \$6,170	Better than the EIA average	County: \$5,910	Better than the EIA average			
EIA average: \$11,540	EIA average: \$10,290	EIA average: \$10,790	EIA average: \$10,940		EIA average: \$11,770				

What: This measures the average dollars of loss per workers' compensation claim for a comparison to the average dollars of loss experienced in other Counties as reported by the CSAC average. The average loss projected by the CSAC-EIA actuary is based on historical loss data and represents ultimate final loss costs for claims from each fiscal year. CSAC-EIA insures the majority of California public agencies and is the second largest public entity property and casualty pool in the nation.

Why: Tracking the average dollars lost per workers' compensation claim provides a measurement of the effectiveness of the County's workers' compensation program as compared to other counties. An effective workers compensation program limits the number and cost of workers' compensation claims.

How are we doing? Like all counties, San Luis Obispo County's claim costs have begun to rise with the overall rise in health care costs. However, San Luis Obispo County's claim costs are still nearly half of the CSAC-EIA average. The Workers Comp program, including in-house staff, a Third Party Claims Administrator, and a third party management consultant, is recognized state-wide as a model program. Proactive claims management contributes to low dollar loss per claim. The County adopted and effectively implemented a Return to Work program sooner than many other CSAC-EIA members. The maturity of our program contributes to our lower cost per claim than the EIA average.

GOALS AND PERFORMANCE MEASURES

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

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

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

07-08 Actual Results	08-09 Actual Results	09-10 Actual Results	10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Adopted	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Target
30	19	25	17	21	17	20

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

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

How are we doing? The Audit staff is currently comprised of three staff auditors performing cash, departmental, compliance, and State mandated audits and a Chief Auditor performing audit, review and research duties. The results for FY 2011-12 were lower than estimated due to several audits being more complex than originally anticipated and consequently requiring additional staff time. In addition to audits, the Audit staff monitors and corrects errors in the State allocation of sales tax. The Internal Audit Division also monitors sub-recipients of the Workforce Investment Act for proper accounting methods, authorized expenditures, and services provided; calculates and prepares the Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO) billing to the various special districts and cities within the county. They also prepare and submit the County's Financial Transaction Report to the State, and take the lead in preparing the Comprehensive Annual Financial Report. Audits and other reports prepared by the Audit staff are submitted to the Board of Supervisors and available to the public for comment. During the last few months of FY 2011-12 the Audit staff was responsible for performing Redevelopment agreed upon procedures as part of the dissolution of Redevelopment Agencies, which resulted in fewer regular reviews.

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

07-08 Actual Results	08-09 Actual Results	09-10 Actual Results	10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Adopted	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Target
24	16	16	16	16	21	18

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

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

How are we doing? The number of audits increased from the prior year adopted level due to an additional auditor reassignment. Audit staff focused on concessionaire and Transient Occupancy Tax audits in FY 2010-11. We believe maintaining an audit presence helps create an even balance in the community. In addition, the staff began reviewing service providers' compliance with contracts to the County. In this way, service providers are properly compensated and the County receives the full spectrum of services purchased. Audits and other reports prepared by the audit staff are submitted to the Board of Supervisors and available to the public for comment.

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

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

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

07-08 Actual Results	08-09 Actual Results	09-10 Actual Results	10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Adopted	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Target
Audit with no exceptions	Audit with no exceptions	Audit with no exceptions	Audit with no exceptions			

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

**Auditor-Controller
Fiscal Year 2012-13 Proposed Budget**

Fund Center 107

Why: The County is reimbursed for overhead costs.

How are we doing? The State Controller's Office performed an audit of the FY 2011-12 County Cost Allocation Plan. There were no findings or adjustments as a result of the audit.

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

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

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

07-08 Actual Results	08-09 Actual Results	09-10 Actual Results	10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Adopted	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Target
1	1	1	1	1	1	1

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

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

How are we doing? The external auditors have completed their annual audit of the FY 2010-11 fiscal year's financial statements and have issued unqualified or clean opinions. The review of the County's financial statements is required to be done and submitted to the State Controller's Office by December 31 following the end of each fiscal year. Actual results for the FY 2011-12 Audit report will not be known until the end of the 2012 calendar year.

Department Goal: Insure that all automated accounting systems designed to provide easy access to relevant data are maintained with adequate internal controls and audit trails.

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

5. Performance Measure: Percentage of County users that receive annual workshop training sessions on automated financial management, human resource/payroll and budget preparation systems.

07-08 Actual Results	08-09 Actual Results	09-10 Actual Results	10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Adopted	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Target
85%	85%	85%	85%	85%	85%	Delete

What: This measures our desire to be certain County users know what systems and information are available and how to use them. While training is still an important role for the Auditor's staff it has become more about instructing when new systems or upgrades are introduced. The trainer position has been eliminated leaving training duties to staff members considered subject matter experts.

Why: County users will know what information is available and how to retrieve it given adequate training.

How are we doing? The elimination of training position in the Auditor's Office has led to a decrease in training making this measure obsolete. While trainings for a variety of processes are still given as needed, they're now dependent on changes in systems. This Performance Measure will be deleted for the 2012-13 fiscal year.

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

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

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

07-08 Actual Results	08-09 Actual Results	09-10 Actual Results	10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Adopted	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Target
1.7	1.7	1.6	1.6	1.6	1.6	1.6

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

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

How are we doing? Staffing levels per 100 employees for our comparable counties (5 counties surveyed) ranged from a low 1.0 in Monterey County to a high of 1.7 in Marin County. The Auditor's Office maintains levels slightly above the average of 1.4, but within the range of our comparable counties. It is evident our comparable counties continue to face financial challenges as the number of full time equivalent (FTEs)

continue to decline.

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

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

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

07-08 Actual Results	08-09 Actual Results	09-10 Actual Results	10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Adopted	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Target
N/A	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

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

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

How are we doing? During FY 2010-11, we successfully implemented all known legal mandates. Some of these include: the Patient Protection and Affordable Health Care Act, which among other requirements changed coverage for dependents as well as COBRA provision changes. Unemployment Insurance Reauthorization and Job Creation Act of 2010 and the reduction of employee paid FICA for 2011. Also complied with the electronic filing of quarterly reports to the IRS and updated reporting forms and changed tax rate tables. Implemented alternative work schedules, telecommuting policies and eliminated remuneration statement printing to reduce greenhouse gases per California AB32. Updated system for payment to employees who are Reserve Military on active duty. We will continue to implement all mandates as they develop in FY 2012-13. The number of legal mandates varies from year to year depending on changes at the State and Federal levels.

GOALS AND PERFORMANCE MEASURES

<p>Department Goal: Provide helpful, courteous, responsive service to County departments and the public while accommodating all reasonable requests. Communitywide Result Link: <input type="checkbox"/> Safe <input type="checkbox"/> Healthy <input type="checkbox"/> Livable <input type="checkbox"/> Prosperous <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Well-Governed Community</p>						
<p>1. Performance Measure: Percentage of customer satisfaction surveys which rate department performance as "excellent" or "good."</p>						
07-08 Actual Results	08-09 Actual Results	09-10 Actual Results	10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Adopted	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Target
97%	98%	98%	100%	100%	100%	100%
<p>What: This measure tracks the satisfaction survey results collected from customers who are served in person, through the mail, or over the Internet. Why: Customer satisfaction levels are measured and tracked to identify areas in which the department can improve its level of service to the public. How are we doing? In FY 2011-12, the department received 75 completed customer satisfaction surveys from the public service counter. All 75 survey responses or 100% rated the service as "good" or "excellent". The department continues to fine-tune the services provided to the public by enhancing the Tax Collector's website and the Taxes on the Web system to increase the percentage of department services available 24/7. The property tax management system allows taxpayers the ability to manage all of their assessments in one transaction, and to "go green" by using the e-Billing solution. Staff continually cross-train to enhance their knowledge and skills, which increases the level of service available to the public. The projected result for FY 2012-13 remains 100% of customer satisfaction surveys to indicate that the department's performance is "good" or "excellent".</p>						
<p>Department Goal: Manage the County Treasury investment pool, which includes deposits from the County, schools, and special districts, in a manner that ensures the preservation of capital and provides the ability to meet the cash flow needs of the pool participants. Communitywide Result Link: <input type="checkbox"/> Safe <input type="checkbox"/> Healthy <input type="checkbox"/> Livable <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Prosperous <input type="checkbox"/> Well-Governed Community</p>						
<p>2. Performance Measure: Percentage of public funds invested. <i>This performance measure is being deleted in FY 2012-13.</i></p>						
07-08 Actual Results	08-09 Actual Results	09-10 Actual Results	10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Adopted	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Target
99%	99%	99%	99%	99%	98%	Deleted
<p>What: This measures the percentage of available funds that are invested in the County Treasury investment pool. Why: To maximize the return on investment for public funds not immediately required to support governmental operations. How are we doing? The County Treasurer's policy is to invest all funds that are not immediately needed. The department is able to invest such a high percentage of available funds because of detailed daily cash flow tracking and projections, electronic banking, and on-line account tracking. The percentage of available funds invested has remained steady over the years and the department anticipates no issue with maintaining the targeted high percentage of investment in FY 2011-12. Based on a recent survey of all California counties, in which half of the counties responded, the average percentage of available funds invested by responding counties is 95%. In an effort to streamline the County Treasury performance measures, this performance measure is being deleted in FY 2012-13, because the goal of maximizing the return on public funds is best measured by the overall net yield. The overall net yield for the County Treasury investment pool is measured against the State of California Local Agency Investment Fund (LAIF) in performance measure #4.</p>						
<p>3. Performance Measure: Percentage of time that the annual County Treasury Oversight Committee investment policy compliance audit results in 100% compliance. <i>This performance measure is being deleted in FY 2012-13.</i></p>						
07-08 Actual Results	08-09 Actual Results	09-10 Actual Results	10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Adopted	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Target
100%	95%	100%	100%	100%	100%	Deleted
<p>What: The County Treasury Oversight Committee (CTOC) was formed in 1996. One of its duties is to authorize an independent audit of the County Treasury investments each year. The committee may contract with one of the following: 1) the County Auditor-Controller, 2) the independent certified public accountants (CPAs) that review the County's Comprehensive Annual Financial Report, or 3) independent CPAs, as deemed appropriate. This measure tracks the percentage of time that the annual County Treasury Oversight Committee investment policy compliance audit results in 100% compliance. Why: The annual compliance audit ensures that investment procedures are effectively being implemented to preserve capital and meet cash flow requirements of the pool participants. How are we doing? The audit by the Auditor-Controller for FY 2010-11 (conducted in FY 2011-12) resulted in no negative findings or recommendations. The annual investment audits have consistently found the County Treasury to be in compliance with the San Luis Obispo County Treasury Investment Policy. In an effort to streamline the County Treasury performance measures, this performance measure is being combined with performance measure #6, in order to have one performance measure which reflects the results of all audits of the County Treasury.</p>						

**Treasurer, Tax Collector, Public Administrator
Fiscal Year 2012-13 Proposed Budget**

Fund Center 108

Department Goal: Manage County funds on deposit in the County Treasury to meet three goals, in order of priority: 1) Ensure the safety of principal, 2) provide liquidity to meet the funding needs of participants, and 3) to earn an appropriate and competitive yield.

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

4. Performance Measure: Percentage of time in which the net yield of San Luis Obispo County Treasury investments falls within 0.5% of the yield earned by the State of California Local Agency Investment Fund (LAIF).

07-08 Actual Results	08-09 Actual Results	09-10 Actual Results	10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Adopted	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Target
92%	83%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

What: The investment yield (return on investments minus all administrative and banking costs) of the County Treasury Pool is compared to the yield of the State of California investment fund, LAIF. The LAIF is utilized as a standard benchmark for investment yield by most California counties as an indicator that investment portfolios are following the market. The LAIF has a fund balance of over \$60 billion, or about 100 times the size of the County Treasury investment pool. Further, the LAIF is a pure investment fund, where the County Treasury's investment pool must also act as an operating fund, covering the daily operating liquidity needs of participating County departments and agencies. This performance measure is based on achieving a relative net yield within 0.5% of the LAIF.

Why: Net investment yield is the third priority for the County Treasury investment pool, after safety and liquidity. Achieving this standard means the County is effectively maximizing its income from investments.

How are we doing? The County Treasury net yield was within the targeted variance of 0.5% compared to the LAIF net yield in FY 2011-12. The County Treasury continues to explore ways to reduce costs and aggressively search for options to obtain better yields without jeopardizing safety and liquidity.

5. Performance Measure: Maintain an "AAA/V1" credit rating by Fitch Ratings for the Treasury Combined Pool Investments.

07-08 Actual Results	08-09 Actual Results	09-10 Actual Results	10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Adopted	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Target
"AAA/V1+"	"AAA/V1+"	"AAA/V1"	"AAA/V1"	"AAA/V1"	"AAA/V1"	"AAA/V1"

What: This measure tracks the County Treasury's success in meeting its "Safety" and "Liquidity" goals for the Treasury investment pool. Fitch Ratings, Inc. ("Fitch") is a nationally recognized statistical rating organization that provides an independent evaluation of the investment pool, and its ability to protect the principal and provide liquidity, even in the face of adverse interest rate environments. The target is to achieve the highest available rating.

Why: Credit ratings are an objective measure of the County's ability to pay its financial obligations as well as meet safety and liquidity goals for the County Treasury investment pool.

How are we doing? Fitch has assigned their highest managed fund credit rating of "AAA" and a market risk rating of "V1" to the County Pool. The investment pool's "AAA" rating "reflects the fund's vulnerability to losses as a result of defaults based on the actual and prospective average credit quality of the fund's invested portfolio." The pool's "V1" volatility rating "reflects low market risk and a capacity to return stable principal value to meet anticipated cash flow requirements, even in adverse interest rate environments." Fitch has consistently rated the County Pool with their highest rating since FY 1994-95. Effective February 10, 2010, Fitch eliminated the V1+ rating from its Fund Volatility Rating scale and revised its highest rating to V1. On March 18, 2010, the County Pool's volatility rating was revised to "V1," to reflect the new highest rating. On March 17, 2011 and again on March 14, 2012 Fitch confirmed the County Pool's "AAA/V1" rating.

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

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

6. Performance Measure: Percentage of time that "no findings" is the result of the internal quarterly cash procedures audit by the County Auditor-Controller's Office and the annual Treasury audit by outside auditors. *This performance measure is being deleted in FY 2012-13.*

07-08 Actual Results	08-09 Actual Results	09-10 Actual Results	10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Adopted	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Target
100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	Deleted

What: Each quarter, the County Auditor-Controller's Office conducts an unannounced cash procedures audit of the County Treasury. Annually, a firm contracted by the County, currently Gallina, LLP, requests access to office documents in order to conduct a departmental audit. These audits are required by government code. This measure tracks the results of the County Treasury's internal quarterly and external annual audits.

Why: Internal and external audits certify that procedures are being maintained to ensure effective internal control to safeguard, manage, and account for liquid assets.

How are we doing? The above audits have consistently resulted in no negative findings or recommendations. All of the quarterly cash procedures audits received in FY 2011-12 resulted in no negative findings or recommendations. The annual audit report for FY 2010-11 which was received in FY 2011-12, also was without findings or recommendations thus achieving the 100% target. In an effort to streamline the

**Treasurer, Tax Collector, Public Administrator
Fiscal Year 2012-13 Proposed Budget**

Fund Center 108

County Treasury performance measures, this performance measure is being combined with performance measure #3 in the new measure below, in order to have one performance measure which reflects the results of all audits of the County Treasury. The annual audit for FY 2011-12 has not yet been completed.

6. Performance Measure: Percentage of time that “no findings” is the result of the internal quarterly cash procedures audit by the County Auditor-Controller’s Office, the annual County Treasury audit by outside auditors, and the annual audit ordered by the County Treasury Oversight Committee.

07-08 Actual Results	08-09 Actual Results	09-10 Actual Results	10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Adopted	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Target
New	New	New	New	New	100%	100%

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

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

How are we doing? The above audits have consistently resulted in no negative findings or recommendations. For prior year results, see measures #3 and the previous #6 above (both of which are being deleted in FY 2012-13 and combined into this one new measure #6). All of the audits received in FY 2011-12 resulted in no negative findings or recommendations. The annual audit for FY 2011-12 has not yet been completed.

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

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

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

07-08 Actual Results	08-09 Actual Results	09-10 Actual Results	10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Adopted	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Target
3.5%	3.9%	3.5%	3.2%	3.5%	2.2%	3.1%

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

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

How are we doing? In FY 2011-12, San Luis Obispo County had an uncollected current secured tax charge percentage of 2.2%, or \$8,642,948.86, which represents a decrease of 1% from FY 2010-11 levels. The State average for FY 2010-11 (the last year for which stats are currently available) was 3.0%. The decrease in the amount of delinquencies can be attributed to the department's continuing efforts to notify taxpayers of their tax status through a comprehensive Tax Status Letter, which was mailed in the fall and in the spring of FY 2011-12.

8. Performance Measure: Percentage of qualified delinquent unsecured taxes collected. *This performance measure is being deleted in FY 2012-13.*

07-08 Actual Results	08-09 Actual Results	09-10 Actual Results	10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Adopted	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Target
26%	24%	24%	31%	25%	39%	Deleted

What: This measures the percentage of qualified delinquent unsecured taxes that are collected.

Why: Revenue and Taxation Code 2963 limits active collection of taxes on the unsecured roll to three years from the date taxes become delinquent. This measure demonstrates the level at which unsecured taxes are collected within three years from the date taxes become delinquent.

How are we doing? In FY 2011-12, the amount of unsecured taxes eligible for delinquent collection efforts was \$1,882,426.25. The collections unit collected \$745,538.24 or 39% of the amount subject to active collections compared to the projected amount of \$470,606 or 25%. Additional staff hours were devoted to delinquent collections, and there was an increase in the number of delinquent tax status notices mailed in FY 2011-12 which accounted for the increased percentage of amounts collected. Due to a lack of comparable county data, this performance measure is being eliminated in FY 2012-13.

Department Goal: Implement cost justified, proven technologies to improve automated processing and reporting systems to provide current, accessible, and accurate information for the public.

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

**Treasurer, Tax Collector, Public Administrator
Fiscal Year 2012-13 Proposed Budget**

Fund Center 108

9. Performance Measure: Percentage of the customer service program that has been implemented which enables the public to review and transact business on-line.

07-08 Actual Results	08-09 Actual Results	09-10 Actual Results	10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Adopted	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Target
75%	80%	84%	80%	85%	85%	90%

What: The Treasurer, Tax Collector, Public Administrator website is being modified to allow for electronic commerce with the community. The department's Customer Service Program (CSP) is implemented in modules with the major portions of the program already in operation to benefit customers, such as Taxes on the Web (TOW) and the Property Tax Management System (PTMS). Over the course of the project, the program has expanded as additional customer needs are identified. This measure tracks the percentage of the implemented online services that will enable the public to review and transact business online.

Why: The ability to transact business on-line 24/7 is an important tool to improve the quality of service to the community. This measure reflects the Treasurer Office's progress in implementing online services to better serve the community.

How are we doing? The customer web interface for business license and transient occupancy tax payments was completed in the second quarter of FY 2011-12. For the coming FY 2012-13, the focus will be placed on completing the phone call logging system to more accurately record and track tax issues and tax information provided on individual property assessments as well as updating the Taxes on the Web program to provide more information in a faster and more efficient manner.

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

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

10. Performance Measure: Percentage of referrals to the Public Administrator that are completed with an initial investigation report, burial arrangements, and any required initial legal filing within 15 business days.

07-08 Actual Results	08-09 Actual Results	09-10 Actual Results	10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Adopted	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Target
100%	100%	80%	100%	100%	100%	100%

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

Why: This measure demonstrates the County's compliance with legal requirements and the expediency with which the County protects estate assets.

How are we doing? All cases referred to the Public Administrator are investigated and a decision to accept or decline the case is made within 15 business days. Each estate investigation begins immediately upon notification. The procedure involves extensive asset investigations, family location processes, and burial arrangements. In FY 2011-12, 32 estate referrals were investigated. In 19 of those estate investigations, either an heir or other responsible person was located to administer the estate, or it was determined that there were no estate assets to administer. The remaining 13 estates were accepted for administration by the Public Administrator pursuant to California Probate Code. In FY 2011-12, all of these 32 estate referrals were investigated and determined within the 15 business day policy. It remains the goal of the Public Administrator to promptly investigate and determine estate administrations within 15 business days.

GOALS AND PERFORMANCE MEASURES

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

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

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

07-08 Actual Results	08-09 Actual Results	09-10 Actual Results	10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Adopted	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Target
98%	98%	96%	97%	95%	91%	97%

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

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

How are we doing? The percentage of the completed assessment workload was 91% which is below where it has been in prior years with 7,600 work items incomplete. This was due to the increase in assessment reviews and appeals related to the decline in market values. Most of the increase was in commercial properties which are more time consuming to appraise, and are not appraised using automated programs such as the Assessment Evaluation Services (AES) program. Another factor was the numerous vacancies caused by leaves of absence, retirements, and delays in the recruitment process. The loss of organizational knowledge due to the retirement of long term staff also adversely impacted the completion of the assessment roll. To offset the adverse impacts on the workload, staff worked overtime and the deadline to turn the assessment roll over to the Auditor-Controller was delayed by one week. These efforts averted an even larger backlog of incomplete items. The 7,600 incomplete work items will delay the start of the FY 2012-13 workload, and create an obstacle to the timely completion of the assessment roll.

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

07-08 Actual Results	08-09 Actual Results	09-10 Actual Results	10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Adopted	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Target
2,561	3,044	3,072	3,603	3,000	3,531	3,200

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

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

How are we doing? While staff exceeded the FY 2011-12 Adopted target, the FY 2011-12 Actual Results were lower than the FY 2010-11 Actual Results. This decline is partially attributed to the decline in value reviews for commercial properties as mentioned above. The increase in the number of Assessment Appeals also hindered the appraisers' overall production. Assessment Appeals require numerous contacts with the applicants and additional research which causes the appeal workload to be much more time consuming.

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

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

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

07-08 Actual Results	08-09 Actual Results	09-10 Actual Results	10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Adopted	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Target
.78	1.8	1.8	2.96	4.5	6.0	3.5

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

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

How are we doing? During FY 2011-12, the assessment appeal workload grew substantially as a result of a weak real estate market. Not only was there an increase in the number of new assessment appeals filed, there was a substantial number of appeals from the previous year that were resolved in FY 2011-12. The FY 2011-12 Actual Results increased to 6 appeals per 1,000 assessments which is double the FY 2010-11 Actual Results. At this time the data for comparable counties is not available. However, based on the most recent State Board of Equalization (BOE) "Reports on Budgets, Workloads, and Assessment Appeals Activities" for FY 2010-11, our assessment appeal workload

is consistent with the number of appeals in comparable counties.

4. Performance Measure: Cost per assessment.

07-08 Actual Results	08-09 Actual Results	09-10 Actual Results	10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Adopted	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Target
\$45.89	\$47.33	\$46.01	\$45.08	\$49.00	\$43.75	\$47.00

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

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

How are we doing? For FY 2011-12, the cost per assessment was less than the FY 2010-11 Actual Results and the FY 2011-12 Adopted. Budget cuts are reflected in the decreasing costs per assessment for FY 2009-10 and FY 2010-11 and the decreased costs reflect improved efficiencies. However, the most recent decrease, reflected in the FY 2011-12 Actual Results is not solely a continuation of this trend of improved efficiency. Significant salary savings accrued during the year due to an unusually high number of vacancies, as well as employees on extended leaves. It is not anticipated that the Actual Results for FY 2011-12 will be repeated in the future, nor would funding at such a low level be considered acceptable. The unusually large number of vacant positions caused a staff shortage, and this caused a significant number of incomplete assessments for the year. The State Board of Equalization's "Report on Budgets, Workloads, and Assessment Appeals Activities" for FY 2010-2011 (published in February 2012) indicates the San Luis Obispo County Assessor's costs were below our comparable counties. During that time period, the median cost per assessment for comparable counties was \$47.89.

GOALS AND PERFORMANCE MEASURES

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

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

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

07-08 Actual Results	08-09 Actual Results	09-10 Actual Results	10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Adopted	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Target
98.1%	93%	98%	96%	100%	99%	100%

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

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

How are we doing? In FY 2011-12, 99% (28,060 of the 28,186 recordings received in the mail) were examined and recorded or returned within two business days. Recording levels for FY 2011-12 have increased by approximately 3,300 documents compared to FY 2010-11 due to an upswing in the housing market. Deed recordings increased by 13% and Deed of Trust recordings increased 12%. FY 2011-12 fell just shy of adopted levels because of occasional staffing shortages. With our focus on additional training for staff, we continue to strive to achieve our goal of 100% in the coming year; however, with the upcoming Presidential General Election, which statistically has the highest turnout of any election, and a planned retirement in October, it may be difficult to meet this goal during the first half of the year.

Department Goal: Provide easy access to all public records and documents to enhance customer service.

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

2. Performance Measure: Percentage of requests for vital and official records per month conducted online via the web.

07-08 Actual Results	08-09 Actual Results	09-10 Actual Results	10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Adopted	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Target
4.4%	4.7%	5.3%	5.4%	6.5%	3.4%	6%

What: This measure tracks the use of Clerk-Recorder services that are available online for a fee.

Why: Copy requests via the web require less staff time and measuring the use of online services assists in the assignment of staff within the department, resulting in a more efficient use of staff time. Tracking measurements of the level of use of online vital and official records use also provides indicators of the need to advertise and enhance the availability of certain services online to better serve the public.

How are we doing? The online purchase of birth and death copies has been restricted in the State since 2003, and in 2010 the restriction was expanded to include copies of marriage licenses. The percentage of online requests for the purchase of vital and official records has been increasing since legislation was passed in 2004 to allow customers to fax a notarized statement for purchase of these records. In April 2011, the County contracted with a new vendor for processing credit card payments, which has resulted in a 60% (\$4.51) decrease in the convenience fee paid by the customer versus the web-based vendor. The new vendor does not have the ability to allow customers to place orders on the web. This has had an effect on the number of customers who chose to place orders on the internet, as opposed to contacting the office directly. The decrease in FY 2011-12 can be attributed to the new credit card payment vendor and the savings that the new system offers for the customer. The customer saves \$4.51 by placing their order directly through the Clerk-Recorder, rather than online. The vendor that is utilized for the web orders continues to make improvements to their service, which will hopefully result in increased numbers of customers utilizing web based record request services. 3.4% of requests is equivalent to 32 requests per month for vital and official records via the web.

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

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

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

07-08 Actual Results	08-09 Actual Results	09-10 Actual Results	10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Adopted	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Target
\$2.07	\$1.97* \$2.08**	\$2.00* \$1.89**	\$1.77* \$2.06**	\$2.25	\$2.22	\$2.10

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

Why: Vote-by-mail ballots have traditionally been very labor intensive to administer and process. Currently, approximately 54% of San Luis Obispo County voters choose to permanently vote by mail ballot. Tracking the costs to issue vote-by-mail ballots allows the department to plan for the budgetary impacts of these ballots accordingly and contributes to efforts to automate and streamline the process to increase efficiency and keep costs down.

How are we doing? The deployment of technology has had a profound effect on this labor intensive process. Since San Luis Obispo County began implementing technology and introduced efficiencies for the issuance of vote-by-mail ballots, per ballot costs have been reduced from \$4.11 per voter in 1998 to the current \$2.25 or less per voter. The expansion of permanent vote-by-mail status has further assisted in reducing this cost as these voters do not need to apply for a ballot, reducing the staff time to process the request by about one-third. Currently, 79,417 voters have registered for Permanent Vote-by-Mail status, which is 54% of all registered voters in the County. Legislation that streamlined the manual tally of vote-by-mail ballots became effective January 1, 2012, saving approximately 300 hours of staff time per election, which equates to roughly \$0.05 per ballot in savings. The FY 2011-12 actual results were slightly below adopted levels because the contract for ballot printing and services yielded a \$0.031 per ballot reduction in printing costs, \$0.06 per ballot savings on stuffing and mailing Vote-by-Mail ballots, as well as an overall 2% discount for prepayment. The lowered cost per vote-by-mail ballot targeted in FY 2012-13 is a result of not printing party specific ballots in a General Election, which reduces the number of ballots ordered; and also reflects the anticipated savings from the newly stream-lined manual tally procedures and the lowered costs of printing and other services.

Some of our comparable counties were able to provide the following information as a comparison. Costs are from prior years as current costs are not available.

Placer County \$5.41 per ballot
Santa Barbara County \$3.88 per ballot
Napa County \$2.85 per ballot

FY 2008-09 Results: * November 2008 General Presidential Election ** May 2009 Special Statewide Election
FY 2009-10 Results: * June 8, 2010 Primary Election ** June 22, 2010 Special SD 15 Primary Election
FY 2010-11 Results: * August 2010 Special SD 15 General Election ** November 2010 General Election
FY 2011-12 Results: June 2012 Presidential Primary

4. Performance Measure: Average cost per registered voter in the County.

07-08 Actual Results	08-09 Actual Results	09-10 Actual Results	10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Adopted	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Target
\$3.56	\$4.08* \$2.40**	\$3.83* \$2.46**	\$2.21* \$3.49**	\$3.85	\$3.77	\$4.00

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

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

How are we doing? Even with the increased number of voter registrations and high voter turnout, the department continues to maintain its commitment to providing the best election experience in the most cost effective manner. The costs for the June 2012 Presidential Primary Election were slightly below target compared to the adopted amounts. In the early part of 2012, a new contract was negotiated with the current ballot printer, resulting in a savings of \$0.031 per ballot, plus a 2% discount for prepayment, which resulted in an approximate \$8,450 savings in ballot printing costs. The sample ballot booklet was also reformatted from a full 8½" X 11" size to a "digest" size in order to lower postage costs that were scheduled to increase significantly. These changes resulted in a savings of \$30,000 in printing costs, and \$6,300 in postage for the sample ballots. There was also a \$15,400 savings on Election Officer Payroll that was achieved by reducing the number of poll workers assigned to each polling place from 5 workers to 4. This change cannot be sustained during the General Election in November because the additional workers are required to assist the increased number of voters who historically turnout during a Presidential General Election. The FY 2012-13 Target reflects costs associated with the higher voter turnout during a Presidential General Election. An increase in voter turnout increases costs associated with the election, such as charges for processing voted ballots and increased overtime necessary to conduct and certify the election within the mandated timeframe.

Some of our comparable counties were able to provide the following information as a comparison. These comparisons are from prior years as current figures are not available.

Placer County \$4.99 per registered voter
Santa Barbara County \$11.00 per registered voter (includes indirect costs)
Napa County \$2.67 per registered voter

FY 2008-09 Results: * November 2008 General Presidential Election ** May 2009 Special Statewide Election
FY 2009-10 Results: * June 8, 2010 Primary Election ** June 22, 2010 Special Senate District 15 Primary Election
FY 2010-11 Results: * August Special SD 15 General Election ** November 2010 General Election
FY 2011-12 Results: June 2012 Presidential Primary

5. Performance Measure: Voter Participation Rate.

07-08 Actual Results	08-09 Actual Results	09-10 Actual Results	10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Adopted	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Target
63.5% * 43.4% **	83.1% * 39.4% **	40.27% * 47.12% ** 37.87% ***	43.41%* 69%**	65%	48.59%	80%

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

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

How are we doing? Many factors affect voter turnout. Turnout is always highest in a Presidential General Election and lowest in a gubernatorial Primary Election and in special elections. In addition, voter file maintenance is critical to ensure that election files are current and up-to-date, thereby giving a more accurate picture of the voter turnout. This office is committed to encouraging voter participation and educating the public on deadlines for voter registration and the process to obtain a vote-by-mail ballot for each election. Our commitment to mail voter information pamphlets/vote by mail applications at the earliest possible date, and the posting of information and polling place lookup on the internet, assists our voters in being informed and contributes to the County's high rates of voter turnout. The office has also made an effort to utilize social media sites, such as Facebook and Twitter, to notify citizens of upcoming deadlines and other voter information. These efforts to encourage voter turnout are reflected in the County's 48.59% (71,565 ballots cast) voter turnout for the June 2012 Presidential Primary Election being nearly 18% higher than the statewide average of 31.06%. Voter turnout fell short of adopted figures, but that can be attributed to the fact that there were no competitive party elections by the time the California Primary occurred. The target of 80% voter turnout (117,820 ballots cast) for FY 2012-13 reflects the anticipated increase in voter interest for the 2012 Presidential General Election. This percentage is on par with previous Presidential General Elections.

FY 2005-06 Results:	* November 2005 Special Statewide Election	** June 2006 Direct Primary Election
FY 2007-08 Results:	* February Presidential Primary Election	** June 2008 Direct Primary Election
FY 2008-09 Results:	* November 2008 General Presidential Election	** May 2009 Special Statewide Election
FY 2009-10 Results:	* November 2009 Uniform District Election /City of Paso Election	** June 2010 Direct Primary Election
	*** June 22, 2010 Special SD 15 Primary Election	
FY 2010-11 Results:	* August 2010 Special SD 15 General Election	** November 2010 General Election
FY 2011-12 Results	June 2012 Presidential Primary	

GOALS AND PERFORMANCE MEASURES

Department Goal: Provide exemplary litigation services, defending decisions and advocating positions of our clients to assist those clients in achieving their objectives.

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

1. Performance Measure: Cases litigated where we achieve a positive outcome determined as follows below.

07-08 Actual Results	08-09 Actual Results	09-10 Actual Results	10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Adopted	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Target
21 Resolved 161 Pending	44 Resolved 148 Pending	49 Resolved 162 Pending	53 Resolved 156 Pending	50 Resolved 150 Pending	52 Resolved 108 Pending	30 Resolved 131 Pending

What: This measure tracks the number of cases where County Counsel realized a positive outcome by successfully defending the legislative and executive decisions of the Board of Supervisors, upholding County officers' decisions and protecting County assets.

Why: Tracking the results of cases litigated by County Counsel helps to measure the success of the department in implementing governmental decisions and protecting the County's proprietary interests.

How are we doing? During FY 2011-12 there were 52 litigation files that were closed. As of the end of the fiscal year, we are managing or overseeing 108 lawsuits and administrative proceedings (not including probate matters, conservatorships, mental health habeas corpus proceedings, and juvenile dependency matters).

Department Goal: Represent the County and advocate to protect the interests of the client in cases which address the special needs of fragile populations in the community (children referred to Child Welfare Services, residents receiving mental health care and individuals requiring financial conservatorship), as well as estates without probate representation.

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

2. Performance Measure: Proceedings in which legal advice is provided to Child Welfare Services (CWS) and advocate representation is provided in court to assure that the law is followed while attempting to achieve results that are in the best interest of the child.

07-08 Actual Results	08-09 Actual Results	09-10 Actual Results	10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Adopted	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Target
459	629	700	690	600	695	650

What: A large number of proceedings are handled annually by CWS to protect the children of our community. County Counsel provides legal representation in all court appearances for CWS matters.

Why: If strong legal representation is provided by County Counsel to CWS in these matters, then CWS will be successful in protecting the abused and neglected children of our community.

How are we doing? It should be noted that the County Counsel's office has virtually no influence on the number of proceedings that are handled. We handle whatever comes our way via the Department of Social Services (DSS). The number of proceedings depends on numerous factors beyond our control, including (1) the number of proceedings initiated by participants in the juvenile court (DSS, parents, children, etc.); (2) the mix of proceedings that need to be disposed of (e.g., more complex proceedings consuming large amounts of court and DSS resources generally means that fewer short cases can be processed by the court and DSS); and (3) the amount of juvenile court resources available to hear proceedings, which tends to be finite. Not included in the figures above are the number of writs and appeals that are filed in regard to these cases. It should be noted that the number of writs and appeals continue to increase each year, for reasons beyond our control. For example: parents are entitled to outside appellate counsel from a large panel, and individual panel attorneys may take more aggressive approaches. In addition, changes in statutes or case law can trigger a rash of related appeals. A significant amount of work is required to prepare responses to these filings and to argue some at the Court of Appeal. FY 2011-12 saw them up to 21 from 13 in the previous year. A significant amount of work is required to prepare responses to these filings and to argue some at the Court of Appeal. No comparable county data is available.

3. Performance Measure: Cases involving people who are unable to care for themselves in which County Counsel represents the County to assure that the law is followed while attempting to achieve results that are in the best interest of the individual as determined by the Public Guardian, Public Administrator or Department of Behavioral Health.

07-08 Actual Results	08-09 Actual Results	09-10 Actual Results	10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Adopted	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Target
158	162	143	148	150	156	150

What: The Public Guardian is appointed as Conservator on an ongoing basis for individuals when it has been determined by the court that they cannot care for themselves. The Department of Behavioral Health assists individuals in urgent short-term mental health situations such as Habeas Corpus matters, where it comes to the authorities' attention that the individual needs immediate assistance and are detained (for not more than 72 hours) until a judge makes a determination as to whether or not they are able to care for themselves. The Public Administrator is appointed by the court to assist in the disposition of the estate of a decedent where no executor is available. County Counsel is involved in these matters in order to assure that the law is complied with while protecting the rights of those members of our community who are unable to make their own decisions or care for themselves. County Counsel provides legal representation in all court appearances for these matters.

Why: If effective legal representation is provided by County Counsel in these matters, the Public Guardian and Public Administrator will be successful in assuring the care of those in the community who are unable to care for themselves and the Department of Behavioral Health will be more likely to improve the mental stability of its patients.

How are we doing? During FY 2011-12, there were 45 Habeas Corpus matters handled by County Counsel. There are 102 ongoing/active conservatorship cases, as well as nine estate matters from the Public Administrator. The number of conservatorship cases holds fairly steady, though their complexity continues to be at an elevated level, resulting in more hours of preparation and increased court appearances than in years past. No comparable county data is available.

Department Goal: Provide accurate, timely, and reliable document review and legal advice for County boards, commissions, departments, and agencies in order to help these clients achieve their objectives without unnecessary litigation or loss.

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

4. Performance Measure: Percentage of clients who report advice provided by attorneys was clear, relevant and timely.

07-08 Actual Results	08-09 Actual Results	09-10 Actual Results	10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Adopted	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Target
95%	95%	95%	97%	99%	100%	99%

What: This measurement reflects the level of satisfaction with County Counsel's departmental support as reported by department representatives during the yearly attorney evaluation process and through frequent contact with managers and staff of client departments.

Why: Each of our clients operates under a highly technical set of governing laws and regulations. By helping them understand and meet their legal obligations, we help them serve the community. Asking departments to evaluate the work that County Counsel does provides us with the opportunity to improve our services to departments.

How are we doing? Results are calculated by comparing the number of clients the department represents (106) with the comments received. During FY 2011-12 all clients reported that advice from County Counsel was clear, relevant and timely. The results continue to improve. No comparable county data is available.

5. Performance Measure: Percentage of projects in which the response to requests for legal advice or contract review are completed within five working days.

07-08 Actual Results	08-09 Actual Results	09-10 Actual Results	10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Adopted	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Target
97%	96%	98%	99%	98%	91%	90%

What: This measurement reflects the percentage of time that the review of a variety of legal documents, conduct of research, and rendering of opinions as requested, is completed within five working days.

Why: It is our intent to be in contact with the requestor or respond to each written request for legal advice within five working days. Measuring our response time to requests for legal advice enables us to evaluate our customer service and improve the assistance we provide to our clients in achieving their objectives as expeditiously as possible.

How are we doing? During FY 2011-12, there were 3,649 requests for legal advice submitted by various clients. Please note that the results for prior years were calculated on a point-in-time basis as opposed to individual comparisons of received date and completed date. Using the new, more accurate method on a retrospective basis yields a comparable result of 92% for FY 2010-11. The decrease in timeliness seems to reflect short-staffing and overall increased workload for our attorneys. Some of the requests for legal advice require considerable time to complete due to their complexity or necessary research but the requests are not weighted according to complexity or difficulty and therefore do not take this factor into account. No comparable county data is available.

6. Performance Measure: Percentage of contracted projects and Board of Supervisors agenda items completed without litigation.

07-08 Actual Results	08-09 Actual Results	09-10 Actual Results	10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Adopted	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Target
99%	99%	99%	99%	99%	99%	99%

What: All contracts and agreements are reviewed and approved prior to being presented at the Board of Supervisors meetings. These contracts and agreements pertain to a variety of issues, including capital projects, services, land use, etc. County Counsel also provides continuous legal advice while contracts are administered. All land use planning issues before the Board are reviewed by this office and advice is provided on all such items. This measure reflects the percentage of time that County Counsel provides the legal advice necessary to avoid litigation regarding contracts and agreements approved by the Board of Supervisors.

Why: Providing good legal advice in the review and administration of contracts and other agreements tends to inversely correlate with the number of lawsuits filed challenging the approval or administration of those contracts. Approval and administration of the contracts and other agreements without litigation helps our clients to achieve their objectives and creates a significant savings for the County.

How are we doing? During FY 2011-12, there were three lawsuits filed that involved the County and were a result of a contracted project, agreement, and/or Board of Supervisors agenda item. The Board averages approximately 1,000 agenda items and/or contracted projects during each fiscal year; all contracts and agreements are signed off by County Counsel and the remainder of the agenda items reviewed by County Counsel. No comparable county data is available.

Department Goal: Provide effective legal representation to County boards, commissions, departments, and agencies in a cost-effective manner.

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

7. Performance Measure: County Counsel expenses as a percentage of the County Budget.

07-08 Actual Results	08-09 Actual Results	09-10 Actual Results	10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Adopted	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Target
.78%	.66%	.69%	.81%	.76%	.75%	.76%

What: This measure demonstrates the relationship between County Counsel's expenditures and the expenditures of the County as a whole. This measurement is obtained by dividing the County Counsel net County cost by the County's total budget.

Why: County Counsel strives to keep costs as low as possible, while providing effective legal advice and representation to its clients. This measure provides an indication of how cost effective County Counsel's legal support is.

How are we doing? County Counsel's operating budget continues to stay fairly consistent with prior years. Expenditures are monitored closely throughout the year. The budget status includes the funds that are encumbered periodically during the year for professional services (i.e., outside law firms and outside technical experts). These professional services are incurred on behalf of the County and are budgeted and paid for through the County Counsel budget. At the beginning of any budget process, it is difficult to predict what professional services might be required.

GOALS AND PERFORMANCE MEASURES

<p>Department Goal: Conduct, monitor, and evaluate recruitment and testing in a timely manner in order to provide County departments with qualified candidates while ensuring compliance with regulations and merit principles.</p> <p>Communitywide Result Link: <input type="checkbox"/> Safe <input type="checkbox"/> Healthy <input type="checkbox"/> Livable <input type="checkbox"/> Prosperous <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Well-Governed Community</p>						
<p>1. Performance Measure: Average number of days to produce eligibility lists for departments for open recruitments.</p>						
07-08 Actual Results	08-09 Actual Results	09-10 Actual Results	10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Adopted	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Target
38 days	38 days	34 days	44 days	40 days	62 days	39 days
<p>What: This measures the time (recruitment final filing date through establishment of eligibility list) it takes Human Resources to provide departments with a list of qualified candidates to fill a vacant position after the recruitment closes.</p> <p>Why: The number of days to produce an eligibility list for recruitments is one measure of departmental efficiency. Human Resources endeavors to provide eligibility lists as quickly as possible to maintain staffing levels adequate to provide services to the community.</p> <p>How are we doing? Hiring department resource constraints and requests by hiring departments for delays in the process contributed substantially to the increase in the number of days. After initiating recruitments through Human Resources, some departments halted their recruitments because their budgets could not support the addition of staff. Recruitments halted by initiating departments raised the average number of days to produce an eligibility list, reflecting parameters other than Human Resources departmental efficiency. While the number of days has increased, Human Resources' recruitment satisfaction rating remains at a high level (98%). Comparable-entity data is not available.</p>						
<p>2. Performance Measure: Percentage of departments rating their level of satisfaction with the overall recruitment process as satisfactory or better.</p>						
07-08 Actual Results	08-09 Actual Results	09-10 Actual Results	10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Adopted	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Target
N/A	N/A	100%	97%	95%	98%	95%
<p>What: This measure presents the results of surveys completed by departments at the close of open recruitments as to the level of satisfaction with the overall recruitment process.</p> <p>Why: Recruitment process satisfaction survey results are tracked to determine whether or not the recruitment process is effective in meeting departments' staffing needs. Survey results enable us to identify opportunities to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of recruitments.</p> <p>How are we doing? The Human Resources department's performance can influence satisfaction with the recruitment process. Mutually agreed upon process improvements increased recruitment timelines, but contributed to a high level of customer satisfaction. During FY 2011-12, 98% of 51 survey respondents rated the overall recruitment process as satisfactory or better. Target levels represent a high expectation for continued service excellence. Comparable-entity data is not available.</p>						
<p>Department Goal: To provide reliable, high quality internal support services to County departments.</p> <p>Communitywide Result Link: <input type="checkbox"/> Safe <input type="checkbox"/> Healthy <input type="checkbox"/> Livable <input type="checkbox"/> Prosperous <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Well-Governed Community</p>						
<p>3. Performance Measure: Percentage of County departments that rate Human Resources' service as satisfactory or better relative to timeliness, accuracy, and quality of service (competency).</p>						
07-08 Actual Results	08-09 Actual Results	09-10 Actual Results	10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Adopted	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Target
N/A	Accuracy: 100% Competency: 96% Timeliness: 97%	Accuracy: 93% Competency: 93% Timeliness: 93%	Accuracy: 95% Competency: 95% Timeliness: 94%	Accuracy: 95% Competency: 95% Timeliness: 95%	Accuracy: 89% Competency: 90% Timeliness: 88%	Accuracy:95% Competency:95% Timeliness:95%

What: The Human Resources department surveys departments annually to determine their level of satisfaction with our staff support relative to accuracy, competency and timeliness (ACT). This measure reflects the results of the department's satisfaction survey.

Why: This measure reflects the information gained from the satisfaction survey and allows us to continuously improve our service and support to departments.

How are we doing? Of 24 respondents to a survey conducted in Summer 2012, 88-90% rated Human Resources as satisfactory or better in a variety of areas. The data for this measure suggests the impact of lean staffing and new employees in Human Resources. Human Resources experienced turnover in key customer service positions in FY 2011-12. New staff are quickly assimilating into their roles, and vacancies have been eliminated, enabling the department to maintain a high expectation for continued service excellence. Comparable-entity data is not available.

Department Goal: To provide effective response to, and resolution of, unanticipated challenges to County employment related rules or personnel actions.

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

4. Performance Measure: Percentage of filed grievances and appeals resolved prior to Civil Service Commission hearing.

07-08 Actual Results	08-09 Actual Results	09-10 Actual Results	10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Adopted	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Target
N/A	N/A	89%	89%	85%	75%	85%

What: This measure tracks the rate at which Human Resources resolves grievances/appeals (allegations of improper personnel practices by the County) prior to the matter reaching a Civil Service Commission (CSC) hearing.

Why: The grievance/appeal resolution rate is a reflection of the ability of Human Resources' professional staff to collaborate with stakeholders, design solutions to challenges, and reach mutually agreeable terms on grievance/appeal matters.

How are we doing? There were six grievances/appeals filed in FY 2011-12. Of these six, only one reached a Civil Service Commission hearing, three were resolved prior to hearing, and two remain pending. At the end of FY 2010-11, there were six cases pending. Of these, three were resolved prior to CSC, two remain pending, and one was heard at CSC. As a result, a total of 12 grievances/appeals were addressed in FY 2011-12. Of these 12 grievances/appeals, eight were resolved, with six (75%) resolved prior to the matter reaching a Civil Service Commission hearing. The remaining four cases addressed in FY 2011-12 are still pending (neither resolved nor heard by the Civil Service Commission). Because certain grievances or appeals are more appropriately heard rather than resolved prior to hearing, a result of 75% resolution represents a high achievement rate. The target resolution rate of 85% represents a continued high expectation for this area of emphasis within Human Resources. Comparable-entity data is not available.

Department Goal: Provide cost-effective personnel services.

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

5. Performance Measure: Number of full-time equivalent Human Resources department staff per 1,000 employees.

07-08 Actual Results	08-09 Actual Results	09-10 Actual Results	10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Adopted	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Target
7.2	6.2	5.8	6.3	6.1	6.3	Better than market comparators

What: This measures the number of Human Resources department full time equivalent (FTE) staffing per 1,000 employees.

Why: This data can be compared with other Human Resources departments with similar characteristics to provide one measure of whether or not we are appropriately staffed for providing personnel services.

How are we doing? In FY 2011-12, Human Resources had 6.3 FTE per 1,000 employees (15.0 filled FTEs, for a total County employee count of 2,376). Human Resource departments comparable to San Luis Obispo County's (including Placer, Napa, Marin, Santa Barbara and Santa Cruz) had an average Human Resources staffing level of 9.5 FTE per 1,000 employees in FY 2011-12. The fact that the County employs fewer Human Resources staff per 1,000 employees than comparable Human Resource departments indicates a high level of efficiency in Human Resources department operations.

GOALS AND PERFORMANCE MEASURES

Department Goal: Provide timely, accurate, and cost effective architectural services to all County Departments with capital improvement and maintenance projects.

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

1. Performance Measure: Percentage of capital projects completed within their allocated funding.

07-08 Actual Results	08-09 Actual Results	09-10 Actual Results	10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Adopted	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Target
94%	93%	100%	100%	92%	94%	Deleted

What: This is a measure of the percentage of projects completed within their allocated funded amounts compared to the total number of projects completed within a fiscal year. This ratio gives the success rate of projects completed within budget.

Why: This measure reflects on the ability of Architectural Services staff to manage projects cost effectively and to provide reliable project "opinions of probable cost" for the County's Capital Improvement Program.

How are we doing? Architectural Services exceeded its target for projects completed within allocated funding in FY 2011-12. The Architectural Services group completed seven capital projects, and 41 maintenance projects. Residual funding balances of projects completed under budgetary limits were returned to the original funding source. Original funding source examples include General Fund, Reserves, Public Facility Fees, Quimby Fees and Department Operational budgets. This measure is deleted in FY 2012-13 in favor of measuring efficiency by targeting the percentage of Capital and Maintenance projects that were completed on or before their originally scheduled completion date (see performance measure # 19).

Department Goal: To provide great service to Architectural Services customers.

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

2. Performance Measure: Percentage of project clients who rate Architectural Services as satisfactory or above in the management of their capital and maintenance projects.

07-08 Actual Results	08-09 Actual Results	09-10 Actual Results	10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Adopted	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Target
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	90%	80%*	Deleted

What: Architectural Services distributes two surveys: (1) an annual survey to customers and stakeholders involved in the annual Capital Improvement Project (CIP) request process, and (2) a project specific survey at the completion of every project to the project's stakeholders. Results from both surveys are compiled and reported on annually.

Why: To ensure Architectural Services is communicating effectively with customers and stakeholders (1) during the annual CIP request process (when projects are requested, the scope is identified, cost estimates are made, and projects are prioritized for funding recommendations in the following fiscal year), and (2) during each project's inception to completion (involving scope revisions, budgetary constraints, and scheduling coordination.)

How are we doing? * The target result was not met. However, it is noted that the survey methodology used at the end of FY 2011-12 was revised and the change in methodology may be a contributing factor in the lower rating shown in the actual result. The previous methodology included 3 of the 5 survey choices reflecting Satisfied or better, the new methodology included only 2 of 5 choices as Satisfied or better. To obtain customer satisfaction input, the General Services Agency sent surveys to 1,932 County employees. The survey received a 21% response rate overall. Additionally 16 responses out of 33 point-of-service surveys were received. Of those who responded specifically to Customer Satisfaction questions related to Architectural Services, 80% rated Architectural Services customer service as Satisfactory or better. Results showed that 11% of those surveyed were Dissatisfied or lower, while 9% were Neither Satisfied or Dissatisfied. This measure is deleted in FY 2012-13 in favor of a more comprehensive Customer Satisfaction survey for all of General Services functions (see Performance Measure#14).

Department Goal: Meet health and safety requirements and provide timely and effective custodial services to all County Departments.

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

3. Performance Measure: Percentage of County departments rating custodial services as “good” to “excellent” in annual customer survey.

07-08 Actual Results	08-09 Actual Results	09-10 Actual Results	10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Adopted	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Target
95%	96%	92%	95%	85%	77%*	Deleted

What: Annual surveys of County Departments provides a measure of customer satisfaction regarding the cleanliness of facilities, staff responsiveness, staff courtesy and the ease of doing business with Custodial Services.

Why: Our success in providing acceptably clean facilities to client Departments is ultimately measured in the responses and opinions of our clients.

How are we doing? *The target result was not met. However, it is noted that the survey methodology used at the end of FY 2011-12 was revised and the change in methodology may be a contributing factor in the lower rating shown in the actual result. The previous methodology included 3 of the 5 survey choices reflecting Satisfied or better, the new methodology included only 2 of 5 choices as Satisfied or better. To obtain customer satisfaction input, the General Services Agency sent surveys to 1,932 County employees. The survey received a 21% response rate overall. Of those who responded specifically to Customer Satisfaction questions related to Custodial Services, 77% rated Custodial Services customer service as Satisfactory or better. Results showed that 12% of those surveyed were Dissatisfied or lower, while 11% were Neither Satisfied or Dissatisfied. This measure is deleted in FY 2012-13 in favor of a more comprehensive Customer Satisfaction survey for all of General Services functions (see Performance Measure#14).

4. Performance Measure: Square footage of office space cleaned per custodian.

07-08 Actual Results	08-09 Actual Results	09-10 Actual Results	10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Adopted	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Target
29,221 sq. ft./custodian	28,470 sq. ft./custodian	31,366 sq. ft./custodian	37,697 sq. ft./custodian	37,697 sq. ft./custodian	38,185 sq. ft./custodian	Deleted

What: This measure shows the average amount of office space each custodian is responsible for keeping clean.

Why: This measure indicates the workload of custodial staff and compares it to industry standards.

How are we doing? The Association of Physical Plant Administrators (APPA) industry standards recommend that one custodian is needed for every 16,400 square feet of office space in order to maintain an acceptable level of cleanliness. Custodial Services exceeded their estimated cleaning square feet and exceeded industry standards by approximately 130% for FY 2011-12. This measure is deleted in FY 2012-13 in favor of other measurements that capture cost per square foot for custodial and maintenance, completion percentages of maintenance work and overall customer satisfaction (see Performance Measure # 16).

Department Goal: Meet health and safety requirements and provide timely and effective facility maintenance service to all County departments in a cost effective manner.

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

5. Performance Measure: Square footage of facilities maintained per Maintenance Mechanic.

07-08 Actual Results	08-09 Actual Results	09-10 Actual Results	10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Adopted	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Target
52,628 sq. ft./person	60,943 sq. ft./person	69,788 sq. ft./person	63,593 sq/ ft./person	58,505 sq/ ft./person	66,671 sq. ft./person	Deleted

What: This measure shows the average amount of space and related equipment each maintenance mechanic is responsible for maintaining in working order.

Why: This measure illustrates the magnitude of tasks and the measure of workload of our maintenance staff and compares it to industry best practices.

How are we doing? This measurement is a function of the number of Maintenance personnel divided into the total square footage of facilities to be maintained. The goal established in this measure is based upon best practices criteria identified by the International Facility Management Association. According to this organization, best practices call for one maintenance mechanic for every 49,000 square feet of facility space. Maintenance Services exceeded their adopted maintenance measurement by approximately 14% in FY 2011-12. This measure is deleted in FY 2012-13 in favor of other measurements that capture cost per square foot for custodial and maintenance, completion percentages of maintenance work and overall customer satisfaction (see Performance Measure # 17).

6. Performance Measure: Percentage of total person hours available dedicated to the preventive maintenance program.						
07-08 Actual Results	08-09 Actual Results	09-10 Actual Results	10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Adopted	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Target
22%	20%	20%	17%	25%	17%	Deleted
<p>What: This measure compares the maintenance person hour resources being dedicated to, and utilized in, the preventive maintenance program.</p> <p>Why: The overall goal is to increase and enhance the preventive maintenance (PM) program to limit unscheduled breakdowns, control costs for major maintenance, and reduce the number of routine work orders requested by departments. Measuring the percentage of hours dedicated to the preventive maintenance program is an indicator of a more or less active PM program.</p> <p>How are we doing? Maintenance industry standards and best practices recommend 40% of maintenance work hours be dedicated to preventive maintenance (PM). To accomplish the FY 2011-12 target of 25%, staff attempted to focus on preventative maintenance. Facility Maintenance did not achieve the stated goal as corrective maintenance (CM) in critical facilities took precedence over scheduled PM tasks. This measure is deleted in FY 2012-13 in favor of other measurements that capture cost per square foot for custodial and maintenance, completion percentages of maintenance work and overall customer satisfaction. Preventive maintenance will be specifically measured for effectiveness in terms of the percentage of work orders completed (see Performance Measure # 18).</p>						
7. Performance Measure: Percentage of County Departments rating maintenance services as "good" or "excellent" in annual customer survey.						
07-08 Actual Results	08-09 Actual Results	09-10 Actual Results	10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Adopted	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Target
96%	100%	100%	100%	95%	77%*	Deleted
<p>What: Our annual survey of customer departments measures opinions about the condition of the facilities, the quality of service and the ease of doing business with Maintenance Services. This measure focuses on the overall quality of our building maintenance service.</p> <p>Why: Fully functional facilities support our customers' mission and vision for delivering service to San Luis Obispo County. Periodic surveys measure our effectiveness in meeting their needs and help us improve our service delivery.</p> <p>How are we doing? *The target result was not met. However, it is noted that the survey methodology used at the end of FY 2011-12 was revised and the change in methodology may be a contributing factor in the lower rating shown in the actual result. The previous methodology included 3 of the 5 survey choices reflecting Satisfied or better, the new methodology included only 2 of 5 choices as Satisfied or better. To obtain customer satisfaction input, the General Services Agency sent surveys to 1,932 County employees. The survey received a 21% response rate overall. Of those who responded specifically to Customer Satisfaction questions related to Maintenance Services, 77% rated Maintenance Services customer service as Satisfactory or better. Results showed that 12% of those surveyed were Dissatisfied or lower, while 11% were Neither Satisfied or Dissatisfied. This measure is deleted in FY 2012-13 in favor of a more comprehensive Customer Satisfaction survey for all of General Services functions (see Performance Measure#14).</p>						
<p>Department Goal: Professional management of the County's real estate assets and leases in order to maximize return and minimize expense to the County and to meet the space needs of the County Departments.</p> <p>Communitywide Result Link: <input type="checkbox"/> Safe <input type="checkbox"/> Healthy <input type="checkbox"/> Livable <input type="checkbox"/> Prosperous <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Well-Governed Community</p>						
8. Performance Measure: Percentage of leased facilities secured by Real Property Services for less than or equal to the market rate per square foot for similar length leases.						
07-08 Actual Results	08-09 Actual Results	09-10 Actual Results	10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Adopted	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Target
100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	Deleted
<p>What: Percentage of new or renewed lease facilities secured at less than or equal to the market rate per square foot.</p> <p>Why: To ensure the cost effectiveness of County leases.</p> <p>How are we doing? In prior years, Real Property Services (RPS) negotiated 100% of new or renewed leases at market rate or below. Although the economy is starting to see signs of improvement, County staff continues to enjoy a strong negotiating position in the market. RPS achieved 100% in this measure for FY 2011-12. This measure is deleted in FY 2012-13 in favor of overall customer satisfaction surveys and individual 'point-of-service' surveys to assess Real Property transactions in terms of quality and timeliness (see Performance Measure # 15)</p>						
9. Performance Measure: Percentage of County Departments rating Real Property Services as "good" to "excellent" in securing and negotiating with tenants, landlords, permittees, and concessionaires.						
07-08	08-09	09-10	10-11	11-12	11-12	12-13

General Services Agency
fiscal year 2012-13 Proposed Budget

Fund Center 113

Actual Results	Actual Results	Actual Results	Actual Results	Adopted	Actual Results	Target
100%	100%	100%	91%	95%	98%	Deleted

What: After each major project, the Real Property Manager sends a survey to the staff with whom Real Property Services interfaced during the project to request ratings of our services, communication, timeliness, and professionalism.

Why: To assist departments in achieving full utilization of County real estate assets, maximize revenue to the County, assist departments to make cost-effective moves to leased facilities, and provide a professional level of representation in negotiations between County departments and tenants, landlords, permittees, and concessionaires, buyers and sellers.

How are we doing? Real Property Services (RPS) exceeded its customer satisfaction target in FY 2011-12. The previous methodology included 3 of the 5 survey choices reflecting Satisfied or better, the new methodology included only 2 of 5 choices as Satisfied or better. To obtain customer satisfaction input, the General Services Agency sent surveys to 1,932 County employees. The survey received a 21% response rate overall. Additionally 45 responses out of 46 point-of-service surveys were received. Of those who responded specifically to Customer Satisfaction questions related to Real Property Services (RPS), over 98% rated RPS customer service as Satisfactory or better. Results showed that 2% of those surveyed were Dissatisfied or lower, while 6% were Neither Satisfied or Dissatisfied. This measure is deleted in FY 2012-13 in favor of a more comprehensive Customer Satisfaction survey for all of General Services functions (see Performance Measure#14).

Department Goal: Provide friendly, timely, accurate financial and administrative support services to the Department of General Services and other County Departments.

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

10. Performance Measure: Percentage of interdepartmental survey respondents who rate Administration/Accounting services as "good" or "excellent" in the customer survey.

07-08 Actual Results	08-09 Actual Results	09-10 Actual Results	10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Adopted	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Target
71%	97%	89%	98%	90%	96%	Deleted

What: Surveys of customers provide a measure of customer satisfaction regarding staff responsiveness, courtesy, and accuracy of information.

Why: Our success in providing helpful service and accurate information is measured in the responses and opinions of our customers.

How are we doing? Administrative/Accounting Services exceeded its customer satisfaction target in FY 2011-12. To obtain customer satisfaction input, the General Services Agency sent surveys to 1,932 County employees. The survey received a 21% response rate overall. Of those who responded specifically to Customer Satisfaction questions related to Administrative/Accounting Services, 96% rated their services as satisfactory or better. Results showed that 4% of those surveyed were Dissatisfied or lower, while 0% were Neither Satisfied or Dissatisfied. This measure is deleted in FY 2012-13 in favor of a more comprehensive Customer Satisfaction survey for all of General Services functions (see Performance Measure#14).

Department Goal: Efficiently provide timely and reliable distribution of U.S. and interoffice mail service to all County departments.

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

11. Performance Measure: Percentage of County departments rating their level of satisfaction with the services of Central Mail as satisfactory or better.

07-08 Actual Results	08-09 Actual Results	09-10 Actual Results	10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Adopted	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Target
100%	100%	100%	100%	90%	100%	Deleted

What: Results of a customer satisfaction survey.

Why: To ensure internal customer's needs are satisfactorily met.

How are we doing? Central Mail Services exceeded its customer satisfaction target in FY 2011-12. To obtain customer satisfaction input, the General Services Agency sent surveys to 1,932 County employees. The survey received a 21% response rate overall. Of those who responded specifically to Customer Satisfaction questions related to Central Mail Services, 100% rated Central Mail Services as neutral (satisfactory) or better. This measure is deleted in FY 2012-13 in favor of a more comprehensive Customer Satisfaction survey for all of General Services functions (see Performance Measure#14).

Department Goal: Manage County purchasing services to maximize value for the County dollar.

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

12. Performance Measure: Percentage of purchasing transactions subject to a competitive solicitation.						
07-08 Actual Results	08-09 Actual Results	09-10 Actual Results	10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Adopted	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Target
22%	21%	22%	26%	20%	26%	50%
<p>What: A measure of the percentage of purchasing transactions that include a local competitive solicitation, a governmental cooperative purchasing agreement or Board of Supervisors review prior to contracting.</p> <p>Why: To encourage market competition among suppliers of goods and services and get the best value for County expenditures.</p> <p>How are we doing? Purchasing exceeded its performance target for FY 2011-12. Beginning in FY 2012-13 this measure is being expanded to include the percentage those purchase orders subject to Board of Supervisors approval and those resulting from the use of governmental cooperative purchasing agreements along with the percentage of purchase orders resulting from quotations, bids and request for proposals. The additions to the measure better captures the competitive processes which contribute to cost effective purchasing practices for all County departments. The resulting percentage target is 50% rather than 20%. For FY 2011-12, Purchasing exceeded the target of 20%. For FY 2012-13 The target has been set at 50%. Purchasing processes approximately 1,800 purchase order transactions accounting for 97 million annually through our financial system (SAP).</p>						
13. Performance Measure: Percentage of County Departments rating their level of satisfaction with the services of Purchasing Services as satisfactory or better.						
07-08 Actual Results	08-09 Actual Results	09-10 Actual Results	10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Adopted	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Target
94%	96%	98.6%	95%	95%	99%	Deleted
<p>What: Results of a satisfaction survey.</p> <p>Why: To ensure that purchasing services offered are responsive and satisfactory in meeting the needs of County Departments.</p> <p>How are we doing? ? Purchasing exceeded its customer satisfaction target in FY 2011-12. To obtain customer satisfaction input, the General Services Agency sent surveys to 1,932 County employees. The survey received a 21% response rate overall. Of those who responded specifically to Customer Satisfaction questions related to Purchasing, 99% rated Central Mail Services as neutral (satisfactory) or better. This measure is deleted in FY 2012-13 in favor of a more comprehensive Customer Satisfaction survey for all of General Services functions (see Performance Measure#14).</p>						
<p>Department Goal: Provide timely, reliable and cost-effective services that meet or exceed customer expectations.</p> <p>Communitywide Result Link: <input type="checkbox"/> Safe <input type="checkbox"/> Healthy <input type="checkbox"/> Livable <input type="checkbox"/> Prosperous <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Well-Governed Community</p>						
14. Performance Measure: Percentage of Customers rating their experience with General Services as "satisfactory" or better.						
07-08 Actual Results	08-09 Actual Results	09-10 Actual Results	10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Adopted	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Target
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		90%
<p>What: The aggregate percentage of those responding to an annual survey that rate General Services (Accounting, Administration, Purchasing, Mail, Architectural Services, Maintenance and Custodial services) in terms of both efficiency and quality (timeliness, accuracy, courtesy and satisfaction) as "Satisfactory" or better.</p> <p>Why: General Services is dedicated to delivering accurate, reliable, and timely services that are valued by our customers.</p> <p>How are we doing? This is a new metric for FY 2012-13, consolidating several individual customer satisfaction survey tools. Customers will receive a single survey that addresses all of the services provided within General Services. Each service manager will receive their specific survey responses to better understand their customer needs. The report will be an aggregate percentage for all of General Services. This change will better capture and illustrate the overall satisfaction levels of the General Services organization while reducing the numerous and somewhat repetitive survey tools. For FY 2012-13 The target is 90%.</p>						
<p>Department Goal: Manage the County's real estate assets and leases to support the operational needs of County Departments</p> <p>Communitywide Result Link: <input type="checkbox"/> Safe <input type="checkbox"/> Healthy <input type="checkbox"/> Livable <input type="checkbox"/> Prosperous <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Well-Governed Community</p>						
15. Performance Measure: Percentage of customers rating the process and results as satisfactory or better. The process includes defining the space related business needs and meeting those needs with appropriate space and location.						
07-08 Actual Results	08-09 Actual Results	09-10 Actual Results	10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Adopted	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Target

General Services Agency
fiscal year 2012-13 Proposed Budget

Fund Center 113

N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		90%
<p>What: The percentage of customers responding to 'point-of-service' survey or interview, conducted at the completion of each transaction or project that rate Real Property Services transactions in terms of quality and timeliness as Satisfactory or better. This includes the lease and permitting processes.</p> <p>Why: To encourage timely processing of requests and high quality transactions by measuring customers responses.</p> <p>How are we doing? This is a new metric for FY 2012-13. The expectation is that customer feedback will assist in improving and maintaining responsiveness. For FY 2012-13. The target is 90%.</p>						
<p>Department Goal: Provide cost-effective, reliable and safe facilities and property for County use.</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>16. Performance Measure: Percentage change (as well as actual dollar change) of the Average Per- square-foot Maintenance and Custodial costs, as compared to the previous year.</p>						
07-08 Actual Results	08-09 Actual Results	09-10 Actual Results	10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Adopted	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Target
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		0% / \$0
<p>What: A comparison of the percentage change and actual dollar change in the per-square-foot costs of County owned facilities as compared to the previous year.</p> <p>Why: This is a measure of effective management of County facilities. Facility costs per-square-foot are developed annually as part of General Services Fees. This will create the basis for year-over-year comparisons. The goal is to keep the cost of ownership of County facilities flat or decreasing while ensuring optimal performance in terms of function and reliability.</p> <p>How are we doing? This is a new metric for FY 2012-13. The expectation is that per-square-foot facility costs will illustrate how well best management practices are working to contain costs and ensure facility reliability. The goal is to apply continuous downward pressure on facility costs wherever possible. The annual base line costs per-square-foot range from \$2.28 - \$7.20 based upon facility use and type. The target has been set to reflect no increase or decrease for the first baseline year.</p>						
<p>17. Performance Measure: The percentage of Corrective Maintenance (CM) work orders completed by Maintenance staff.</p>						
07-08 Actual Results	08-09 Actual Results	09-10 Actual Results	10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Adopted	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Target
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		90%
<p>What: The percentage of Corrective Maintenance work orders opened and completed within the expected time frame (each week) aggregated for the fiscal year. The average number of annual work orders for Corrective Maintenance (CM) is approximately 4,450.</p> <p>Why: Completion of Corrective Maintenance work orders is highly visible to our customers and contributes to excellent customer service.</p> <p>How are we doing? This is a new metric for FY 2012-13. It replaces the former metric that measured the square footage maintained by Maintenance staff. This metric focuses on the timely completion of Corrective Maintenance (or 'break-fix') work orders. The completion of this type of work order drives the functionality of facilities and is captured in the financial system (SAP). Improvement in the timely completion of work orders contributes to a smoother operating facility which better serves customers and the public. For FY 2012-13 the target has been set at 90%.</p>						

18. Performance Measure: Percentage of Preventive Maintenance (PM) work orders completed within their designated schedule.							
07-08 Actual Results	08-09 Actual Results	09-10 Actual Results	10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Adopted	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Target	
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			20%
<p>What: The percentage of Preventive Maintenance (PM) work orders issued and completed by Maintenance staff within the scheduled time frame.</p> <p>Why: To monitor and improve the completion percentage for Preventive Maintenance work orders. Timely completion of preventive maintenance activities contributes to functional facilities and fewer corrective maintenance or 'break-fix' calls. It leads to the most effective deployment of staff and optimizes the usefulness of the facilities to support our customers and the public. The number of annual Preventive Maintenance work orders is approximately 3,000.</p> <p>How are we doing? This is a new metric for FY 2012-13. It replaces the former metric that focused on the percentage of staff hours devoted to Preventive Maintenance. This measure captures the productivity of the Preventive Maintenance effort and is a more accurate measure of work accomplished. Scheduled and actual time frames for completion of projects are captured in the automated work order system (SAP). For FY 2012-13 the garget has been set at 20%, in alignment with former targets. The expectation is that over time this percentage will increase.</p>							
19. Performance Measure: Percentage of Capital and Maintenance projects that were completed within expected time estimates.							
07-08 Actual Results	08-09 Actual Results	09-10 Actual Results	10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Adopted	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Target	
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			90%
<p>What: The percentage of Capital and Maintenance projects that were completed within expected time estimates and according to Project Customer expectations.</p> <p>Why: Timely completion of capital and maintenance projects is one indicator of efficiency and contributes to functional facilities for our customer departments.</p> <p>How are we doing? This is a new metric for FY 2012-13. In project management there are three elements of success; budget, time and quality. This measures the critical element of timeliness and encourages staff to work to the project schedule as well as budget. Project schedules and completion time frames are captured in the project disposition reports and are used to determine whether projects are completed within the expected time frames. For FY 2012-13 the target has been set at 90%. As historical data is analyzed this target will be refined.</p>							

GOALS AND PERFORMANCE MEASURES

Department Goal: Provide timely, reliable and cost-effective services that meet or exceed customer expectations.						
Communitywide Result Link: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Safe <input type="checkbox"/> Healthy <input type="checkbox"/> Livable <input type="checkbox"/> Prosperous <input type="checkbox"/> Well-Governed Community						
1. Performance Measure: Percentage of time the County's radio communication system is available. This is an industry standard (the six nines rule) for public safety.						
07-08 Actual Results	08-09 Actual Results	09-10 Actual Results	10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Adopted	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Target
100%	100 %	100%	100%	99.9999%	100%	99.9999%
What: Maintain the availability of the Countywide microwave radio communication system to an outage level of no more than 32 seconds per year (the public safety interconnect industry standard is 99.9999% availability).						
Why: The microwave radio communication system provides radio coverage of more than 2,900 square miles in San Luis Obispo County for countywide public, safety and emergency service agencies. Radio communications within the County support the Sheriff/Coroner, County Fire, medical/ambulance response, and many other emergency and general government activities. The radio system also provides reliable communications with other local jurisdictions such as cities within the county and our neighboring counties. Lastly, the system allows for coordinated communications response with State and Federal agencies. Full availability and reliability contributes to a safe community.						
How are we doing? Information Technology continues to exceed its goals and the industry standard for communication system availability. Activities are underway to convert all County-owned and licensed radio frequencies to narrowband operation in order to meet the FCC-imposed deadline of December 31, 2012.						
Department Goal: Provide timely, reliable and cost-effective services and infrastructure that meet or exceed customer expectations						
Communitywide Result Link: <input type="checkbox"/> Safe <input type="checkbox"/> Healthy <input type="checkbox"/> Livable <input type="checkbox"/> Prosperous <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Well-Governed Community						
2. Performance Measure: Percentage of time the County's voice mail communication system is available.						
07-08 Actual Results	08-09 Actual Results	09-10 Actual Results	10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Adopted	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Target
99.8%	99.8%	99.9%	99.9%	99.9%	99.8%	99.9%
What: The availability of the voice mail (voice mail boxes) system for internal or external access.						
Why: Voice mail is an integral management tool for County voice communications.						
How are we doing? The County's voicemail system consists of over 2,850 voicemail boxes and was available 99.8% of the time during FY 2011-12, narrowly missing the target by 0.1%. The availability of the voicemail system was affected by two hardware failures, which occurred outside normal business hours. Notification that there was a voicemail waiting, often referred to stutter dial, functionality also suffered an outage during FY 2011-12. However, throughout the stutter dial failure, the voicemail system itself was fully functional.						
Department Goal: Provide timely, reliable and cost-effective services and infrastructure that meet or exceed customer expectations						
Communitywide Result Link: <input type="checkbox"/> Safe <input type="checkbox"/> Healthy <input type="checkbox"/> Livable <input type="checkbox"/> Prosperous <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Well-Governed Community						
3. Performance Measure: Percentage of GSA-IT managed project milestones completed within expected baseline budget and time estimates.						
07-08 Actual Results	08-09 Actual Results	09-10 Actual Results	10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Adopted	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Target
96%	67%	95%	86%	95%	81%	95%
What: This measure tracks the blended percentages of GSA-IT managed project milestones completed and budget amounts met according to Project Sponsor/Customer expectations and approved change requests.						

**Information Technology
Fiscal Year 2012-13 Proposed Budget**

Fund Center 114

Why: Increased focus on project management will result in improved communication, strategic focus aligned with County goals, better resource planning, and more effective and efficient expenditure of technology dollars.

How are we doing? The Project Management Office (PMO) managed 12 projects and met 81% of the budget and timeline milestones tracked in FY 2011-12. The adopted target of 95% was not achieved. The integrated document management county-wide deployment project experienced significant schedule milestone issues due to conflicting priorities within departments and a general lack of experience with the technologies being deployed.

4. Performance Measure: Percentage of time the GSA-IT managed Local-Area-Network (LANs) and Wide-Area-Network (WAN) are available.

07-08 Actual Results	08-09 Actual Results	09-10 Actual Results	10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Adopted	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Target
99%	99%	99%	99%	99%	99.2%	99%

What: The percentage of availability is calculated by comparing the monitored "up time" against scheduled "up time".

Why: Availability of County computing resources translates directly into County staff productivity and ultimately into their service delivery to the public.

How are we doing? Significant expansion of the County's wireless network is providing additional service to members of the public who visit County buildings and mobile County employees. GSA IT expanded automated monitoring allowing quicker response and also helping to identify preventive maintenance opportunities. These actions contributed to assuring network services remained available. During the year, Internet access was available 99.999% and there was only one outage which lasted five minutes.

Department Goal: Protect the County's computing assets through continued implementation of Information Security best practices.

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

5. Performance Measure: Percentage of County staff that have received security training or reviewed an annual information security awareness reminder.

07-08 Actual Results	08-09 Actual Results	09-10 Actual Results	10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Adopted	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Target
100% of new hire staff, 100% of existing County staff	100% of new hire staff, 0% of existing County staff	100% of new hire staff, 60% of existing County staff	100% of new hire staff, 100% of existing County staff	100% of new hire staff, 100% of existing County staff	100% of new hire staff, 100% of existing County staff	100% of new hire staff, 100% of existing County staff

What: Staff will become aware of proper security measures and apply them to their everyday work habits. It is expected the media delivery mechanism will change from year-to-year to maintain interest, e.g., general training, an Awareness Handbook, Intranet-based information, short Web-video viewable from the desktop, etc.

Why: Industry analysis has proven that over 70% of all security breaches are internal to an organization. Education and prevention have been identified as the two most cost efficient keys to ensuring systems security. San Luis Obispo County, in a collaborative effort with other California counties, used the International Organization for Standards (ISO) guidelines to create and adopt eighteen security policies. The Security Awareness Program is an essential requirement that is included in those policies. Therefore we measure the success of that Security Awareness Program each year. In this way, we meet industry standards.

How are we doing? Information Technology achieved its goal of providing optional security training to over 2580 County employees in FY 2011-12. The training was provided via a "security survey" that was emailed to most County staff. GSA-IT is making plans to make the survey mandatory with the inclusion of a signature page are being developed for FY 2012-13.

Department Goal: To deliver excellent service to every customer.

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

**Information Technology
Fiscal Year 2012-13 Proposed Budget**

Fund Center 114

6. Performance Measure: Percentage of responses to Customer Satisfaction Survey rating overall effectiveness as "satisfactory" or better.

07-08 Actual Results	08-09 Actual Results	09-10 Actual Results	10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Adopted	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Target
98.6%	98.2%	97.4%	97.9%	97%	89%*	97%

What: The percentage of those responding to an annual survey that rate Information Technology in terms of both efficiency and quality (timeliness, accuracy, courtesy and satisfaction) as "Satisfactory" or better.

Why: GSA-IT is dedicated to delivering accurate, reliable, and timely Information Technology solutions that are valued by our customers.

How are we doing? * The target result was not met. However, it is noted that the survey methodology used at the end of FY 2011-12 was revised and the change in methodology may be a contributing factor in the lower rating shown in the actual result. The previous methodology included 3 of the 5 survey choices reflecting Satisfied or better, the new methodology included only 2 of 5 choices as Satisfied or better. To obtain customer satisfaction input, the General Services Agency sent surveys to 1,932 County employees. The survey received a 21% response rate overall. Of those who responded specifically to Customer Satisfaction questions related to Information Technology, over 88% rated Information Technology's services as Satisfactory or better. Results showed that 3% of those surveyed were Dissatisfied or lower, while 8% were Neither Satisfied or Dissatisfied. Information Technology continued to focus on its mission to "Deliver Excellence to Every Customer" and made a number of changes intended to improve customer service during FY 2011-12.

Department Goal: Provide cost-effective, accurate, and reliable computing environment and assets for general County, departmental specific, and outside agency use.

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

7. Performance Measure: Percentage of technical issues reported to and resolved by the GSA-IT Service Desk Call Center. Calls that cannot be resolved by the Service Desk Call Center are dispatched and resolved by other GSA-IT or County department teams.

07-08 Actual Results	08-09 Actual Results	09-10 Actual Results	10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Adopted	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Target
65%	70%	70%	74%	70%	73%	70%

What: A measure of the value add that the GSA-IT Service Desk Call Center contributes to IT and the County's overall productivity.

Why: The goal is to resolve more technical issues within the GSA-IT Service Desk Call Center, allowing other IT and County teams to focus on other activities. This translates into increased department efficiency and greater delivery of technology value to customers.

How are we doing? Information Technology's Service Desk team resolved 73% of the 8,229 technical issue calls received in FY 2011-12. The formation of the Service Desk was undertaken as part of the County's ITIL (Information Technology Infrastructure Library) initiative. ITIL is the most widely accepted approach to Information Technology service management in the world and provides a cohesive set of best practices, drawn from the public and private sectors.

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.

07-08 Actual Results	08-09 Actual Results	09-10 Actual Results	10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Adopted	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Target
64% 5.4 lbs	68% 4.8 lbs	70% 4.4 lbs	69% 4.6 lbs	70% 4.6 lbs	69% 4.6lbs	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 mandated objective.

How are we doing? In FY 2011-12, we maintained a waste reduction figure of 69%. Since the commercial sector generates nearly 70% of all waste accepted at landfills, the reduced consumer spending has had a positive impact on disposal and recycling of solid waste. As noted above, the regional per capita disposal rate has been steady at 4.6 pounds per person per day; the statewide disposal in 2011 was 4.4 pounds per person per day.

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 law enforcement agencies that serve populations over 100,000 in the State. (Replaces previous Crime in California Jurisdictions (Department of Justice) reporting measure.)

07-08 Actual Results	08-09 Actual Results	09-10 Actual Results	10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Adopted	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Target
Crime rate lower than 71% of comparable counties	Crime rate lower than 83% of comparable counties	Crime rate lower than 85% of comparable counties	Crime rate lower than 100% of comparable counties	Crime rate lower than 85% of comparable counties	Crime rate lower than 85% of comparable counties	Crime rate lower than 100% of comparable counties

What: This measure tracks the number of serious crimes reported each year to all law enforcement agencies per 100,000 total population. Unlike the previous reporting criteria, the rate reported here is the rate for crimes committed county-wide inclusive of both incorporated and unincorporated areas. It also includes data for Marin County which had been a non-reporting county under the previous measure. Rates are included for comparable benchmark counties of Monterey, Santa Barbara, Santa Cruz, Marin, Napa and Placer due to their similarity and/or proximity.

For FY 2012-13 the data source for this performance measure has changed. The previous source, *Preliminary Report-Crime in Selected California Jurisdictions*, has been replaced by *California Criminal Justice Profile Statewide and by County*. The new source provides more complete data on the county's crime rate. Both sources are produced by the California Department of Justice.

Why: This compares the number of serious violent, property, and arson offenses in the incorporated and unincorporated areas of the county per 100,000 total population to most accurately capture countywide law enforcement reporting data.

How are we doing? While San Luis Obispo County's rate was below that of the previous calendar year, one other county was slightly lower than San Luis Obispo County. This is based on the most recent data from the Dept. of Justice for the period January through December 2010 wherein San Luis Obispo County's total rate of serious violent, property, and arson crimes were lower than 85% of our six comparable counties for that reporting period. San Luis Obispo County experienced 1,392.2 total serious violent, property and arson offenses per 100,000 population, whereas Marin County experienced 1,374.6, Placer County 1,437.5, Santa Barbara County 1,452.8, Napa County 1,474, Monterey County 1,887.5, and Santa Cruz County 2,115.1. As a point of reference, San Luis Obispo County's crime rate per 100,000 population was 40% lower than the statewide rate (1,949.3) for all 58 counties.

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.

07-08 Actual Results	08-09 Actual Results	09-10 Actual Results	10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Adopted	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Target
92%	97.2%	95%	94.8%	95%	93.5%	97%

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? Final results for FY 2011-12 reflect that the vast majority of misdemeanor cases continue to be brought to a final disposition in a timely fashion, serving the interests of justice, victims and witnesses. The reported slight decrease from the previous year's rate was most likely attributable to a variety of out of county visiting judges sitting on assignment in the misdemeanor court. 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.

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.

07-08 Actual Results	08-09 Actual Results	09-10 Actual Results	10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Adopted	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Target
12 or more	14	14	16	14	19	18

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 FBI, Cal. Dept. of Real Estate and Cal. Dept. 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. Auto Insurance Fraud Program*
8. Anti-Gang Coordinating Commission
9. Real Estate Fraud*
10. Sexual Assault (Closed) Case Review Team
11. Domestic Violence Death & Elder Death Review
12. Adult Abuse Prevention Council (AAPC)
13. Adult Services Policy Council (ASPC)
14. Cal Poly Safety Committee
15. SART Advisory Board
16. Forensic Coordinating Team
17. Criminal Justice Administrators Association
18. California Identification (CAL-ID) Board
19. Crime Stoppers Program

During FY 2011-12, State cuts to the local Narcotics Task Force resulted in its closure. This closure necessitated the integration of gang and narcotics task force personnel to form a new local collaborative identified as the San Luis Obispo County Sheriff's Office Special Operations Unit. The District Attorney's Office continues to work closely with many county agencies, and over the past twelve months has actively participated in two additional efforts including the California Identification Board and the Crime Stoppers Program.

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.						
07-08 Actual Results	08-09 Actual Results	09-10 Actual Results	10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Adopted	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Target
622	644	561	702	560	658	700
<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>How are we doing? The Workload Statistics Report, which now captures the number of juvenile criminal prosecution petitions, probation violations and miscellaneous cases filed annually, was recently revised by the County Information Technology Department. Modifying this report has provided for more accurate data collection by including juvenile probation violations based on existing and new charges, and various misdemeanor/infraction cases which are handled by the District Attorney's Office. Actual results for FY 2011-12 reflect 658 new juvenile filings which is slightly below the prior year's actual 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.</p>						
<p>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.</p>						
<p>Communitywide Result Link: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Safe <input type="checkbox"/> Healthy <input type="checkbox"/> Livable <input type="checkbox"/> Prosperous <input type="checkbox"/> Well-Governed Community</p>						
5. Performance Measure: Bad check restitution recovery.						
07-08 Actual Results	08-09 Actual Results	09-10 Actual Results	10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Adopted	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Target
75%	68%	67%	80%	65%	69%	65%
<p>What: Percentage of recovery on bad check cases processed by the Bad Check Unit.</p> <p>Why: The higher the collection percentage the more effective the program.</p> <p>How are we doing? Along with providing a valuable recovery and restitution service to our community's bad check victims, an increased emphasis on collections has greatly assisted prosecution efforts by targeting outstanding warrant cases of bad check defendants. Administrative fees charged to the bad check writer substantially cover program costs and enable services to be at no cost to the victim. In addition, bad check unit collection rates exceed traditional private agency rates which typically range from 35% to 55%.</p>						
6. Performance Measure: Average restitution recovery period from case opening.						
07-08 Actual Results	08-09 Actual Results	09-10 Actual Results	10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Adopted	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Target
75 Days	52 Days	55 Days	38 Days	55 Days	57 Days	55 Days
<p>What: The average number of business days required to recover restitution for victims of bad check crime.</p> <p>Why: The more rapid the case initiation and restitution recovery, the more prosperous and safe the community.</p> <p>How are we doing? FY 2011-12 results reflect an average restitution recovery period of 57 days from initial case opening which is consistent with FY 2011-12 adopted results. The increase over 2010-11 actual results is attributable to smaller checks with more difficult recoveries, and personnel shortages for nearly half of the fiscal year.</p>						
<p>Department Goal: Assisting victims to recover from the aftermath of crime and minimizing the inconvenience to witnesses involved in the criminal justice system.</p>						
<p>Communitywide Result Link: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Safe <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Healthy <input type="checkbox"/> Livable <input type="checkbox"/> Prosperous <input type="checkbox"/> Well-Governed Community</p>						

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.

07-08 Actual Results	08-09 Actual Results	09-10 Actual Results	10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Adopted	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Target
76%	77%	77%	84%	80%	85%	85%

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 2011-12, Victim/Witness advocates assisted 1,921 victims in crimes against persons cases charged by our office, and 85% of those victims were contacted within the 8 day target for outreach. This exceeds the target set for FY 2011-12 and reflects the advocates' ongoing dedication to lessening the effects of victims' trauma encountered as the result of a 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.

07-08 Actual Results	08-09 Actual Results	09-10 Actual Results	10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Adopted	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Target
100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	TBD	100%

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? The State of California Victim Compensation and Government Claims Board has advised that FY 2011-12 figures will not be made available until mid-September. Preliminary results indicate that 568 claims have been submitted through June 25 of FY 2011-12, with additional claims likely to increase that final number to complete the reporting period. Every indication is that the number of claims verified, submitted and approved by the State are expected to be comparable to FY 2010-11 results.

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.

07-08 Actual Results	08-09 Actual Results	09-10 Actual Results	10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Adopted	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Target
96%	95%	91%	93%	95%	94%	95%

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 4,184 civilian subpoenas that were mailed and then confirmed by telephone rather than personally served, the estimated savings to the County in FY 2011-12 was over \$400,000. 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? During FY 2011-12, 94% of civilian witnesses who received mailed subpoenas were contacted by Victim/Witness and receipt of their subpoenas confirmed. This slight improvement over FY 2010-11 is irrespective of the fact that the Victim/Witness Division worked with less staff during FY 2011-12 due to various employee leaves of absence. While performance has improved, 100% confirmation of mailed subpoenas is not entirely possible as some subpoenas for civilian witnesses are returned as "undeliverable" due to incorrect addresses or correct addresses not being available.

10. Performance Measure: The annual number of direct, coordinated services to victims and the coordination of subpoenaed witnesses.						
07-08 Actual Results	08-09 Actual Results	09-10 Actual Results	10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Adopted	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Target
3,763 victims; 10,210 subpoenaed witness court appearances	3,600 victims; 11,000 subpoenaed witness court appearances	3,790 victims; 11,664 subpoenaed witness court appearances	3,962 victims; 11,443 subpoenaed witness court appearances	3,700 victims; 11,500 subpoenaed witness court appearances	3,801 victims; 11,090 subpoenaed witness court appearances	3,800 victims; 11,500 subpoenaed witness court appearances
<p>What: The number of crime victims assisted by the Victim/Witness Division and the number of subpoenaed witnesses notified.</p> <p>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. Assistance to crime victims and the coordination of subpoenaed witnesses in criminal cases enhances public safety and confidence in the criminal justice system.</p> <p>How are we doing? Victim/Witness personnel worked diligently to serve 3,801 victims of crime in FY 2011-12, a number which exceeded the FY 2011-12 adopted target. As directed under California law, Victim/Witness personnel continue to inform victims of their Marsy's rights and assist them in exercising those constitutional rights. Victim/Witness Division personnel also coordinated 11,090 victim and witness court appearances in FY 2011-12. While the number of subpoenaed witness court appearances fell just marginally short of the FY 2011-12 adopted target of 11,500, this statistic is extrinsically driven by both the volume of prosecuted cases and necessity of calling witnesses for the materiality and relevancy of their testimony. The coordination of subpoenaed witnesses allows for more efficient use of prosecution, court and defense staff in that court cases are heard at the time scheduled and not delayed due to the absence of essential witnesses. Victim/Witness confirms receipt of mailed subpoenas which saves hundreds of thousands of dollars in County costs that would otherwise be required in order to personally serve subpoenas.</p>						

**Child Support Services
Fiscal Year 2012-13 Proposed Budget**

Fund Center 134

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. We have been the number one overall performing Child Support Department in the State since 2002.

Department Goal: To ensure that children receive the support benefits they are entitled to as quickly as possible.

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

1. Performance Measure: Percentage of child support cases with a court order for child support.

07-08 Actual Results	08-09 Actual Results	09-10 Actual Results	10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Adopted	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Target
92.99%	93.72%	94.30%	94.70%	94.50%	94.60%	94.80%

What: Support orders are the legal documents which establish child and medical 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 2010-11, 94.70% (4,622 of 4,880) of child support cases had a court order for child support. San Luis Obispo County ranked 5th in number of child support cases with court orders when compared to other local child support agencies for FFY 2010-11; and the statewide average was 85.80%. The FFY ends 9/30/2012, and the statewide comparative data for FFY 2011-12 will be provided as soon as it is received from the state, sometime in October 2012.

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: Safe Healthy Livable Prosperous Well-Governed Community

2. Performance Measure: Percentage of current support collected.

07-08 Actual Results	08-09 Actual Results	09-10 Actual Results	10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Adopted	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Target
67.32%	68%	70%	71.30%	71%	74%	71.5%

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 2010-11, the department collected 71.30% (\$10,138,854 of \$14,223,016) of current support owed. San Luis Obispo County ranked 1st in percentage of current support collected when compared to other local child support agencies for FFY 2010-11; and the statewide average was 58.50%. The FFY ends 9/30/2012, and the statewide comparative data for FFY 2011-12 will be provided as soon as it is received from the state, sometime in October 2012.

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

07-08 Actual Results	08-09 Actual Results	09-10 Actual Results	10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Adopted	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Target
74.27%	72.73%	71.60%	74%	73%	74.50%	74.5%

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 2010-11, payment for past due support was collected for 74% (3,145 of 4,251) of cases in which past due support was owed. San Luis Obispo County ranked 1st in collection of payment for past due support when compared to other local child support agencies for FFY 2010-11; and the statewide average was 61.50%. The FFY ends 9/30/2012, and the statewide comparative data for FFY 2011-12 will be provided as soon as it is received from the state, sometime in October 2012.

**Child Support Services
Fiscal Year 2012-13 Proposed Budget**

Fund Center 134

4. Performance Measure: Total child support dollars collected per \$1.00 of total expenditure.						
07-08 Actual Results	08-09 Actual Results	09-10 Actual Results	10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Adopted	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Target
\$3.11	\$3.01	\$3.10	\$2.84	\$3.10	Not available until Dec. 2012	\$3.10
<p>What: This is an efficiency measure relating to the cost effectiveness of collection activities.</p> <p>Why: To ensure that the cost collection ratio compares favorably to other counties within the state.</p> <p>How are we doing? The Actual Result for FFY 2010-11 was \$2.84 of total child support dollars collected per \$1.00 of total program dollars spent. Total collections for FFY 2010-11 were down from the prior year because of the economy, which resulted in establishing lower current support orders, doing more downward modifications of current support, and collecting less past due support, because payments are first applied to current support, with any extra support collections applied to arrears. Also, shrinking school enrollments result in fewer open cases and a corresponding reduction in collections. The department ranked 25th when compared to the total child support dollars collected per \$1.00 of total expenditure in other local child support agencies for FFY 2010-11; and the statewide average was \$2.29. The cost to collection ratio will be provided by the State Department of Child Support Services in December 2012, and will be included budget documents.</p>						

GOALS AND PERFORMANCE MEASURES

Department Goal: To provide cost effective Public Defender services.						
Communitywide Result Link: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Safe <input type="checkbox"/> Healthy <input type="checkbox"/> Livable <input type="checkbox"/> Prosperous <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Well-Governed Community						
1. Performance Measure: Annual number of cases reversed based on the allegation of inadequate defense.						
07-08 Actual Results	08-09 Actual Results	09-10 Actual Results	10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Adopted	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Target
0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<p>What: Counties are mandated to provide public defender services for people who are unable to afford a private attorney. The number of cases that are overturned based upon an inadequate defense measures the effectiveness of public defender services in terms of the meeting the constitutional right to an adequate defense.</p> <p>Why: Providing an adequate defense is a constitutional right and promotes justice. Cases that are overturned because of an inadequate defense ultimately are more costly to taxpayers.</p> <p>How are we doing? We continue to meet our target. Defense services provided by Public Defenders continue to meet legally required standards.</p>						
2. Performance Measure: Per capita costs for public defender services.						
07-08 Actual Results	08-09 Actual Results	09-10 Actual Results	10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Adopted	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Target
\$18.74	\$18.56	\$20.55	\$20.74	\$20.00	\$21.97	\$20.00
<p>What: This measure shows the per capita gross costs to provide public defender services, based on budgeted amounts.</p> <p>Why: We are measuring per capita gross public defender costs in an effort to capture efficiency data.</p> <p>How are we doing? The per capita cost for public defender services in FY 2011-12 is \$21.27. This figure is based on the adjusted budget for public defender expenses of \$5,975,243 and an estimated 2011 population of 271,969 (source: U.S. Census Bureau). In FY 2010-11, the County's per capita cost for public defender services was \$20.74. Total expenditures for public defender services in FY 2010-11 were \$5,593,434. The increase in per capita cost in FY 2011-12 is driven mainly by uncontrollable expenses related to a capital murder case that is being defended by the public defender.</p> <p>The County's per capital cost is lower than all but one of our comparison counties: Marin: \$26.85, Monterey: \$21.87, Napa: \$34.11, Santa Barbara: \$22.88, Santa Cruz: \$33.36.</p> <p>Note that the results for comparable counties are based on FY 2011-12 budgeted expenditures, not actual expenditures. Budgeted amounts 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. The FY 2010-11 actual and the FY 2011-12 target are higher than in past years due to murder cases which are driving up costs for public defender services.</p>						

GOALS AND PERFORMANCE MEASURES

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.

Communitywide Result Link: A Safe Community

1. Performance Measure: Crime rate for law enforcement agencies that serve populations over 100,000 in the State.

07-08 Actual Results	08-09 Actual Results	09-10 Actual Results	10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Adopted	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Target
Crime rate lower than 71% of comparable counties	Crime rate lower than 100% of comparable counties	Crime rate lower than 85% of comparable counties	Crime rate lower than 100% of comparable counties	Crime rate lower than 90% of comparable counties	Crime rate lower than 80% of comparable counties	Crime rate lower than 80% of comparable counties

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 2010 FBI population table, San Luis Obispo has grown to over 250,000 people. This puts the county in the Group 1 population subset of 250,000 to 499,999. Our comparable counties are Monterey, Santa Barbara, Santa Cruz, Placer and Marin. (Note that Napa County is no longer included because its population is less than 250,000.)

Why: This compares the crime rate for serious violent and property offenses in the unincorporated area of the county with that of other law enforcement agencies that serve populations of 250,000 or more.

How are we doing? Department members are trained to be very proactive in reduction strategies through crime prevention programs, community presentations, patrols, school programs, security surveys and rural patrol as well as aggressive prosecutions through specialized investigative units. Based on the 2010 California statistics, the San Luis Obispo crime rate was lower than four (4) of the five (5) comparable counties. The violent crimes, property and arson crimes reported for San Luis Obispo and comparable counties are: Marin – 596; Monterey – 1,195; Placer – 1,561; San Luis Obispo – 983; Santa Barbara – 1,727; Santa Cruz – 1,712. This information is from January 2010 through December 2010 and is the most updated statistics available.

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.

07-08 Actual Results	08-09 Actual Results	09-10 Actual Results	10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Adopted	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Target
74%	77%	59%	65%	77%	71%	75%

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.

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 overall average response time was 10:32 minutes for July 2011 through June 2012. The Coast Patrol received 123 high priority calls and of those calls 87 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 in very remote portions of the patrol area with low population. 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.

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.

07-08 Actual Results	08-09 Actual Results	09-10 Actual Results	10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Adopted	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Target
90%	85%	64%	38%	80%	66%	75%

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.

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 overall average response time was 12:58 minutes for July 2011 through July 2012. This patrol station has the largest geographical area, yet still remains the least populated area of the three patrol stations. The North Station receiving 152 high priority calls and of those calls 101 or 66% 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.

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.

07-08 Actual Results	08-09 Actual Results	09-10 Actual Results	10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Adopted	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Target
80%	93%	73%	72%	80%	75%	75%

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.

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 overall average response time was 10:53 minutes in July 2011 through June 2012. This patrol area has a growing population and deputies here respond to as many, if not more, calls for service than either of the other two station areas. The South Station receiving 205 high priority calls and of those calls 154 or 75% 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.

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

07-08 Actual Results	08-09 Actual Results	09-10 Actual Results	10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Adopted	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Target
100%	50%	100% (Better than National Average)	100% (Better than National Average)	90%	100%	100%

What: Using national Uniform Crime Reporting (UCR) data collected by the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI), 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 three (3) homicides that occurred and were cleared between July 1, 2011 and June 30, 2012. The national clearance rate for population group between 255,000 to 499,999 for 2010 was 41.0% and statewide clearance for 2010 was 63.8%.

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

07-08 Actual Results	08-09 Actual Results	09-10 Actual Results	10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Adopted	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Target
60%	60%	15%	23% (Below National Average)	53%	42%	40%

What: Using national Uniform Crime Reporting (UCR) data collected by the FBI, 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 rates are indicative of effectiveness.

How are we doing? Of the 19 rapes verified as offenses during July 2011 through June 2012, arrests were made for 8 of these (a 42% arrest rate). The number of forcible rape offenses decreased from the same time period ending June 2011. The national clearance rate for the population group between 250,000 to 499,999 for 2010 is 39.8% and a statewide clearance for 2010 of 40%. San Luis Obispo County has a larger incident of 'Non-stranger sexual assault' compared to 'Stranger sexual assault'. With this type of 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 of the statistics reported. Often times the clearance will fall into a different reporting period than the crime itself.

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

07-08 Actual Results	08-09 Actual Results	09-10 Actual Results	10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Adopted	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Target
32%	44%	69% (Better than National Average)	35% (Better than National Average)	45%	53%	55%

What: Using national Uniform Crime Reporting (UCR) data collected by the FBI, 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 rates are indicative of effectiveness.

How are we doing? Of the 15 robbery offenses during July 2011 through June 2012, arrests were made for 8 of these (53%). The actual number of robberies has decreased in the period ending June 2011, which saw a total of 20 robberies, 7 of which were cleared (35%). National clearance rate for population group between 250,000 to 499,999 for 2010 was 25.3% and statewide clearance for 2011 was 26.4%.

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

07-08 Actual Results	08-09 Actual Results	09-10 Actual Results	10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Adopted	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Target
73%	70%	73% (Better than National Average)	77% (Better than National Average)	73%	77%	70%

What: Using national Uniform Crime Reporting (UCR) data collected by the FBI, 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 rates are indicative of effectiveness.

How are we doing? Of the 179 assault offenses during July 2011 through June 2012, arrests were made for 138 of them or 77%. During the same period ending June 2011 there was a total number of 155 aggravated assaults, of which 119 were cleared or 77%. The national clearance rate for population group between 250,000 to 499,999 for 2010 is 51.1% and a statewide clearance rate for 2011 was 52.7%.

9. Performance Measure: Average physical altercation on inmates per month at the Main Jail.

07-08 Actual Results	08-09 Actual Results	09-10 Actual Results	10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Adopted	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Target
5/(567)	4/(539)	5/(551)	8/(558)	NEW	10/(604)	10/(720)

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 left (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 the inmate population. There is no comparison data available from other counties.

How are we doing? For July 2011 through June 2012, the number of inmate assaults is 118, representing an average of slightly less than 10 assaults per month. The average population of the jail continued to increase over the same period. The average daily population topped 600 in June and has increased almost every month since then. The overall average daily population was 605 inmates from July through June 2012 with 4 months exceeding the average daily population of 700.

It is presumed that one of the reasons the number of assaults are going up is because there is a higher population and the jail is overcrowded, causing inmates to be agitated as space is limited and some are sleeping on the floor. Although the increase in the jail population began approximately ten months before it began, the implementation of AB 109 is now one of the main drivers behind the increase in population. (AB 109 redirects lower level felons and parole violators that previously would have served time in prison to now serve their time in county jail.) As of June 2012, 187 of inmates in the jail were serving time under AB 109.

The number of staff assaulted by inmates has fluctuated over the past four years, with 14 staff assaulted in FY 2007-08, 2 in FY 2008-09, 6 in FY 2009-10 and 9 in FY 2010-11. For July 2011 through June 2012, 6 staff members have been assaulted by inmates. As always, our jail staff is working to keep both inmates and staff safe at all times. The increase in the average population will continue into the next fiscal year. Based on this and the current assault rate through June 2012, the FY 2012-13 target is set at an average number of 10 assaults per month.

10. Performance Measure: Overtime as a percentage of the Custody Division's salaries budget.						
07-08 Actual Results	08-09 Actual Results	09-10 Actual Results	10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Adopted	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Target
2.91%	2.1%	1.43%	2.6%	3.0%	4.3%	2.5%
<p>What: This measure tracks the amount of overtime expended annually by the Sheriff 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 maximize the use of limited resources.</p> <p>How are we doing? Overtime hours have continued to increase this fiscal year over the prior fiscal year. For FY 2010-11 overtime hours were 8,179 hours. For FY 2011-12, overtime hours were 13,385 or an increase of 64% from the previous year. This increase is mainly due to 1) vacancies that include 3 Correctional Technicians, 5 Correctional Deputies and 1 Correctional Sergeant and 2) an increase in the average daily jail population (ADP) of approximately 108 or ADP of 497 for FY 2010-11 compared to ADP of 605 for FY 2011-12.</p> <p>In October of 2011, AB109 was implemented and through the Public Safety Realignment the Sheriff's Office was allocated funding to hire 17 FTE positions, which included 15 Correctional Deputies and one Correctional Sergeant. These positions have been filled as of June 2012, although there was a training period for the new staff which created the need for overtime. It is anticipated that overtime will be significantly reduced in FY 2012-13 as the jail becomes fully staffed and the training has been completed. Overtime is generated by holidays, sick and vacation coverage, training needs, inmate transportation, unusual events and to maintain minimum staffing levels. To help assist in the Sheriff's Office effort to reduce overtime, a scheduling software package has been approved and will be implemented in FY 2012-13.</p>						

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.						
07-08 Actual Results	08-09 Actual Results	09-10 Actual Results	10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Adopted	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Target
New Measure	New Measure	New Measure	23 minutes	20 minutes	20 minutes	20 minutes
<p>What: This measure tracks the average amount of time in minutes between when a priority service call (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 20 minutes for 26 high priority calls during FY 2011-12 is on target with the budget and favorable to last year's result. Comparable statistics from other counties are not available at this time.</p>						
2. Performance Measure: Percentage of county-wide dog population which is licensed.						
07-08 Actual Results	08-09 Actual Results	09-10 Actual Results	10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Adopted	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Target
New Measure	New Measure	34%	33%	33%	34%	33%
<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.</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 was 34% during FY 2011-12 (23,266 against a total calculated population of 68,164 dogs).</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.						
07-08 Actual Results	08-09 Actual Results	09-10 Actual Results	10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Adopted	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Target
New Measure	New Measure	New Measure	80%	70%	81%	80%
<p>What: The percentage of animals discharged from Animal Services' shelter alive. Live Animal Outcome Rate is calculated in accordance with definitions established by Middies' Fund and the Sailorman 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> <p>How are we doing? During FY 2011-12, the live outcome rate was 81% and was based upon a total of 4,879 animals discharged, of which 3,960 were discharged alive from the shelter. Of those, 2,080 were dogs resulting in a live outcome rate of 87% and 1,761 were cats resulting in a live outcome rate of 75%. The remaining 119 animals include birds, rabbits and various livestock resulted in a live outcome rate of 75%.</p> <p>Animal Services originally adopted a live outcome rate of 70% due to the current economic environment which exerts negative pressure on the public's ability to take on new animal ownership responsibilities and, in some cases, meet the continuing care requirements of their existing pets. Animal Services was able to offset the current negative economic factors through promotional adoption events, public outreach, and similar efforts in FY 2011-12. In comparison, live animal outcome rates were published by Asilomar for the following California counties (Contra Costa – 58%, Santa Clara – 72%, Monterey – 53%)</p>						

**Animal Services
Fiscal Year 2012-13 Proposed Budget**

Fund Center 137

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

07-08 Actual Results	08-09 Actual Results	09-10 Actual Results	10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Adopted	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Target
89%	91%	79%	93%	100%	88%	100%

What: Animal Services distributes random quarterly mailings of customer service satisfaction surveys to approximately 200 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? A total of 750 surveys were sent out to the public in FY 2011-12, of which 156 surveys were completed and returned for a response rate of 21%. Of those returned, 137 of the respondents rated Animal Services satisfactory, above satisfactory, or excellent and 19 of the respondents rated Animal Services as dissatisfactory for an overall favorable experience of 88%. Though customer service ratings dipped below the adopted level for FY 2011-12, it remains on par with the average rating of 87% (based on the previous four fiscal years). Although moderately below the targeted level of 100%, the response represents a high degree of success in providing the public with a favorable service experience. It is unlikely that every customer interaction will be perceived as a positive experience, particularly in those situations where an individual is the subject of a regulatory or enforcement action. Nevertheless, it is Animal Services’ continuing objective to provide the highest level of customer satisfaction possible and strive for 100%.

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

07-08 Actual Results	08-09 Actual Results	09-10 Actual Results	10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Adopted	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Target
\$6.42	\$5.25	\$7.04	\$8.57	\$7.04	\$9.10	\$8.25

What: This measure tracks the total kennel operation costs divided by “animal kennel days” (number of animals sheltered x the average length of each animal’s shelter stay).

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

How are we doing? Animal Services has continued to operate at full shelter capacity throughout the year. This, together with increased overtime coverage (due to staff vacancies) and under-budgeted amounts in food and household accounts, resulted in greater than anticipated kennel expenditures per day of \$9.10 for FY 2011-12.

Based on current food and household costs, the FY 2012-13 target was updated to reflect an animal kennel day cost of \$8.25. The previous FY 2012-13 target of \$7.04, submitted as part of the proposed budget process, did not factor in food and household expenses at today’s current costs.

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.

07-08 Actual Results	08-09 Actual Results	09-10 Actual Results	10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Adopted	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Target
No Evaluation	0	0	0	No Evaluation	0	0

What: The Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) evaluates a full-scale nuclear power plant emergency exercise every two years. This is done to evaluate emergency preparedness and to ensure 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 a reasonable assurance of protection of the public health and safety.

How are we doing? The full scale exercise held during FY 2010-11 had no deficiencies. The next full scale evaluated exercise will be in FY 2012-13. As for the rating criteria, during each exercise the specific number of areas evaluated by FEMA do vary. For the FY 2010-11 exercise 50 separate areas were evaluated by FEMA. While no evaluated full scale exercise was held in 2011-2012, a smaller exercised was held and evaluated by FEMA; it resulted in no deficiency.

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.

07-08 Actual Results	08-09 Actual Results	09-10 Actual Results	10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Adopted	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Target
No evaluation	3	1	0	No Evaluation	1	0

What: ARCAs are recommendations to improve procedures or training which do not jeopardize the health and safety of the community.

Why: To refine emergency management and response capability.

How are we doing? We received no ARCAs as a result of the FEMA evaluation of our full scale exercise in FY 2010-11. As for the rating criteria, during each exercise the specific number of areas evaluated by FEMA vary. For the FY 2010-11 exercise 50 separate areas were evaluated by FEMA. In FY 2008-09 we received three ARCAs out of 168 areas evaluated which means we met 98% of our full scale exercise objectives with no ARCAs being issued. While no evaluated full scale exercise was held in FY 2011-12, a smaller exercised was held and evaluated by FEMA; it resulted in one ARCA.

3. Performance Measure: Percentage of survey respondents rating the overall effectiveness of our emergency management coordination efforts for cities, schools districts, public safety, and other local agencies involved in emergency drills/exercises or actual events/incidents as good to excellent.

07-08 Actual Results	08-09 Actual Results	09-10 Actual Results	10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Adopted	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Target
90%	84%	96%	96%	95%	80%	95%

What: This measures the effectiveness of our coordination efforts related to emergency drills/exercises and actual events.

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

How are we doing? Out of the 45 feedback documents returned to OES, 80% reported an overall average of rating of good to excellent or above. While this relatively positive feedback, it is below the goal of 95%. A key reason is that one large scale exercise involved a new process and a second involved a changed process from past exercises; these were learning exercises and drills and the lessons learned will help all involved agencies, including OES, to be better prepared for not only future exercises but for actual emergencies. We are maintaining a target goal of 95% for FY 2012-13.

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

07-08 Actual	08-09 Actual	09-10 Actual	10-11 Actual	11-12 Adopted	11-12 Actual	12-13 Target
-----------------	-----------------	-----------------	-----------------	------------------	-----------------	-----------------

**Emergency Services
Fiscal Year 2012-13 Proposed Budget**

Fund Center 138

Results	Results	Results	Results	Results	Results
97%	96%	95%	94%	95%	94%

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? Of the 104 feedback documents returned to OES, 94% reported good to excellent or above results. Training classes or 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

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

07-08 Actual Results	08-09 Actual Results	09-10 Actual Results	10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Adopted	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Target
66¢	33¢	54¢	40¢	57¢	34¢	71¢

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

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

How are we doing? During FY 2011-12, the County Office of Emergency Services had decreased General Fund support costs primarily due to staff vacancies and a need to apply more effort than anticipated toward revenue offset nuclear power plant emergency management including emergency exercises and drills. Comparable counties spent, on average, an estimated \$1.77 in General Fund Support per capita for emergency management services during FY 2011-12. A key reason for the difference in GF support from compared counties is due to our nuclear power plant (NPP) emergency planning and readiness efforts which are revenue offset. Target costs for 2012-13 reflect increased general emergency planning needs and requirements including projects noted in the budget augmentation requests.

**Probation
Fiscal Year 2012-13 Proposed Budget**

Fund Center 139

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: Annual cost per probationer to provide supervision services.

07-08 Actual Results	08-09 Actual Results	09-10 Actual Results	10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Adopted	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Target
\$2,100	\$2,022	\$2,004	\$2,099	\$2,100	\$2,155	\$2,100

What: Cost to supervise adult probationers who are assigned to the Probation Department, divided by the number of probationers served.

Why: A cost effective alternative to incarceration.

How are we doing? There are currently 2,571 adults being supervised by the Department. The cost of supervision for FY 2011-12 is \$5,539,340. The current annual cost to incarcerate an adult in the County Jail is \$28,167. The current annual cost to incarcerate an adult in State prison is \$49,000 (per the California Department of Corrections website). Additionally, probationers who remain in the community are able to continue working and paying their court-ordered fines, fees and restitution. In FY 2011-12 we collected \$219,741 in Monthly Monitoring Fees. This offset approximately 3% of the cost of supervision. Other Probation Departments in California are not tracking or reporting this outcome, so we do not have comparison outcomes at this time.

2. Performance Measure: Recidivism rate of assigned probationers, both adult and juvenile.

07-08 Actual Results	08-09 Actual Results	09-10 Actual Results	10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Adopted	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Target
Adult – 11% Juvenile – 6%	Adult – 11.7% Juvenile – 6%	Adult – 11.4% Juvenile – 10%	Adult – 9% Juvenile – 13%	Adult – 9% Juvenile – 12%	Adult – 14% Juvenile – 13%	Adlt High–9% Adlt MedHi-4% Adlt MedLo-3% Adlt Low-2% Juv High–12% Juv Med-4% Juv Low-3%

What: The recidivism rate measures those probationers who were assigned to field supervision who have been convicted of a new crime in San Luis Obispo County. The recidivism rate measures those probationers, assigned to field supervision that are found to be convicted of a new crime if adult, or the filing of a new W&IC 602 petition if juvenile in San Luis Obispo County. Beginning in FY 2011-12, the recidivism rate began being calculated for each risk level based upon the result of our validated risk and needs assessment tool. This is used for internal tracking, but the overall recidivism rate for the purposes of this report are reported as an aggregate of all risk levels.

Why: A lower recidivism rate among those probationers who have been supervised equates to a decrease in the incidence of crime, creates fewer victims and provides for a safer community.

**Probation
Fiscal Year 2012-13 Proposed Budget**

Fund Center 139

How are we doing: The department continues to expand the reporting capabilities of the new case management system, and to refine and redefine how the data for recidivism is collected and reported. Therefore the recidivism rates as they are more accurately reported may fluctuate from year to year. The goal of the department is to determine a base line recidivism which we can compare from year to year.

Probation continues to utilize Evidence Based Practices to provide appropriate treatment for offenders, while increasing supervision of high and medium risk offenders.

We continue to inquire about recidivism from other Probation Departments in California, however no like sized counties are currently able to provide this data.

3. Performance Measure: Percentage of Adult and Juvenile offenders who successfully complete the terms and condition of their probation.

07-08 Actual Results	08-09 Actual Results	09-10 Actual Results	10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Adopted	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Target
Adult – 82% Juvenile – 86%	Adult – 80% Juvenile – 81%	Adult – 65% Juvenile – 81%	Adult – 65% Juvenile – 71%	Adult – 65% Juvenile – 81%	Adult – 76% Juvenile – 78%	Adult – 65% Juvenile – 81%

What: This measure indicates that the probationer has successfully remained in the community, working, going to school and contributing. Completing probation successfully is defined as satisfactorily completing the terms and condition of probation.

Why: The successful completion of probation encourages the offenders' rehabilitation, re-socialization and reintegration into the community as a law-abiding, contributing citizen.

How are we doing? This performance measure was previously shown as being deleted in the FY 2010-11 Final Budget. However, the Department has decided to continue using this performance measure. Recidivism is good measure of community safety, but successful completion of probation measures the Department's success in addressing the criminogenic needs of the probationers by providing programs and interventions targeted at changing offender behavior.

The Department is reporting successful completion rates for Adults that exceed our target. This is primarily due to the strategic plan that has been implemented which manages caseloads according to risk and needs and utilizes evidence based practices to provide appropriate resources to targeted populations. The successful completion rate for Juveniles falls short of our target. The department has implemented a risk assessment tool for juveniles which more appropriately determines which juveniles are appropriate for probation supervision. As a result of this assessment, the juveniles we are now supervising are a more difficult population, with a higher risk to reoffend. We continue to work towards improving by using evidence based practices to provide appropriate supervision levels, programming and treatment to juvenile offenders.

We continue to inquire about successful completion rates from other Probation Departments in California, however no like sized counties are currently able to provide this data.

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

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

4. Performance Measure: Cost of collection of victim restitution, fines and fees.

07-08 Actual Results	08-09 Actual Results	09-10 Actual Results	10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Adopted	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Target
\$.20 for every dollar collected	\$.25 for every dollar collected	\$.24 for every dollar collected	\$.32 for every dollar collected	\$.27 for every dollar collected	\$.33 for every dollar collected	\$.30 for every dollar collected

What: Cost to collect court-ordered victim restitution, fines and fees.

Why: Efficiency measure demonstrating cost effectiveness of collecting criminal debt internally while maintaining confidentiality of sensitive victim identification information.

How are we doing? In FY 2010-11 we collected \$2,819,729 in fines, fees and restitution and spent \$908,475 to collect this money. In FY 2011-12 we collected \$2,810,051 in fines, fees and restitution and spent \$951,620 to collect this money. The average cost of collection for private collectors to collect civil debt is approximately \$.50 for every dollar collected. The cost for private collectors to collect delinquent criminal debt is approximately \$.65 for each dollar collected, plus additional expenses. We did not decrease our target outcome for FY 2012-13 as we do not anticipate a significant improvement in the economy. We are seeing more probationers who are unemployed or underemployed. We are currently working towards implementing a process that will allow probationers to pay fines, fees and restitution on-line, but that will not occur until sometime in the next two to three years. We have set up a process for probationers to have their credit card automatically charged each month to alleviate cashier window traffic. If someone does come to the window while it is closed, but during regular Probation Department hours, and cannot make a payment using the drop box (cash), we will accept the payment. The Department is working on replacing the aging collections database, which will hopefully increase collections by being a more efficient and powerful tool, however we do not expect to see a change in outcomes until twelve to eighteen months after implementation.

**Probation
Fiscal Year 2012-13 Proposed Budget**

Fund Center 139

Other counties currently do not track or report this outcome, so there are no outcomes to compare our performance to at the county level. We continue to be extremely cost effective in the collection of court-ordered debt as compared to private collector agencies.

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) From stations with all-volunteer staffing (Morro-Toro and Oak Shores stations).
- (b1) From stations with Amador staffing (Cambria, San Luis Obispo and Shandon stations). With Amador staffing, the County pays for staffing during the winter at a state fire station that would otherwise be closed.
- (b2) From stations with part-time staffing (Carrizo Plain (switched to full-time staffing Jan. 2012) and Creston station).
- (c) From stations with full-time staffing (Airport, Avila Valley, Carrizo Plain, Heritage Ranch, Meridian, Nipomo, Nipomo Mesa, Parkhill, and Paso Robles stations).

07-08 Actual Results	08-09 Actual Results	09-10 Actual Results	10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Adopted	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Target
(a) 16 minutes (b) 14 minutes (c) 10 minutes	(a) 12 minutes (b) 12 minutes (c) 9 minutes	(a) 10.9 minutes (b) 9.5 minutes (c) 7.9 minutes	(a) 9.9 minutes (b) 9.6 minutes (c) 6.6 minutes	(a) 11 minutes (b) 10 minutes (c) 8 minutes	(a) 14.5 minutes (b1) 10.8 minutes (b2) 14.2 minutes (c) 8.4 minutes	(a) 11 minutes (b1) 10 minutes (b2) 10 minutes (c) 8 minutes

What: These measures evaluate the Department's ability to provide assistance within acceptable timeframes.

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? Response times increased for all four types of station staffing, as they have for several years. However, over the last few years the department had made significant progress in reducing response times and rendering aid and assistance more rapidly. This, in turn, reduced damage, injuries and deaths caused by fires and other emergencies. 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. It is unclear why response times increased this year, and further analysis is needed

Response times are tracked and reported on a calendar year (CY) basis, for the calendar year ending during the fiscal year (FY) reported. FY 2011-12 results, therefore, are from CY 2011. Each result shown is the mean average of all first-arriving units, grouped by station type. For CY 2011, the mean average time taken for the first unit to arrive at an incident was as follows:

- a) 14.5 minutes from all-volunteer stations, which responded to a total of 56 calls and were first on scene for 32 of those calls;
- b1) 10.8 minutes from Amador stations, which responded to a total of 1,219 calls and were first on scene for 916 of those calls;
- b2) 14.2 minutes from part-time-staffed stations, which responded to a total of 192 calls and were first on scene for 108 of those calls;
- and, c) 8.4 minutes from full-time-staffed stations, which responded to a total of 7,294 calls and were first on scene for 5,531 of those calls.

The national standard for first-on-scene response is five minutes, 90% of the time. We continue to strive to achieve this standard, and are approaching it from full-time-staffed stations. However, the standard is based on response capabilities of urban fire departments. In rural areas such as ours, with fewer resources and longer response distances, adopted performance targets are set higher than the national standard. The county's size, topography, and road network all present challenges to the Department in meeting these performance measures. All-volunteer, Amador and part-time-staffed stations face additional challenges, such as recruiting, training and retaining volunteers. This year, both performance targets and results will be validated using the recently-completed County Fire Department Strategic Plan, and if changes are needed they will be implemented next fiscal year.

Two changes in the way data is reported are occurring for the first time with this budget:

Amador stations (b1) and part-time staffed stations (b2) are been reported separately, when in prior years, they were all reported as part-time staffed stations (b).

Mid-way through FY 2011-12, staffing at the Carrizo Plain Station increased from part-time to full-time, as a result of two major solar plant projects in the area. As a result, for CY 2012, the station will move from the part-time category (b2) to the full-time category (b1).

Department Goal: Reduce Damage, Injuries And Deaths Caused By Fires And Other Incidents.

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

2. Performance Measure: Average dollar value, per thousand population, of all property damaged or destroyed by fire in the area protected by the department.

07-08 Actual Results	08-09 Actual Results	09-10 Actual Results	10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Adopted	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Target
\$34,385	\$32,267	\$28,250	\$30,968	No more than \$30,000	\$30,930	No more than \$30,000

What: This measure evaluates the Department's ability to protect property, one of its primary missions.

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

How are we doing? Property losses within the area served by the department have declined over the past few years. Although they have not declined every year when compared to the previous year, there is a clear trend of decline from the first year on the schedule to the last. 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, as noted in measure #1 above.

Property losses are tracked and reported on a calendar year (CY) basis, for the calendar year ending during the fiscal year (FY) reported. FY 2011-12 results, therefore, are from CY 2011. Each result shown is the mean average 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 11-12 is \$30,930

This number represents a decrease of 0.1% compared to FY 2010-11. Fire loss details for the year included: vegetation fires \$119,590; vehicle fires \$711,820; structure fires \$2,226,660; total fire losses \$3,073,770. Nationwide fire-related property losses totaled \$11.6 billion in 2010, or \$37,288 per thousand population.

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.

3. Performance Measure: Average number of deaths, per ten thousand population, from fire-related causes within the area protected by the department.

07-08 Actual Results	08-09 Actual Results	09-10 Actual Results	10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Adopted	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Target
0.114	0.110	0.132	0.129	0	0.840	0

What: This measure evaluates the Department's ability to protect lives, one of its primary missions.

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 are 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 2011-12 results, therefore, are from CY 2011. Each result shown is the mean 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 thousand population for FY 2011-12 is 0.084. This number represents a decrease of 34.9% compared to FY 2010-11.

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 measure #1 above.

Nationwide fire-related deaths totaled 3,120 in 2010, or 0.10 per ten thousand population. Regardless of statistics and past history, even a single fire-related death is too many.

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

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

07-08 Actual Results	08-09 Actual Results	09-10 Actual Results	10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Adopted	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Target
0.80	0.80	0.80	0.80	0.80	0.80	0.80

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

Why: The number of emergency responders per thousand population is an indicator of two things. First, we need to ensure we have enough emergency responders to deliver services to the community. Second, it is also important to utilize those emergency responder as efficiently as possible, in order to keep labor costs as low as possible.

How are we doing? For FY 2011-12, the Department utilized 72.5 full-time equivalent emergency responders, for a rate of 0.80 per thousand population. Calculations on this performance measure are similar to those used on measure two above. 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 2010, the National Fire Protection Association estimated that nationally there were 1.08 career firefighters per thousand population. For FY 2012-13, the target remains at 0.80, which equates to the current staffing level. 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.

5. Performance Measure: Annual cost of Department operations, on a per capita basis.

07-08 Actual Results	08-09 Actual Results	09-10 Actual Results	10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Adopted	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Target
\$160.45	\$147.55	\$156.64	\$159.16	No more than \$160.00	\$161.85	No more than \$165.00

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 and personnel costs are not considered operating expenditures and so have not been included.

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 has managed to keep operating costs in the range of \$150 to \$160 per resident throughout the past several years. For this fiscal year, costs jumped to \$161.85 per capita, as a result of increasing costs and additional staffing at the Carrizo Plain Station. Inflation increased by a total of approximately 10% over the past five years. The department has worked closely with County Administration to control and in some cases reduce costs in order to help deal with financial challenges faced by the County. As a result, we have maintained an essentially flat level of operating expense, in spite of inflationary cost increases.

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

07-08 Actual Results	08-09 Actual Results	09-10 Actual Results	10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Adopted	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Target
37%	35%	33%	31%	No less than 35%	33%	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 40% of its expenditure budget, which would otherwise be funded by the General Fund. These revenues are from many sources, primarily from grants and reimbursements for fire fighting activities paid by other government agencies. Specific types and amounts of revenues are subject to significant changes from year to year, so the 35% target has been set below historic performance levels. It should be noted that achieving this target will only be possible if federal and state monies remain available for grant programs and fire-fighting cost reimbursements, which is uncertain in the current economic environment.

GOALS AND PERFORMANCE MEASURES

Department Goal: Ensure the department's Mission Statement commitment to serving the community is demonstrated by all services.						
Communitywide Result Link: <input type="checkbox"/> Safe <input type="checkbox"/> Healthy <input type="checkbox"/> Livable <input type="checkbox"/> Prosperous <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Well-Governed Community						
1. Performance Measure: Percentage of clients that indicate they are satisfied with departmental services. (Quality measure)						
07-08 Actual Results	08-09 Actual Results	09-10 Actual Results	10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Adopted	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Target
98.5% overall satisfaction with services provided to local customers receiving plant shipments from Glassy-winged Sharpshooter infested areas	95% overall satisfaction with services provided to local customers submitting pesticide use reports over the internet	100% overall satisfaction with services provided to local customers who receive certification for farmers markets	94.4% overall satisfaction with services provided to local customers who receive export certification services	95% overall satisfaction with services provided to local grape growers who participate in the detection of European Grapevine Moth	100% overall satisfaction with services provided to local grape growers who participated in the detection of European Grapevine Moth	90% overall satisfaction with services provided to the local residents whose properties required pesticide treatments during the Glassy-winged Sharpshooter eradication project
<p>What: The department solicits feedback including ideas for improvement from its clients each fiscal year. Each year we choose a different program within our department to survey for customer satisfaction. Survey methods vary depending on clientele, and include direct mailings, person-to-person handouts, and through www.slocounty.gov/agcomm. Surveys are solicited at various times during the year and the format is standardized to maintain comparative results.</p> <p>Why: The department is committed to excellent customer service. Customer feedback and suggestions help us achieve that goal.</p> <p>How are we doing? In February 2012 we solicited feedback from county grape growers who participated in the 2011 pest detection survey for European Grapevine Moth (EGVM). Four hundred sixty five surveys were mailed to vineyard owners and operators. Two hundred twenty-three surveys were returned in the Spring of 2012 ranking the overall satisfaction of the program. One hundred percent gave a positive overall satisfaction with the EGVM detection program. Surveys from properties not involved in the program were not included. In FY 2012-13 we will survey residents within the Glassy-winged Sharpshooter eradication area whose properties required pesticide treatments in 2011.</p>						

2. Performance Measure: The number of packages denied entry into San Luis Obispo County due to violations of quarantine laws per 1,000 packages inspected at Federal Express. (Outcome measure)						
07-08 Actual Results	08-09 Actual Results	09-10 Actual Results	10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Adopted	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Target
15.3	14	15.3	7.4	15	13.7	14
<p>What: San Luis Obispo County enjoys a relatively pristine environment, mostly free from quarantine agricultural pests and diseases. Ag Commissioner staff intercepts incoming packages containing plant material at freight and package shipping terminals and inspect for the presence of detrimental pests. Shipments in violation of quarantine laws are denied delivery to the receiver, and the shipment must be treated, returned to the sender or destroyed, thereby protecting the county from potential pest infestations or disease outbreaks. This measure tracks the number of "Notices of Rejection" issued per one thousand packages inspected at the San Luis Obispo County Federal Express terminal and reflects our effectiveness in protecting the agricultural and environmental resources of the county. Although we inspect shipments passing through other shipping terminals, such as UPS and OnTrac, we consider Federal Express to be the highest risk pathway due to the volume of shipments originating from areas with high populations of significant agricultural pests. Thorough inspections also serve as a deterrent for shippers to avoid sending infested shipments to San Luis Obispo County.</p> <p>Why: To protect agriculture and the urban and natural ecosystems in San Luis Obispo County. Each pest found is one new infestation prevented, which eliminates eradication costs and the negative effects on the county.</p> <p>How are we doing? For July 1, 2011 through June 30, 2012, staff inspected 1,527 packages at Federal Express and 21 were denied entry for an overall rejection rate of 13.7 packages per 1,000 inspected. In FY 2011-12, the department refocused staff training, which resulted in better documentation of violations. The Department continues to provide a valuable service to the county by preventing new pest infestations. California statewide rejection data is not readily available.</p>						

3. Performance Measure: The overall rate of insect specimen interceptions by pest detection staff. (Quality measure) *This is a new measure in FY 2012-13.*

07-08 Actual Results	08-09 Actual Results	09-10 Actual Results	10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Adopted	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Target
91.3%	92.9%	100%	89.7%	NEW	95.7%	90.0%

What: San Luis Obispo County is predominantly free from exotic and invasive insect pests. To help ensure that this remains true, the department conducts several state-mandated insect detection programs, each implemented and maintained under specific state protocols. Staff place and monitor insect traps throughout the county in order to detect target insects before any infestation exceeds one square mile. Well trained and efficient Pest Detection Trappers are necessary for an effective program. To measure trapper performance, staff from the California Department of Food and Agriculture (CDFA) periodically, and unannounced, place insect specimens in traps, and rate the ability of individual trappers to intercept these planted specimens. An effective pest detection program is determined largely by the collective interception rate for all program trappers. The department has determined that successfully trained trappers should achieve an individual, and collective, score of at least 90%.

Why: Early detection of exotic and invasive pests protects agriculture, urban environments, and natural ecosystems in San Luis Obispo County, and prevents the negative ecological and economic effects caused by an established insect pest infestation.

How are we doing? This is a new measure for FY 2012-13; however we have included the historical data for comparison. Quality control tests are conducted on Pest Detection Trappers throughout the trapping season by CDFA, including the training period for new trappers. During July 2011 through June 2012, trappers intercepted 45 of 47 planted insect specimens for an overall interception rate of 95.7%.

Formerly #3. Performance Measure: The percentage of the statewide total of all California Counties intercepting live Glassy-winged Sharpshooter life-stage finds on nursery plant shipments entering San Luis Obispo County from any source within a regulated portion of California. (Outcome measure) *This measure is deleted beginning FY 2012-13.*

07-08 Actual Results	08-09 Actual Results	09-10 Actual Results	10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Adopted	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Target
55%	46.5%	50%	44.4%	30%	33%	DEL

What: County staff inspect shipments of plants originating from outside San Luis Obispo County and imported by any shipper for compliance with Glassy-winged Sharpshooter (GWSS) Quarantine laws and reject shipments not in compliance, including the presence of live pests. This measure compares the level of pest interception in San Luis Obispo County to overall statewide data. A high percentage of the statewide total shows the level of thoroughness and accuracy of inspections performed locally compared to other counties.

Why: To prevent the introduction of this detrimental pest into SLO County, which is necessary to protect grapes and other plants from the deadly Pierce's Disease.

How are we doing? In FY 2011-2012, staff detected one shipment infested with live GWSS representing 33% of the statewide finds. Overall, GWSS detections in the state have fallen significantly, and only three live finds were made statewide during the last fiscal year.

The number of Glassy-winged Sharpshooter infested shipments has dropped in recent years due to revised protocols implemented by the California Department of Food and Agriculture placing heightened restrictions on nurseries shipping from Glassy-winged Sharpshooter infested areas. This, in turn, provides for a higher compliance rate for nursery stock arriving from infested counties. Due to the increased compliance rates, the presence of live pests has dropped significantly and no longer provides a meaningful performance measure.

4. Performance Measure: Percentage of overall compliance by all regulated pesticide users (agricultural, structural and governmental). (Outcome measure)

07-08 Actual Results	08-09 Actual Results	09-10 Actual Results	10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Adopted	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Target
95.6%	96.5%	96.4%	96.9%	97.5%	97.8%	97%

What: Laws require pesticide users to comply with mandated requirements such as, but not limited to: following pesticide labels, training workers, operating equipment and applying pesticides in a safe manner, and keeping records of usage. This measure reflects the effectiveness of Ag Commissioner staff in educating pesticide users and, through strict enforcement, insuring that users are in compliance with California's pesticide laws. This measure excludes home use by the public, which currently is not monitored.

Why: To protect workers, the public's health and safety, the health of the environment, and to ensure safe food.

How are we doing? The Pesticide Use Enforcement Program continues to provide a high level of protection for the community. During the 2011-12 fiscal year, staff inspected 8,878 compliance requirements and found 8,674 requirements in compliance resulting in a 97.8% compliance rate. The overall statewide pesticide use enforcement compliance rate for FY 2010-11 (the most current information available)

was 98.8%; however, each county has a unique work plan negotiated with the state that focuses inspections on specific areas of concern. San Luis Obispo County's compliance rate is lower than the state average due to our focus on pesticide use in and near urban areas, the transient nature of maintenance gardener businesses and the high level of technical detail required to apply field fumigants. The compliance rate has improved over the past five years due to the department's consistent oversight and focus.

5. Performance Measure: Number of pesticide use report records processed per hour. (Efficiency measure)

07-08 Actual Results	08-09 Actual Results	09-10 Actual Results	10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Adopted	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Target
38.4	50.3	75.9	79.2	80.0	68.2	79.0

What: Producers of agricultural commodities and pest control businesses are required to report pesticide use to the County Agricultural Commissioner. This data is reviewed and entered into a statewide pesticide use report database. This measure demonstrates how efficiently we process pesticide use report data.

Why: Interested parties want prompt and efficient processing of pesticide use reports to obtain up-to-date data for identifying pesticide use in the county.

How are we doing? The Department's pesticide use report review and data entry efficiencies declined during FY 2011-12 due to the transition to the new statewide permitting and reporting system (CalAgPermits). FY 2012-13 will continue to be a transitional year of learning and adjusting to the new system. We expect the number of records processed per hour to increase to the targeted level once the new system is fully implemented. There is no statewide or comparable county data available for this measure.

6. Performance Measure: Percentage of all weighing and measuring devices found to be in compliance with California laws. (Outcome measure)

07-08 Actual Results	08-09 Actual Results	09-10 Actual Results	10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Adopted	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Target
SLO County 88.2%	SLO County 92.0%	SLO County 94.3%	SLO County 90.9%	To equal or exceed the statewide compliance average	SLO County 91.9%	To equal or exceed the statewide compliance average
Statewide 91.3%	Statewide 93.5%	Statewide 93.9%	Statewide 93.1%		Statewide data not currently available	

What: California law mandates the County Commissioner/Sealer to inspect and test all commercial weighing and measuring devices on an annual basis, with a few exceptions. This measure represents the percentage of San Luis Obispo County weighing and measuring devices found upon initial inspection to be in compliance with laws, and our county's compliance level compared to the statewide results for the year. This measure reflects the Sealer's effectiveness in educating operators of commercial weighing and measuring devices and, through strict enforcement, insuring that these devices are in compliance with California weights and measures laws.

Why: The use of correct weighing and measuring devices protects consumers and helps insure that merchants compete fairly.

How are we doing? The annual statewide compliance rate for all California counties combined averaged 92.8% during the past five years. Our results averaged 91.5% during this period. During FY 2011-12, 2,972 weighing and measuring devices were found in compliance out of 3,233 devices inspected, for a 91.9% overall compliance rate. Statewide compliance data for FY 2011-12 will be published in Spring 2013. Thoroughness of inspections results in slightly lower local compliance rates as compared to the statewide average.

7. Performance Measure: Percentage of price scanners found to be in compliance with California laws. (Outcome measure)

07-08 Actual Results	08-09 Actual Results	09-10 Actual Results	10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Adopted	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Target
SLO County 98.6%	SLO County 98.0%	SLO County 99.1%	SLO County 98.7%	To equal or exceed the statewide compliance average	SLO County 99.3%	To equal or exceed the statewide compliance average
Statewide 97.8%	Statewide 98.1%	Statewide 98.2%	Statewide 98.1%		Statewide data not currently available	

What: Price scanner inspections compare the actual prices charged for items at retail store checkout stands with the lowest advertised, posted or quoted prices for those items. All retail stores, such as supermarkets and department stores, utilizing automated price scanners are subject to inspection. This measure represents the percentage of items tested that are charged correctly at the checkout stand and our county's compliance level compared to the statewide results for the year. This measure reflects the Sealer's effectiveness in educating operators of price scanning systems and, through strict enforcement, insuring that pricing is in compliance with California weights and

measures laws.

Why: Accurate price scanners protect consumers and help insure that merchants compete fairly.

How are we doing? The annual statewide compliance rate for all California counties combined averaged 98.0% during the past five years. Our results averaged 98.6% during this period. During FY 2011-12, 49 locations were inspected. Of the 1621 items inspected, 1610 items were in compliance, for a 99.3% compliance rate. Statewide compliance data for FY 2011-12 will be published in Spring 2013. Despite a minimal inspection presence, compliance levels remain high. In FY 2012-13, the department will focus inspections on establishment types identified in a recent statewide survey with lower than average compliance rates.

GOALS AND PERFORMANCE MEASURES

Department Goal: Conserve natural resources to promote a healthy environment.							
Communitywide Result Link: <input type="checkbox"/> Safe <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Healthy <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Livable <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Prosperous <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Well-Governed Community							
1. Performance Measure: Acres of land protected through the agricultural preserve program.							
07-08 Actual Results	08-09 Actual Results	09-10 Actual Results	10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Adopted	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Target	
794,394 acres protected	799,914 acres protected	792,900 acres protected	794,248 acres protected	795,015 acres protected	795,328 acres protected	796,113 acres protected	
What: The objective of the Agricultural Preserve Program (Williamson Act) is to protect agricultural lands for continued production of food & fiber. The land is reassessed on the basis of the agricultural income producing capability of the land. This assures the landowners that property valuations and taxes will remain at generally lower levels							
Why: To protect agricultural land, strengthen the County's agricultural economy and preserve natural resources, consistent with County policy.							
How are we doing? There was a slight net increase in the actual acres protected. Agricultural Preserve contracts are for either 10 or 20 years and are automatically extended annually for another year unless the owner files a notice of non-renewal. Consequently, some contracts expire each year after completing their 10 or 20 year non-renewal period.							
Department Goal: Protect public health and safety by effective and timely administration of development regulations and by fostering clean and safe communities through responsive code enforcement and preparation and implementation of the County General Plan.							
Communitywide Result Link: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Safe <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Healthy <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Livable <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Prosperous <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Well-Governed Community							
2. Performance Measure: Percentage of project types processed within established time lines for representative project types.							
	07-08 Actual Results	08-09 Actual Results	09-10 Actual Results	10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Adopted	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Target
<u>Building Permit applications</u> Goal: Single-family dwelling permits - 20 days to complete plan check.	70%	87%	96%	94%	98%	94%	98%
Goal: Commercial project permits - 30 days to complete plan check	n/a	n/a	90%	95%	95%	95%	95%
<u>Building Inspection</u> Goal: All building inspections requested completed by the next day	99%	99%	98%	100%	98%	99%	98%

**Planning and Building
Fiscal Year 2012-13 Proposed Budget**

Fund Center 142

<u>Land Use Permit & Subdivision applications</u>								
Goal:								
Exemptions from CEQA - 60 days from acceptance	59%	64%	65%	60%	70%	70%	75%	
Goal:								
Negative Declaration - 180 days from acceptance	51%	47%	56%	71%	75%	76%	75%	
<u>Code Enforcement</u>								
Goal: All complaints reviewed within 10 working days.								
	---	---	---	---	100%	100%	100%	
Goal:								
Voluntary compliance resolved within 45 days of initial inspection	---	---	---	---	50%	47%	40%	
<u>Long Range Planning</u>								
Goal:								
Complete annual reports and public review drafts within the timeframes set by their respective work programs	n/a	90%	90%	60%	85%	82%	85%	
What: Timely processing of applications/permits and complaints and the timely completion of long range planning initiatives.								
Why: To provide timely, quality service that saves applicants time and money, adds value to tax base and local economy, and meets local and state laws. Timely completion of long range plans ensures a plan produced within budget and adequate time respond to the community's vision, local needs and issues before the document begins the hearing process. Timely annual reports keep the communities and decision makers current on issues affecting the County.								
How are we doing?								
Building Permits – We monitor our workload weekly to accomplish our goal of completing 98% of the initial plan review for new dwellings within 20 working days. We finished the year slightly below our target goal by reviewing 94% of the new dwellings within 20 days (139 out of 148 permits). We accomplished our goal of 95% of commercial plans being reviewed within 30 days by year end (113 out of 119 projects). Three significantly large projects have impacted the department and specifically the building division resulting in the small minor delay in completing initial reviews. We remain focused on providing excellent service to our typical customers while accommodating the time constraints of the three significantly large projects. The total number of construction permits appears to be flat but our customer service contacts are remaining steady over the past several fiscal years. (FY 2008-09: 26,173 permit center contacts, FY 2009-10: 26,980 permit center contacts, FY 2010-11 26,623 permit center contacts, FY 2011-12 27,548 permit center contacts). We are also devoting time to: (a) updating Title 19 – ordinance hearing set for July 24, 2012, (b) reviewing the more complex projects in house, (c) providing frequent consultations to customers for expired/abandoned projects and unpermitted construction due to the changing economy, (d) preparing a new Green Building Ordinance – hearing scheduled for August 28, 2012, and (e) administering the National Storm Water Pollution Program.								
Building Inspections- Most inspections are completed the day after they are requested, except in a limited number of remote areas of the County. Our goal is to complete 98% of construction inspections on the day after they are requested. For FY 2011-12 we have completed 10,915 inspections out of 10,920 inspections on the date requested or more than 99%.								

Land Use Permits/Subdivisions – The number of land use and subdivision applications processed in FY 2010-11 was 133. The number processed FY 2011-12 was 110, which is 17% less than the FY 2010-11 total. While some processing times have increased slightly due to the significant complexity of a few applications; others have decreased. In FY 2011-12, the average processing times to take all projects to a Review Authority for action decreased from 113 days in FY 2010-11 to 112 days (1% decrease) and increased from 161 to 163 days (1% increase) for projects that require Negative Declarations. 57 out of 81 exempt projects were processed within 60 days (70%) and 22 out of 29 projects subject to Negative Declarations were processed within 180 days (76%).

Code Enforcement: There were 712 enforcement cases initiated in FY 2011-12. All complaints are being reviewed within 10 days of receiving the complaint. For cases involving health and safety (e.g. substandard living conditions), a high priority is assigned to those cases and these are typically reviewed within two days. Voluntary compliance within 45 days is at 47% due other department needs. These include (a) substantially assisting in the preparation of mandated National Storm Water Pollution Program requirements and (b) augmenting inspection staff on the large solar projects. In addition, unpermitted projects typically require professionals (e.g. engineers), special studies (e.g. geological), and additional site visits resulting in an increased time to reach compliance.

Long Range Planning: Approximately 82% of the reports and public review drafts of long range plans have been completed within the timeframes set by their work programs. Of the 17 plans or studies either completed or in process, 14 are on schedule or have had their schedules revised to reflect changes in circumstances, as described below. The 17 long-range plans being tracked are the Annual Report on the General Plan, EnergyWise Plan (formerly the Climate Action Plan), Shandon Community Plan Update, Paso Robles Groundwater Basin Resource Capacity Study (RCS) implementation program, Strategic Growth implementation amendments and studies (Complete Communities Survey, Infill Subdivision-Development Standards, Community Design Model, Illustrative Design Model, Land Use Economics Study), Land Use and Circulation Element (LUCE) Update, Resource Management System (RMS) and Growth Management Ordinance (GMO) revisions, the San Miguel Community Plan, the Agricultural Cluster Ordinance and Element and LUE amendments, the two Mobilehome Park Combining Designation Amendments, the Mobilehome Park Zoning and Standards, and the Economic Element update. The Department provides the Board with regular updates regarding Department workload and priorities, which should allow the Department to better estimate time needed for completion of Long Range planning initiatives.

Long Range:

The following is a description of each long range plan, including its current status, whether it is on time and the reason for or circumstance involving any delay.

Annual Report on the General Plan. This is to be presented to the Planning Commission in September 2012 and to the Board in October 2012, in line with expected dates.

EnergyWise Plan. The Public Review Draft was released in April 2011, past the original target date of November 2010, because the Department and the Board of Supervisors made modifications to the contract with the consultant. These modifications expanded the scope of work well beyond what was called for in the original contract, and extended the time frame to complete the project. Following three Planning Commission hearings in September and October 2011, the Board adopted the Plan on November 23, 2011, in line with the revised project schedule.

Shandon Community Plan Update. The Public Review Draft was released in February 2010 behind schedule, and completion of the update was further delayed by a lengthy Planning Commission hearing process, followed by the Board's continuance of this item off-calendar in November 2011. As directed by the Board, staff worked with the community to resolve concerns that were raised at the November 2011 Board hearing. The Board adopted the community plan update on April 3, 2012, within the timeframe expected as of the previous update to these performance measures.

Paso Robles Groundwater Basin RCS implementation program. This is now a top priority per Board direction. Substantial public outreach and preliminary work on ordinance amendments have been completed. Instead of first releasing draft ordinance amendments, staff prepared an outline of ordinance amendments in August 2011 for review by the Water Resources Advisory Committee (WRAC), followed by draft amendments to the Land Use Ordinance in December 2011. The expected time frame for draft amendments was fall 2011; the outline of ordinance amendments was released ahead of schedule and the draft amendments were released a little later than the expected time frame. The WRAC took several months to review and comment on the ordinance outline and amendments, completing its review in February 2012. The Planning Commission is scheduled to hold a public hearing on July 26, 2012, which is later than anticipated start of hearings in spring 2012, due primarily to a longer review time by the WRAC than originally estimated.

Strategic Growth implementation amendments and studies. A package of amendments to encourage infill development and implement other aspects of Strategic Growth was authorized by the Board in 2009. Since then, Strategic Growth implementation efforts have been focused on several studies funded by a grant from the California Strategic Growth Council grant. The studies are intended to enhance unincorporated communities by encouraging infill development, planning for infrastructure, calculating the effects of strategic growth and other land use scenarios, and illustrating compatible infill development and community expansion. In November 2011, the Board approved consultant contracts, together with work programs and schedules for several Strategic Growth-related projects, including amendments to encourage infill development. Work began on these amendments in winter 2011. The status of these projects is described below.

Complete Communities Survey to identify infrastructure and facility needs, costs, funding and financing for Nipomo, Oceano, San Miguel and Templeton. The project started in December 2011 and is ahead of schedule. It should be completed sooner than 15 months from the start date.

Infill Subdivision – Development Standards to revise standards and remove barriers in order to encourage in-town development. The project started in December 2011 and is on schedule to be completed within 22 months from the start date. The background report has been completed and is posted on the Department's website. We are on schedule to hold public workshops in August 2012.

Community Design Model to calculate the results of different growth scenarios. The project started in December 2011 and is on track to be completed within 10 months of the start date--by September 2012.

Illustrative Design Model to clearly show how a compact, well-planned neighborhood and infill project can be integrated into an

**Planning and Building
Fiscal Year 2012-13 Proposed Budget**

Fund Center 142

existing community. The project started in December 2011 and has been completed about one month later than originally estimated. Refinements are being finalized by staff.

Land Use Economics Study to evaluate the land use and economic effects of community-focused growth. This project started in January 2012, and the completed study was released at the beginning of July 2012, about one month later than the originally estimated completion date.

LUCE Update. In March 2011, the Board revised the work program for the LUCE. Staff is currently working only on a consolidation and reorganization of the Land Use Element and Land Use Ordinance to streamline it and make it user-friendly, along with preparation of countywide viewshed standards (the viewshed standards has been deferred until 2013). The revised work program shows the Public Review Draft of the first or reorganization phase of the LUCE being completed by spring 2012. Due to assigned staff having commitments to other projects that experienced delays, significant work on the LUCE started later than expected. In addition, staff resources have been shifted somewhat to complete other top priority projects. As a result, a Public Review Draft of the LUCE reorganization is now expected to be released in late summer 2012.

RMS and GMO revisions. The previous target of completing draft RMS and GMO revisions in 2011 was moved back to fall 2012 and then early 2013 due to workload and staff commitment to completing higher-priority projects by the end of 2012. The RMS and GMO revisions are not included in the top Department priorities per Board direction. Two tasks have been completed in connection with the RMS Annual Resource Summary Report, and work is underway on the remaining tasks. Staff is now targeting completions of the Public Review Draft RMS and GMO revisions by spring 2013, with the exception of specific growth rate limits and possible significant revisions to the GMO that would likely require an Environmental Impact Report (EIR), for which funds are currently not budgeted.

San Miguel Community Plan Update. In November 2011, the Board authorized processing a Community Plan Update, together with a work program and schedule. The work schedule estimated release of the Public Review Draft by June 2012; however, the consultant selection process took much longer than expected, and as a result, the Public Review Draft is now expected to be released at the beginning of November, as the results of certain consultant studies need to be included in the Public Review Draft. Staff estimates that the Public Hearing Draft Plan can be released by August 2013, less than two months from the originally estimated date.

Agricultural Cluster Ordinance and Element and LUE Amendments. The Public Review Draft of the proposed amendments was released in August 2011 on schedule. The public review period for the Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) ended on October 17, 2011, and the final EIR is currently being prepared. The first Planning Commission hearing is scheduled for August 30, 2012, later than previously estimated.

Housing & Economic Development:

Most programs of this section are ongoing, such as grants administration and Mobilehome Park Rent Review Board support. They are “on schedule” in that deadlines set by funding sources and by the Mobilehome Park Rent Stabilization Ordinance were met, so no sanctions from the funding sources were imposed and no complaints from Mobilehome Park owners, residents or the Rent Review Board were filed.

There are three items that are not on-going. Two of these items on are track and one is behind schedule.

Mobilehome park combining designation– this will create a new combining designation or overlay zone to (1) encourage expansion of existing mobilehome parks and (2) encourage development of new mobilehome parks. A draft has been prepared and environmental review is in process within the timeframes set in the revised work program. The project is within the timeframes established by the revised work program.

Mobilehome Park Zoning and Standards This will amend Section 22.30.440 / 23.08.164 - Residential - Mobilehome Parks to bring county standards into conformance with California Code of Regulations regarding design and construction of mobilehome parks. This ordinance amendment continues to be behind schedule primarily because the staff member assigned to this project has had to spend more time than anticipated in his role as staff to the Mobilehome Park Rent Review Board. The Public Review Draft has not yet been completed.

Economic Element. The Board of Supervisors approved a work program in September for the Economic Element. The Public Review Draft was published on April 30, 2012 on target with the work program, and a Planning Commission hearing is scheduled for August 23, 2012.

3. Performance Measure: Percentage of customers who rate the overall services provided by the Planning and Building Department as “above satisfactory” or higher through continuous client surveys.

07-08 Actual Results	08-09 Actual Results	09-10 Actual Results	10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Adopted	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Target
----------------------------	----------------------------	----------------------------	----------------------------	------------------	----------------------------	-----------------

94% 90% 92% 95% 95% 97% 95%

What: The Planning and Building Department’s customers who submit building and land use permits will be continuously surveyed to determine how well their needs were served.

Why: To ensure effective customer service is provided and track changing customer expectations.

How are we doing? Our focus has been on creating a “Customer Service Center” to provide timely and accurate information in a helpful way. We have improved our customer service by increasing our electronic application/ePermit service which reduces the amount of times applicants need to come into the county to apply for a permit and we have provided a designated Code Enforcement officer to assist with clients coming for unpermitted projects or expired permits. In addition, customers now have the ability to pay by credit card on all fee type transactions processed in the department. Additional data has been linked to our GIS system, allowing for quicker access to more information. We have consolidated all our sections into fewer locations, this allows for quicker access to building inspectors to assist customers or staff at the front counter. For several larger projects, the Department has assigned dedicated staff to process applications in the shortest time frame possible. To the greatest extent feasible, we are committed to maintaining the staffing levels necessary to meet customer needs Monday through Friday, and our current average wait time for customers is less than 10 minutes. To date, 97% of the

Land Based

**Planning and Building
Fiscal Year 2012-13 Proposed Budget**

Fund Center 142

individuals who completed "how are we doing" surveys rated the above satisfactory or outstanding (31 out of 32).

Department Goal: Promote economic development and affordable housing opportunities countywide pursuant to the Economic and Housing Elements of the County General Plan.

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

4. Performance Measure: Number of newly constructed/purchased affordable housing units for low - and moderate - income families.

07-08 Actual Results	08-09 Actual Results	09-10 Actual Results	10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Adopted	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Target
----------------------------	----------------------------	----------------------------	----------------------------	------------------	----------------------------	-----------------

218 housing units	105 housing units	82 housing units	80 housing units	194 housing units	39 housing units	149 housing units
-------------------	-------------------	------------------	------------------	-------------------	------------------	-------------------

What: Affordable housing units resulting from permit requirements and incentives (including state, federal and local funds) to maximize the number of newly constructed /purchased affordable housing units provided for low and moderate-income families.

Why: Affordable housing enhances the health of families and improves the stability of communities and the local workforce.

How are we doing? The number of affordable units constructed in FY 2011-12 was 39, including: 29 units (Terebinth Lane Homes) in Templeton by People's Self Help Housing Corporation, 6 secondary dwellings countywide, and 4 farm support quarters countywide. These units include 36 units for lower income households and 3 units for moderate income households. It was anticipated that 11 units (Oak Leaf Homes) in Nipomo by Peoples' Self-Help Housing Corporation would be completed; however this project was delayed and will likely be completed in 2012-13. Additionally, 6 apartment units in San Simeon were not completed and fewer secondary dwellings units and farm support quarters were constructed than anticipated. The target for FY 2012-13 includes 149 units, including 35 units in Arroyo Grande (Courtland Homes), 23 units in Nipomo (Oak Leaf), 6 units in Oceano, all by People's Self Help Housing Corporation, 69 units in Paso Robles (Oak Park) by the Paso Robles Housing Authority, 10 secondary dwelling units countywide, and 6 farm support quarter units countywide. The targeted 149 housing units include 145 units for very low and low income households and 4 units for moderate income households.

Department Goal: Promote the values of good planning and building through education and outreach

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

5. Performance Measure: Percentage of planned public outreach and education efforts completed during the year.

07-08 Actual Results	08-09 Actual Results	09-10 Actual Results	10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Adopted	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Target
----------------------------	----------------------------	----------------------------	----------------------------	------------------	----------------------------	-----------------

N/A	N/A	370	465	Revised Measure 100%	93%	100%
-----	-----	-----	-----	-------------------------	-----	------

What: To provide public information/training and gather public input through outreach on specific topics of interest that impact the land owners of the unincorporated areas of the County.

Why: To improve, strengthen and foster maximum participation in the process through listening to concerns and educating stakeholders about department processes and the benefits of good planning and building programs.

How are we doing? The success of our work depends on our ability to gather information from stakeholders, inform residents and property owners of our efforts and educate the general public about planning and building. Our public outreach and education is designed to promote public awareness for a wide variety of audience and stakeholders within and outside government.

Our on-going measures include: live broadcasting and web-streaming of Planning Commission meetings, live web-streaming of Airport Land Use Commission, Subdivision Review Board and Planning Department meetings, staff reports and agendas available on the webpage, e-comment for hearing items available on the webpage, "how to" and other informational handouts available on the webpage, interactive Geographic Information System (GIS) mapping and data on the department's web page, annual GIS day, Community Advisory Councils (CAC) liaison duties, yearly CAC training, yearly California Environmental Quality Act training, yearly biological report training, twice yearly erosion control training, Agriculture Liaison Advisory Board presentations, guest lecturing at Cal Poly and Cuesta College, a quarterly newsletter, and information provided on Facebook and Twitter.

To continue our successful collaboration with agencies, organizations and residents, our goal for FY 2011-12 is to complete the following outreach and public education efforts. Where a measurement is noted, the department will provide a report on that measure.

Did Not Complete in FY 2011-12

- Mobilehome Park Amendment Outreach
- Santa Margarita Resource Capacity Study Outreach (project postponed by Board of Supervisors – not counted)

Completed in FY 2011-12

- CDBG / HOME (and other housing grant) Outreach & Public Workshops (number of grants awarded in FY 2011-12 – 5 grants)
- Homeless Services Oversight Council Meetings
- Land Use and Circulation Element Outreach
- Energy Retrofit Training and Energy Efficiency Outreach (number of contractors trained – 16, number of outreach events - 12)
- Green Building Code Training

Land Based

**Planning and Building
Fiscal Year 2012-13 Proposed Budget**

Fund Center 142

Ag Tourism Ordinance Amendment Outreach
Camp Roberts Joint Land Use Study Meetings & Outreach
NPDES Training & Outreach (number of grading regulation violations as compared to permits issued – 46 out of 58, many of the violations are allowed alternate review and would not require a permit)
Housing Needs Education (Various Stakeholder Groups)
Economic Development Education
San Miguel Community Plan Outreach
Resource Education (Water, Oak Woodlands, Mining, GIS, etc)
Stakeholder Outreach (Building Industry, Environmental Interests, Professional Organizations, Service Organizations, etc)

For FY 2011-12 the Department met 93% of the outreach and public education efforts identified. Only one of the identified outreach and public education efforts were not completed. The Mobilehome Park amendment is not yet at a point in the process where outreach is appropriate. This should begin next fiscal year. The Santa Margarita Resource Capacity Study Outreach

GOALS AND PERFORMANCE MEASURES

Department Goal: Prevent epidemics and the spread of disease or injury.						
Communitywide Result Link: <input type="checkbox"/> Safe <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Healthy <input type="checkbox"/> Livable <input type="checkbox"/> Prosperous <input type="checkbox"/> Well-Governed Community						
1. Performance Measure: Annual rate of reported retail foodborne disease outbreaks per 100,000 county population.						
07-08 Actual Results	08-09 Actual Results	09-10 Actual Results	10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Adopted	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Target
1.5	0	1.50	.37	.75	.37	.75
<p>What: Measures the number of reported outbreaks originating from food sources (restaurants, other retail food preparation facilities, or community meals) as a rate per 100,000 population. A foodborne outbreak is defined as “the occurrence of 2 or more cases of a similar illness resulting from ingestion of a common food source.”</p> <p>Why: One of the many roles of the Public Health Department (PHD) is to ensure food safety in our county. The Communicable Disease program in collaboration with Environmental Health Services responds to foodborne disease outbreaks in order to mitigate further spread, identify the cause, and implement systems change in an effort to prevent future outbreaks of the same nature. There are many steps in the food production process and public health alone in no way has the capability of eradicating foodborne exposures. Local public health departments contribute meaningfully to ensuring the safe consumption of food products. It is unlikely that foodborne outbreaks will be eliminated. Yet, were this measure to worsen dramatically, the PHD would need to take a close look at where its efforts may be going awry.</p> <p>How are we doing? There was one foodborne outbreak in FY 2011-12 (1 divided by SLO County’s population of 269,337/100,000 = .37). National data reflects an estimated 76 million cases of foodborne disease occur each year in the United States. The majority of these cases are mild and cause symptoms for only a day or two. The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) estimates that there are 325,000 hospitalizations and 5,000 deaths related to foodborne diseases each year. Laboratory technologies are constantly improving which may lead to the detection of increased identification of outbreaks in the future.</p> <p>Of the benchmark counties, only six months of data is available for FY 2011-12; Marin, Monterey, Napa, Placer, Santa Barbara and Santa Cruz Counties all reported 0 outbreaks.</p>						
2. Performance Measure: Cost per visit for childhood immunization.						
07-08 Actual Results	08-09 Actual Results	09-10 Actual Results	10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Adopted	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Target
\$57.23/visit	\$62.66/visit	\$47.95/visit	\$56.62/visit	\$55/visit	\$45.53/visit	\$54/visit
<p>What: Measures the County’s net cost per visit to immunize a child. The measure does not include flu-only clinics and vaccinations for persons traveling overseas. Cost per visit includes all child immunization direct costs to the Family Health Services Division, less any fees that are collected for the immunization service divided by the number of visits.</p> <p>Why: To monitor the efficiency of delivering this core Public Health function. The most current data from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) reflects that for every dollar spent on immunizations there is a corresponding savings of \$6.30 on future medical costs.</p> <p>How are we doing? The actual cost per visit in FY 2011-12 was \$45.53, \$9.47 or 17% less than the adopted measure. In FY 2011-12, Public Health nursing staff vaccinated 2,124 children as compared to 1,616 in FY 2010-11, representing a 31.25% increase. The increase in the number of vaccinations is reflective of new legislation requiring 7th graders to be vaccinated with the Tdap vaccine before entering school. The State provided free vaccine to Public Health to immunize incoming 7th grader’s during FY 2011-12. In FY 2010-11, the State provided free vaccine and new mandates that all children in 7th grade through 12th grade be vaccinated. The State mandate did not require this population be vaccinated prior to entering school as required in FY 2011-12. The cost per visit was calculated by dividing the total expense of \$96,708 by 2,124 children. It is unclear at this time how healthcare reform will impact immunizations services provided by Public Health Departments. There is a possibility that the State will no longer provide free vaccine to Public Health Departments. If this goes into effect, the number of vaccines provided by Public Health staff could decrease significantly.</p> <p>Benchmark data from other counties are not available.</p>						
3. Performance Measure: Rate of newly diagnosed HIV cases per 100,000 population.						
07-08 Actual Results	08-09 Actual Results	09-10 Actual Results	10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Adopted	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Target
5.6*	7.5	7.9	5.6	8.0	5.2	5.9
<p>What: This measure denotes the number of unduplicated, newly reported Human Immunodeficiency Virus (HIV) cases throughout the</p>						

County (excluding the prison system) per 100,000 population.

Why: The rate of reported HIV cases reflects those who are newly diagnosed. Public Health staff contact physicians, hospitals and other places that test for HIV to assist in capturing new HIV cases.

* The FY 2007-08 rate reflects only HIV cases reported through the Public Health Laboratory. In FY 2008-09, the methodology changed to include all documented HIV cases in the County.

How are we doing? In FY 2011-12, 14 cases at a rate of 5.2 (# of cases divided by (SLO County's population of 269,337 divided by 100,000)) were reported, as compared to FY 2010-11, 15 cases at a rate of 5.6. This is not a statistically significant change. The effect of funding reductions state wide dedicated to HIV prevention long-term is still to be determined. It also should be noted that in low prevalence communities like the County of San Luis Obispo, year to year changes may appear to be considerable.

Benchmark data for other counties are not available.

Department Goal: Promote and encourage healthy behaviors.

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

4. Performance Measure: Birth rate of adolescent females, ages 15 to 17, per 1,000 population.

07-08 Actual Results	08-09 Actual Results	09-10 Actual Results	10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Adopted	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Target
13.8	9.8	12.7*	11.6*	12.0	11.24	12.0

What: The rate measures the number of live births born to adolescent females who are between the ages of 15 to 17 years old.

Why: The rate of adolescents giving birth is a direct predictor of future health, social and economic status of both the mother and child. The age range of 15 to 17 year olds is a critical one and a direct indicator of future high-risk families.

* The Actual Results for this performance measure updated to reflect more accurate US Census data rather than utilizing Department of Finance population data.

How are we doing? In FY 2011-12, 43 females in the age range of 15-17 years gave birth, compared to 53 in FY 2010-11, a 18.9% decrease (*Automated Vital Statistic System*). Calculating the three year average, a total of 154 females between the ages of 15 to 17 gave birth during FY 2009-10 through FY 2011-12. This results in a rate of 11.24 births per 1,000 15 to 17 year olds (1,540 total births divided by 13,707 which is the total three year population divided by 1,000). The 2010 Census estimates that there were 4,569 females between the ages of 15 to 17 in San Luis Obispo County. FY 2011-12 results represent a three-year rolling average in order to better reflect trend data.

Benchmark comparable data from other counties are not available for the ages of 15 to 17. The majority of California Counties track this type of data for females between the ages of 15 to 19 year olds. The County of San Luis Obispo tracks 15 to 17 year olds since this population tends to be more at risk and 18 years and older is considered to be an adult.

5. Performance Measure: Percentage of low birth weight infants.

07-08 Actual Results	08-09 Actual Results	09-10 Actual Results	10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Adopted	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Target
6.9%	6.2%	6.1%	5.6%	6.0%	5.4%	6.0%

What: Measures the percentage of live-born infants born to San Luis Obispo County residents who weigh less than 2,500 grams (five and three-quarters pounds) at birth. The calculation is derived by the total number of infants born who weigh less than 2,500 grams divided by the total number of babies born that year. Beginning with FY 2008-09 actual results for this measure have been updated to report rolling averages over a three-year time period.

Why: Low birth weight (LBW) impacts the infant's survival and future development. Reducing the percentage of low birth weight infants would decrease costs for neonatal medical care and enhance quality of life and infant survival.

How are we doing? For the three year period ending with FY 2011-12, the low birth rate was 5.4% (426 LBW babies divided by total live births of 7,930) compared to 5.6% for (449 LBW divided by 7,968 live births) for the three year period ending in FY 2010-11 (*Automated Vital Statistic System*).

The low rate in SLO County may be attributed in part to multiple preventative Public Health programs including *First-Time Mothers/Early Support Program* (nurse home-visiting), *Baby's First Breath* (tobacco cessation), *Women, Infants and Children (WIC) Program* and the *Perinatal Substance Use Program (4 P's program – Past Parents Partner and Pregnancy)* which all are aimed at reducing the rate of low birth weight infants and improving birth outcomes. Emphasis is placed on increasing outreach, education and referral to reduce known risk factors such as teen pregnancy, poor nutrition, tobacco, alcohol and/or other drug use and late entrance into prenatal care.

Benchmark data from other counties are not available.

6. Performance Measure: Percentage of live born infants whose mothers received prenatal care in the first trimester.

07-08 Actual Results	08-09 Actual Results	09-10 Actual Results	10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Adopted	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Target
76%	78%	78%	78.5%	76%	81.7%	78%

What: Percentage of live-born infants, born to this County's residents, whose mothers received prenatal care in the first trimester of pregnancy.

Why: Early, high quality prenatal care reduces the incidence of morbidity and mortality for both mother and infant.

How are we doing? In FY 2011-12, 81.7% (2,137 women out of a total of 2,616) of mothers sought prenatal care in their first trimester compared to 78.5% (2,073 out of a total of 2,638) in FY 2010-11.

In addition to having a relatively educated and engaged population, our County's rate of women receiving early prenatal care can be attributed in part to some of the preventive Public Health programs. In particular, the Family Planning program identifies women early in their pregnancies, and provides immediate counseling and referral into prenatal care, as do other Public Health programs such as Women, Infants & Children (WIC), Comprehensive Perinatal Services Program, and Field Nurse home-visiting programs. Additionally, many at risk mothers participating in Public Health programs develop trusting relationships with Public Health staff, such that they continue to seek prenatal care with future pregnancies.

The U.S. Department of Health & Human Services, in its Healthy People 2020 publication, set as a target that 77.9% of all mothers giving birth received prenatal care beginning in the first trimester of their pregnancy.

7. Performance Measure: Percentage of the State allocated caseload enrolled in the Women, Infants & Children (WIC) Program.

07-08 Actual Results	08-09 Actual Results	09-10 Actual Results	10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Adopted	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Target
100%	97.5%	97%	100%	99%	99%	99%

What: Measures the number of San Luis Obispo County women, infants and children receiving supplemental foods, nutrition education and referrals to health care as a percentage of the State allocated caseload. Allocated baseline caseload is determined by the State WIC Branch and is based on a combination of census data, county poverty levels, and past performance.

Why: Numerous studies have shown that the WIC program helps reduce complications of pregnancy; lowers the incidence of low birth weight, reduces iron deficiency anemia in children; and promotes optimum growth and development of infants and young children. Ensuring high program participation enhances the health of low-income women, infants and children.

How are we doing? In San Luis Obispo County, the average number of women, infants and children participating in the WIC program in FY 2011-12 was 4,903 a month or 98.6% of the State allocated caseload target (4,975). Our counties attainment of 99% of allocated caseload rate is a notable achievement when compared to most comparable counties and the state as a whole.

Benchmark data for FY 2011-12: Marin – 92% (3,278); Monterey – 97.0% (21,589); Napa – 96.5% (3,955); Placer – 100% (4,475); Santa Barbara – 96.3% (18,405); Santa Cruz – 96.9% (9,620); Statewide - 95% (1,474,666).

8. Performance Measure: Youth smoking rate (proportion of youth in 11th grade who have smoked cigarettes within the past 30 days).

07-08 Actual Results	08-09 Actual Results	09-10 Actual Results	10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Adopted	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Target
20%	Biennial Survey	16%	Biennial Survey	15%	Results not available	Biennial Survey

What: Measures the proportion of our County youth in the 11th grade who have smoked cigarettes within the past 30 days, based on the Healthy Kids Survey conducted every two years by the California Department of Education.

Why: Among young people, the short-term health consequences of smoking include respiratory illness, addiction to nicotine, and the associated risk of abusing alcohol and/or drugs. Most young people who smoke regularly continue to smoke throughout adulthood. According to the 2007 National Survey on Drug Use and Health, the rate of illicit drug use was almost 9 times higher among youths aged 12 to 17 who smoked cigarettes in the past month (47.3 %) than it was among youths who did not smoke cigarettes in the past month (5.4 %).

How are we doing? No new data is available at this time. The San Luis County Office of Education had planned on initiating a survey in Spring but due to lack of funding, the survey was not completed. It is anticipated that the Department will be notified by school personnel in late August of the status of the survey. School personnel involved in the survey are off for the summer. The last reported data from the 2010 California Healthy Kids Survey for San Luis Obispo County reflected a 4% drop from the previous survey in 2008. Of the 1,763

students, 282 (16%) indicated they had smoked cigarettes within the past 30 days. Teen smoking rates have been in decline since 1996. The decline in smoking rates can be attributed to the overall perception that smoking is harmful to their health, increased laws which ban smoking in indoor and outdoor areas, the increased cost due to higher taxes, and the change in social norms attributable to work in the tobacco control field for the past 20 years.

The July 2010 Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) Morbidity and Mortality Weekly report, indicated that the percentage of high school students nationally who are current users of tobacco was 19.5%. California tends to have one of the lowest smoking rates nationwide, and our County even more so, such that the fact that the 11th graders in this county have a lower rate than the national rate.

The California Healthy Kids Survey 2009 benchmark data indicates: 14% of 11th graders smoked in Kern County, 14% in Ventura, 13% in Monterey, 12% in Santa Cruz, and 15% in Santa Barbara.

9. Performance Measure: Adult smoking rates.

07-08 Actual Results	08-09 Actual Results	09-10 Actual Results	10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Adopted	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Target
Biennial survey	11.1% (2007 survey)	Biennial survey	15.1% (2009 survey)	Biennial Survey	Biennial Survey	10%

What: This measure is based on the proportion of adults who smoke based on the California Health Interview Survey (CHIS), which is completed every two years.

Why: The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) reports that, in addition to the well-known association with lung cancer, cigarette smoking also increases the risk for heart disease and stroke. On average, someone who smokes a pack or more of cigarettes per day lives seven years less than someone who never smoked.

How are we doing? Recent data, reflected in the 2009 California Health Interview Survey (CHIS), asserts that the percent of adults over 18 who smoke every day in the state of California is 23.5%. The same survey reflected that in SLO County, the adult smoking rate was 15.1%. There are several factors that contribute to the relatively low smoking rate in San Luis Obispo. San Luis Obispo tends to be more affluent and have higher education rates than the population of California as a whole, and smoking is inversely related to socioeconomic status. The Tobacco Control Program has also been effectively working with local jurisdictions to create retail licensing ordinances, and ordinances to ban smoking in outdoor areas. Research indicates that the more environmental restrictions there are, and the higher the cost of cigarettes, the lower the rate of smoking overall.

Benchmark data from the 2009 California Health Interview Survey includes: Kern County: 15.4%, Ventura: 11.2%, Santa Barbara: 9%, Santa Cruz: 12.1% and Monterey: 10.8%.

Department Goal: Protect against environmental hazards.

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

10. Performance Measure: Percentage of Small Water systems in compliance with State or Federal bacteriological drinking water standards.

07-08 Actual Results	08-09 Actual Results	09-10 Actual Results	10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Adopted	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Target
97.1%	96.8%	96.3%	95.7%	96%	95.4%	96%

What: San Luis Obispo County regulates approximately 150 small water systems that supply water to approximately 20% of our county. Water samples are tested for total coliform bacteria, which is the standard test for complying with bacteriological drinking water standards.

Why: Water systems contaminated with fecal material can cause diseases such as typhoid fever, cholera, shigella and cryptosporidiosis. By performing routine inspections for coliform bacteria on water systems and requiring repairs and improvements to water systems that repeatedly fail bacteriologic standards, we will improve the healthfulness of the drinking water supply and reduce the risk of disease.

How are we doing? In FY 2011-12, 95.4% (1,952 out of 2,047) of the routine water samples were in compliance with the drinking water standards, compared to 95.7% (1,950 out of 2,039) in FY 2010-11. Overall, compliance rates have remained relatively stable. We continue to monitor this indicator to ensure that there is no dramatic decrement in our drinking water systems and to continue to strive for improvement. When a sample fails, the water system operator is notified immediately and instructed on how to resolve the problem. Follow-up samples are taken until the small water system passes.

Benchmark data from other counties are not available.

Department Goal: Promote accessible, appropriate and responsive health services to all members of the community.

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

11. Performance Measure: Percentage of pregnant and parenting women with a positive drug and/or alcohol screen or admitted substance abuse who are enrolled in Public Health Nursing Case Management Services and receiving follow-up.

07-08 Actual Results	08-09 Actual Results	09-10 Actual Results	10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Adopted	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Target
59.1%	63.3%	66%	61%	65%	59%	65%

What: Measures the percentage of pregnant and parenting women who are referred to our County's Public Health Nursing case management services due to a positive drug and/or alcohol screen or who admitted substance abuse and subsequently enroll in Public Health Nursing Case Management programs.

Why: Using alcohol, drugs or smoking during pregnancy can substantially affect newborn health and increase the healthcare costs associated with the newborn. The percentage is a measure of how well the program reaches and enrolls this very high-risk target population.

How are we doing? In FY 2011-12, Public Health Nursing received referrals of 81 pregnant and parenting women with substance abuse issues. Public Health Nursing Case Management Services enrolled 48 of the 81 women (59%). Of the 33 not served, 11 were not able to be located, 1 client moved out of county, and 12 declined by mutual consent because they were currently receiving case management services from other agencies. The remaining clients were placed on a wait list. The nurse case managers prioritize the wait list to determine which clients are at the highest risk. These clients become priority to be seen. Data from benchmark counties are not available.

GOALS AND PERFORMANCE MEASURES

Department Goal: To help individuals experiencing severe mental illness or serious emotional disturbance to be as functional and productive as possible in the least restrictive and least costly environments.

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

1. Performance Measure: Rate of Client Satisfaction with County Mental Health Services.

07-08 Actual Results	08-09 Actual Results	09-10 Actual Results	10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Adopted	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Target
84%	92%	89%	91%	89%	N/A	89%

What: Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS) require client satisfaction surveys to be completed by Medi-Cal beneficiaries. The State previously performed the survey independent of the County Mental Health Plans. The State discontinued sending the surveys to the beneficiaries in 2009 due to budget cuts. A local survey, based on the State's previously provided survey, is now given to all clients receiving mental health services during one-week periods in November and May of each fiscal year. Clients surveyed include both youth and adult. The indicators for the client satisfactions surveys are Access to Service, Cultural Sensitivity, Participation in Treatment Planning, Outcomes and General Satisfaction. The rate is an average for all indicators, with the maximum possible score of 100%. The following rate ranges are indicative of the following responses: 70-79% "satisfactory", 80-89% "above satisfactory" and 90-100% "excellent".

Why: Client satisfaction is one indicator of the quality of services provided for mental health services.

How are we doing? During November 2010 and May 2011, the results from 494 client surveys indicated a client satisfaction rating of 91% for FY 2010-11. The November 2011 and May 2012 Statewide surveys were cancelled due to the State's direction and pending clarification of the survey requirements, so there are no results available to report for FY 2011-12. The next Statewide Consumer Satisfaction Survey is scheduled to be administered August 20-24, 2012. Other comparable county results are not published by the State and thus unavailable for comparison purposes.

2. Performance Measure: Day Treatment Days Provided to Youth in Out-of-County Group Home Facilities.

07-08 Actual Results	08-09 Actual Results	09-10 Actual Results	10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Adopted	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Target
2,067	2,692	2,212	2,937	2,283	1,501	2,200

What: The County is responsible for placing youth in residential environments that are safe and fosters support for therapeutic interventions when their home is not an option. This measure reflects the number of day treatment days received by youth who are residing in an out-of-county Rate Classification Level (RCL) 14 group home. RCL 14 is the highest service level classification for State residential treatment facilities and group homes. Youths are placed in RCL 14 group homes by the Department of Social Services, Probation and School Districts.

Why: Youths placed in out-of-county group homes receive the most expensive form of treatment that is reserved for youths who are severely emotionally disturbed. Youth mental health outpatient services are designed to minimize placements in RCL 14 group homes, whenever possible.

How are we doing? Actual day treatment days reported for FY 2011-12 are 1,501, which is lower than the 2,283 days budgeted and significantly lower than the 2010-11 actual results of 2,937. During 2011-12 the average monthly count in group homes was 7 clients, which is a significant decrease from the 2010-11 average monthly count of 11 clients placed in group homes. Collaborations between the County and School Districts have been successful in both moving group home clients into lower levels of care and providing a network of care to allow more youth to remain in the community, thereby reducing the overall group home client counts and spending within reduced budget levels. For 2011, our County was above the average number of day treatment days based on comparable counties and slightly below the statewide average. A report by APS Healthcare, California's External Quality Review Organization (EQRO), found that for calendar year 2011, San Luis Obispo County provided day treatment services to 0.06% of its Medi-Cal eligible youth population compared to 0.04% for all medium sized counties and 0.07% for all counties statewide.

**Behavioral Health
Fiscal Year 2012-2013 Proposed Budget**

Fund Center 166

3. Performance Measure: Net Mental Health Services Act (MHSA) operating cost per full service partnership enrollee.						
07-08 Actual Results	08-09 Actual Results	09-10 Actual Results	10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Adopted	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Target
\$13,446	\$15,711	\$10,319	\$12,140	\$16,000	\$13,940	\$12,500
<p>What: The Community Services and Support component of the MHSA includes full service partnership (FSP) programs that are designed to provide "whatever it takes" services to clients, but if not monitored can be very expensive. The cost per FSP enrollee is determined by taking the net amount of FSP dollars used for client services, which takes into consideration any reimbursements from Medi-Cal and Early Periodic, Screening, Diagnosis & Treatment (EPSDT), and then divided by the number of enrollees served.</p> <p>Why: This measure was intended to be used to review relative spending per FSP enrollee compared to other counties once it becomes available from the State. In addition, this measure provides a treatment cost comparison between FSP enrolled individuals and non-FSP enrolled individuals. The cost per non-FSP enrollee is approximately \$2,503 per year. FSP clients require the most intensive services, which results in a higher cost per individual.</p> <p>How are we doing? In FY 2011-12, the net MHSA operating cost per FSP enrollee was \$13,940 (\$2,927,483 cost divided by 210 clients served). This is an increase from FY 2010-11 but lower than the FY 2011-12 Adopted. In FY 2011-12 FSP expenditures increased 2% while FSP Medi-Cal and EPSDT revenue saw a 14% reduction compared to the prior year. The increase in expenditures and decrease in revenue was caused by a 6% reduction in clients served compared to FY 2010-11. As a result of the fixed nature of these expenses, the net cost per enrollee increased. Comparison performance outcome data is not available from the State.</p> <p>(Data Source: Mental Health Services Act System and Enterprise Financial System)</p>						
4. Performance Measure: Average Annual Cost of Services per Unduplicated Medi-Cal Client.						
07-08 Actual Results	08-09 Actual Results	09-10 Actual Results	10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Adopted	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Target
\$4,767	\$5,969	\$5,073	\$5,033	\$5,050	\$4,346	\$5,060
<p>What: This measure calculates the annual cost of Medi-Cal services divided by annual Medi-Cal clients served based on Medi-Cal approved claims.</p> <p>Why: Since the majority of our clients are on Medi-Cal, comparing the cost per client with other comparable counties provides an indicator regarding cost efficiency based on the number of clients served and the relative cost to serve those clients.</p> <p>How are we doing? For FY 2010-11, the cost per Medi-Cal client served was \$5,033 (\$16,273,165/3,233 clients) and the average cost per youth client was \$7,463 (\$11,164,648/1,496 clients), while the average cost per adult client was \$2,941 (\$5,108,517/ 1,737 clients). For FY 2011-12, the cost per Medi-Cal client served declined to \$4,364 (\$16,793,128/3,848 clients), as a result of a 19% increase in clients served, while costs increased by only 3%. The average cost per youth client in FY 2011-12 was \$6,950 (\$10,495,050/1,510 clients), while the average cost per adult client was \$2,694 (\$6,298,078/ 2,338 clients). The higher cost per client in youth versus adult services reflects SLO County's efforts to maintain children in their homes and foster homes by providing more intensive services (i.e. Therapeutic Behavioral Services and Wraparound), thereby avoiding placement in out-of-county group homes.</p> <p>1) The percent of Medi-Cal eligible persons in the county who actually receive services is referred to as the penetration rate. For calendar year 2010, the latest available California External Quality Review Organization (EQRO) report shows San Luis Obispo County's penetration rate was 8.64%, versus 5.80% for other medium size counties and 6.15% for all counties statewide.</p> <p>2) San Luis Obispo County sees more age 6-17 clients as a percentage than other counties. For 2010, EQRO reports San Luis Obispo County's penetration rate for children ages 6-17 was 11.02%, 60% higher than the average for other medium size counties at 6.88% and 42% more than the statewide county average of 7.75%.</p>						
5. Performance Measure: Percentage of Readmission to the Psychiatric Health Facility (PHF) Within 30 Days of Discharge.						
07-08 Actual Results	08-09 Actual Results	09-10 Actual Results	10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Adopted	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Target
9%	9%	11%	11%	11%	9.4%	11%
<p>What: The percentage of clients who are readmitted to the PHF within 30 days from their prior discharge. The 30-day readmission rate is a standard performance measure used in both private and public hospitals.</p> <p>Why: Low readmission rates indicate that clients are being adequately stabilized prior to discharge.</p> <p>How are we doing? For FY 2011-12, the client readmission rate within 30 days to the PHF was 9.4% (112 readmissions/1,186 admits), which reflects a steady stabilization of the rate over the past several months.</p>						

**Behavioral Health
Fiscal Year 2012-2013 Proposed Budget**

Fund Center 166

As a comparator, Sacramento County experienced a readmission rate of 10% to 18% in previous years and reports that their rate increased due to the poor economy and decreases in outpatient services. Santa Barbara reported an increase in the readmission rate for their PHF from 9.6% in FY 2008-09 to 12.5% in FY 2009-10, dropping to 10% in FY 2011-12. In San Luis Obispo County, we saw similar issues in past years, including more homeless clients and clients with increased drug and alcohol problems, but conditions have now improved, and our readmission rate stabilized earlier this year.

Division Treatment Goal: To reduce alcohol and other drug-related problems among program participants who access services in regional clinics that provide efficient, high quality, intensive treatment services to community members desiring recovery from the misuse of alcohol and/or other drugs.

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

6. Performance Measure: Percentage of clients who report reduced or eliminated drug and/or alcohol use in the 30 days prior to leaving Drug and Alcohol Services (DAS) treatment.

07-08 Actual Results	08-09 Actual Results	09-10 Actual Results	10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Adopted	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Target
87%	85%	88%	86%	86%	87%	86%

What: Decreased or eliminated drug and alcohol use demonstrates the impact of treatment and its subsequent effect on behavior.

Why: Successful recovery involves positive lifestyle changes.

How are we doing? This measure coincided with the implementation of the California Outcomes Measurement System (CalOMS) administered by the California Department of Alcohol and Drug Programs. For the 839 treatment program participants discharged in FY 2011-12, the rate of participants demonstrating reduced or eliminated drug and/or alcohol use was 87% or 727 clients. This includes 643 participants who completed their treatment program and reported/demonstrated decreased or eliminated drug and alcohol use at discharge and 84 participants who did not complete their treatment program but reported/demonstrated decreased or eliminated drug and alcohol use prior to leaving treatment services. Outcome of treatment is determined by self-report and verified using drug test by urinalysis.

It should be noted that some program participants are discharged for non-compliance or for simply failing to show for treatment after a prolonged period of time. This tends to lower the rate of demonstrated improvement for the group as a whole. For comparison, the average rate of reported reduction in drug/alcohol use with treatment for all California counties in FY 2011-12 was 81%, which represents 78,396 of 96,576 discharged participants.

(Data Source: California Outcome Measurement System, CalOMS)

7. Performance Measure: Percentage of Drug and Alcohol treatment clients who state overall satisfaction with Treatment Programs as measured by the client satisfaction survey at the levels of "Very Satisfied" or "Extremely Satisfied".

07-08 Actual Results	08-09 Actual Results	09-10 Actual Results	10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Adopted	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Target
87%	90%	94%	92%	91%	91%	91%

What: The client satisfaction survey is used to measure program satisfaction within Drug & Alcohol treatment programs.

Why: Because Drug and Alcohol Services is committed to providing high quality service, client satisfaction is an indication of program quality. The client satisfaction survey allows us to improve our programs based on participant feedback.

How are we doing? Of the 506 treatment clients surveyed in FY 2011-12, 390 surveys were returned for a return rate of 77%. Of those returned surveys, 91% indicated overall high satisfaction (Very Satisfied or Extremely Satisfied rating) with the treatment program and their experience at Drug & Alcohol Services. While the survey includes varying aspects of the client's experience with Drug & Alcohol, this measure is based on the client's response to the survey question of "overall satisfaction" with services. Because satisfaction rates are not part of the statewide CalOMS database, no comparison data is available.

(Data Source: Client Satisfaction Survey)

Division Prevention Goal: To reduce alcohol and other drug-related problems by providing high quality evidence based prevention strategies in the community.

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

8. Performance Measure: Percentage of the County's population reached through Drug & Alcohol Prevention services.

07-08 Actual Results	08-09 Actual Results	09-10 Actual Results	10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Adopted	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Target

**Behavioral Health
Fiscal Year 2012-2013 Proposed Budget**

Fund Center 166

11%	15%	11%	10%	10%	10%	10%
<p>What: The percentage of the County's population reached through Drug and Alcohol Services Prevention campaigns and activities, which engage community members by providing education and information about alcohol and other drugs along with positive alternatives to alcohol and drug use.</p> <p>Why: The Office of National Drug Control Policy has stated that prevention services are considered an industry best practice in reducing the risk factors associated with drug and alcohol use.</p> <p>How are we doing? During FY 2011-12, 26,568 county residents or 9.9% (26,568 out of 269,337) were reached through a variety of activities and campaigns including countywide information, education and interventions provided by County Prevention Services. The State instituted the CalOMS data measurement system for County prevention providers in 2008. Based on that system, the number of individuals reached in FY 2011-12 by all CA county substance abuse prevention efforts statewide was 2%. Historically SLO County has made prevention a priority and has allocated proportionally more funding toward prevention than many other counties. The County has also been successful at being awarded prevention grants.</p> <p>(Data Source: California Outcomes Measurement System -- Prevention)</p>						

GOALS AND PERFORMANCE MEASURES

Department Goal: To provide for the safety, permanence and well being of children.

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

1. Performance Measure: Percentage of children reentering foster care within 12 months of being reunified with their families.

07-08 Actual Results	08-09 Actual Results	09-10 Actual Results	10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Adopted	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Target
17.2%	14.05%	7.45%	14%	5.3%	14.13%	10%

What: This performance measure tracks the percentage of children who must return to foster care after being returned to their families, if the reentry occurs within 12 months of the return.

Why: Both safety and stability are important to the well being of children. One of the goals of Child Welfare is to create permanency in the lives of children and the families to which they belong; if children are removed from their parents, later reunified and then removed a subsequent time, they may suffer emotional harm. The goal of Child Welfare is to create stability, and a higher rate suggests instability.

How are we doing? The County is above the State average (11.87%) by 2.26% and below the Comparison County average (15.67%) by 1.54%. Due to reporting delays with the State, the available data is through the quarter ending March 2012. Actual results reflect the yearly average. In the month of June 2012, 10 out of 116 children returned to foster care. The current year's results are similar to the prior year's results. Our goal in the current year was ambitious, but an increasingly challenging caseload in our Child Welfare Services program put this goal out of our reach.

2. Performance Measure: Percentage of child abuse/neglect referrals where a response is required within 10 days that were responded to timely.

07-08 Actual Results	08-09 Actual Results	09-10 Actual Results	10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Adopted	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Target
69.78%	88.73%	94.1%	96.7%	96.1%	97.33%	98%

What: Child Welfare referrals may warrant either an "Immediate" response or a "10-day" response, depending on the severity of the allegation. The Department has performed consistently well on its Immediate Responses, but seeks to improve its responsiveness on 10-Day referrals.

Why: Delays in responding to an allegation could result in ongoing abuse or neglect. An earlier intervention may reduce the risk of injury or the need to remove a child from the parents' care.

How are we doing? The County is above the State average (92.23%) by 5.1% and above the Comparison Counties (91.97%) by 5.36%. Due to reporting delays from the State, the available data is through the quarter ending March 2012. Actual results reflect the yearly average. In the month of March 2012, 396 out of 404 referrals were responded to within the 10-day time frame. The Department's results have improved with additional training as well as monitoring the response rates of each social worker on a monthly basis.

3. Performance Measure: Percentage of children in out-of-home care who are placed with all of their siblings.

07-08 Actual Results	08-09 Actual Results	09-10 Actual Results	10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Adopted	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Target
59.7%	55.5%	61%	67.8%	60%	68.83%	65%

What: This performance measure demonstrates the extent to which the County places siblings together, thereby maintaining the family to the greatest extent possible.

Why: Maintaining family bonds are important to children, and particularly so when they have been removed from their parents. This is a required Federal/State Outcome Measurement under the "Child Welfare System Improvement and Accountability Act" (AB 636). This legislation was designed to improve outcomes for children in the child welfare system while holding county and state agencies accountable for the outcomes achieved. This data is derived from the "California-Child and Family Services Review (C-CFSR).

How are we doing? The County is above the State average (55.3%) by 13.53% and above the Comparison County average (51.97%) by 16.86%. Due to reporting delays from the State, the figures are from the quarter ending March 2012. The County's results in this measure are above target by 8.83%. Several factors impact this measure, including severity of abuse and the nature of sibling relationships. Our Department's practice in "Team Decision Making" and "Family Group Conferencing," as well as our county's higher than average rate of placements into relatives' homes, all support the opportunity for siblings to be placed together. Actual results reflect the yearly average. In the month of June 2012, 155 out of 227 children were placed with all of their siblings.

Social Services
Fiscal Year 2012-13 Proposed Budget

Fund Center 180

Department Goal: To provide services in a manner that is both effective and efficient.

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

4. Performance Measure: Percentage of General Assistance funds recouped through Supplemental Security Income (SSI) or other repayments.

07-08 Actual Results	08-09 Actual Results	09-10 Actual Results	10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Adopted	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Target
27%	26%	42%	45.49%	55%	24.16%	40%

What: General Assistance is a County General Funded cash program of "last resort" for individuals not currently eligible for other programs. To the extent that the SSI program reimbursements or beneficiary repayments result in cost offsets, the burden on local taxpayers is reduced.

Why: The Department engages in an SSI Advocacy program, working to assist individuals who are disabled in applying for SSI and thereby improving their economic situation while reducing the burden on local taxpayers.

How are we doing? We are below the adopted target (55%) by 30.84%. The figures are through the month ending June 30, 2012. Although the Department advocates on behalf of SSI applicants, not all clients are eligible, resulting in the possible unavailability of recoupment to the County at any given time. A reduction in results may indicate that the Social Security Administration is processing eligibility notifications and awarding SSI payments in a timely manner to the applicants. This would result in less General Assistance being paid out by the County and consequently fewer recoupments. State or comparable County data is not available.

5. Performance Measure: Average Medi-Cal cases per case manager (reflects average of the intake and continuing caseloads).

07-08 Actual Results	08-09 Actual Results	09-10 Actual Results	10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Adopted	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Target
129 cases	140 cases	207 cases	229.25 cases	250 cases	223.25 cases	230 cases

What: Caseload size is a benchmark of efficiency and effectiveness.

Why: The Department tries to strike a careful balance between efficiency and effectiveness. Caseloads that are too high jeopardize the ability to serve the medically needy, while caseloads that are too low may indicate inefficient deployment of limited resources.

How are we doing? Available data is through the quarter ending June 30, 2012. Fluctuations in actual results are due to changes in staffing levels during the year. The average for FY 2011-12 was 223.25 cases, but the actual for the quarter ending June 30, 2012 was 212 cases. State or comparable county data is not available.

6. Performance Measure: The number of cases per Social Worker in Child Welfare Services (CWS).

07-08 Actual Results	08-09 Actual Results	09-10 Actual Results	10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Adopted	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Target
ER-14	ER-13	ER-17	ER-22	ER-11	ER-31	ER-11
FM-16	FM-15	FM-14	FM-10	FM-13	FM-10	FM-11
FR-11	FR-10	FR-10	FR-11	FR-12	FR-12	FR-12
PP-33	PP-28	PP-24	PP-23	PP-19	PP-24	PP-19

What: This performance measure reflects the workloads of Social Workers in each division of CWS: Emergency Response (ER); Family Maintenance (FM); Family Reunification (FR); and Permanency Placement (PP).

Why: This is an important measure because it reflects the number of cases per Social Worker in our four CWS programs. If the cases per Social Worker are too high, the worker may be overburdened and quality affected. Caseloads per worker that are too low may imply reduced efficiency.

How are we doing? The cases for ER are above the adopted target (11) by 20 cases, and PP (19) by 5 cases. Cases are below the adopted target for FM (13) by 3 cases and on target for FR (12) cases. In 2000, the State legislature sponsored a study of Social Workers' caseloads that concluded that they were too heavy by half, and identified optimum standards, as follows: ER-9.88; FM-10.15; FR-11.94; PP-16.42. To help address this problem, significant augmentations of \$700,000, paid entirely with Federal and State funds, have been made each year since that time, accessible only if the entire CWS allocation is spent. In addition, the County has been the recipient of \$1.37 million in additional CWS funds due to its role as a "Pilot County" for Child Welfare Services improvement strategies. To the extent that we spend the money on staff (and we divide it between staff and contracted services), we experience a reduction in average staff caseloads. The available data is through June 30, 2012. State or comparison county data is not available.

Department Goal: To enhance opportunities for individuals to achieve self-sufficiency

**Social Services
Fiscal Year 2012-13 Proposed Budget**

Fund Center 180

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

7. Performance Measure: Percentage of Welfare to Work participants meeting the Federal Work Participation requirements.

07-08 Actual Results	08-09 Actual Results	09-10 Actual Results	10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Adopted	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Target
35.3%	33.3%	35.1%	35.1%	25%	35.1%	30%

What: While some CalWORKs participants may be exempt from work participation requirements due, for example, to the presence of very young children in the home, most are required to participate in some form of work activity. This performance measure demonstrates the extent to which the County is successful in engaging non-exempt families' participation in a negotiated plan to achieve self-sufficiency. The plan may include vocational education, training and other work activities.

Why: The goal of CalWORKs is to assist participants in achieving self-sufficiency. Participation in work-related activities, including unsubsidized employment and vocational training, is key to improving participants' opportunities for financial independence.

How are we doing? This was previously the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) Work Participation Rate. The Federal Deficit Reduction Act changed the requirements, the calculations and the targets, and the transition to the new methodology has been a challenge. The State has changed the process of their system and is utilizing the "E2Lite" system for retrieving data. Additional focus on this activity has resulted in early increases in the rate, but the County clearly needs to continue that improvement. The County is above the State average (29.2%) by 5.9% and above comparison counties average (23.3%) by 11.8%. Among "medium-sized counties," San Luis Obispo ranks #1. The rate is based on a state sample-monthly average per state report: 396 participating out of 1,129. The target for FY 2011-12 was reduced by 10% due to the reduction in child care funding. Note that Actual Results have changed from what was shown in the Final Budget for FY 2008-09 (from 29.3% to 33.3%). The change is due to the addition of actual figures for the quarter ending September 2008, which weren't available previously.

8. Performance Measure: Percent of CalWORKs Adult Participants with earnings.

07-08 Actual Results	08-09 Actual Results	09-10 Actual Results	10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Adopted	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Target
37.4%	32.8%	30.83%	29.7%	30%	27.3%	30%

What: This performance measure tracks the number of CalWORKs participants who have some earned income.

Why: The goal of CalWORKs is to assist participants in achieving self-sufficiency. Participation in work-related activities—especially unsubsidized employment—is key to improving participants' opportunities for financial independence. Unsubsidized employment has been demonstrated to be the most statistically significant activity leading to participants' eventual departure from public assistance.

How are we doing? The County outperforms the State average (24.97%) by 2.33% and is below the Comparison Counties average (28.43%) by 1.13%. Data is through the quarter ending March 31, 2012. San Luis Obispo County maintains a focus both on employment and on eliminating barriers to employment. Since the implementation of CalWORKs, the County has combined the eligibility and employment services functions into a single classification, contrary to the separation of responsibilities that is practiced in many other counties. This has helped the County's staff remain focused on self-sufficiency. The economic recession has resulted in fewer employment opportunities for CalWORKs participants. Note that Actual Results have changed from what was shown in the Final Budget for FY 2009-10 (from 32.4% to 30.83%). The change is due to the addition of actual figures for the quarter ending June 2010, which weren't available previously. Actual results reflect the yearly average. In the month of March 2012, 281 out of 1,029 participants had earnings. The target for FY 2011-12 was reduced by 5% due to the reduction in child care funding.

Department Goal: To provide for the safety of disabled adults and seniors who are at risk of abuse or neglect.

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

9. Performance Measure: Average IHSS cases per Social Worker.

07-08 Actual Results	08-09 Actual Results	09-10 Actual Results	10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Adopted	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Target
132.03 cases	160.35 cases	170 cases	163 cases	174 cases	134.03 cases	150 cases

What: This measures the average number of continuing In-Home Supportive Services (IHSS) cases per Social Worker.

Why: This is an important measure because it reflects the number of cases per Social Worker in our In-Home Supportive Services program. If the cases per Social Worker are too high, the worker may be overburdened and work quality affected. Caseloads per worker that are too low may imply reduced efficiency.

How are we doing? The County is below the FY 2011-12 adopted target by 39.97 cases. Data is through the quarter ending June 30, 2012. Data for State and comparison counties is not available. New assessment and documentation requirements, coupled with increases in the number of severely impaired program participants, have resulted in additional workload for staff even as the administrative allocation

**Social Services
Fiscal Year 2012-13 Proposed Budget**

Fund Center 180

from the State has not kept pace with the cost of doing business. Rising caseloads per worker threaten the accuracy and efficiency of program operations. While no study of optimal workload standards has been conducted, it is the sense of the Department that full program integrity and responsiveness cannot be achieved when the average caseload per worker exceeds 100. The IHSS caseload has fallen by 18% from FY 2010-11.

10. Performance Measure: Percentage of all disabled adults and seniors who were victims of substantiated abuse or neglect and did not have another substantiated report within a 12-month period.

07-08 Actual Results	08-09 Actual Results	09-10 Actual Results	10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Adopted	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Target
91%	85%	93%	90%	93%	91%	93%

What: This measure demonstrates the extent to which initial interventions by Social Services were effective.

Why: This performance measure reflects effectiveness of initial services and quality of assessment. It is our commitment to provide long term and intensive case management to prevent any repeat of abuse to disabled adults and seniors. Initial interventions have been effective in reducing risk to the elderly and disabled.

How are we doing? The Department is below the FY 2011-12 adopted target by 2%. Available data is through June 30, 2012. The results in this measure may see higher than average fluctuations due to the fact that the denominator for this measure (the number of adults with an initial abuse 12 months ago) is a small number, which varied between 4 to 28 adults over the last 6 report months. Actual results reflect the yearly average. In the month of June 2012, 9 out of 12 of these disabled adults and seniors did not have another substantiated report within a 12-month period. Reductions in Adult Protective Services funding and staffing have reduced our ability to respond effectively to all reports of abuse and neglect. State or comparable county data is not available.

GOALS AND PERFORMANCE MEASURES

Department Goal: Provide cost effective medical care maintaining the health of County jail inmates.

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

1. Performance Measure: Medical cost per inmate day at the County Jail.

07-08 Actual Results	08-09 Actual Results	09-10 Actual Results	10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Adopted	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Target
\$9.07	\$9.27	\$8.46	\$8.41	\$8.70	\$7.66	\$8.43

What: This shows the average cost per day to provide mandated medical services to adult inmates at the County jail. The measure is calculated by accumulating all costs of providing medical care to inmates and dividing by the product of the average daily inmate census and the number of days in the year.

Why: Medical cost per inmate day is intended to be an efficiency-oriented performance measure reflecting both the cost of providing medical care and the level of demand among jail inmates. This measure has been in place over a period of relative stability in the inmate census and as such has been helpful in monitoring the cost-efficiency of the provision of medical services for jail inmates, against an established standard, \$9/inmate day.

How are we doing: In light of the 2011 Public Safety Realignment (AB 109) which began October 1, 2011, consideration of this performance measure is not as straightforward as it has been in previous years. On the one hand, looking at the 2011-12 result of medical costs per inmate day of \$7.66 (calculated by \$1.898M costs ÷ 679/inmates ÷ 365/days) demonstrates services have been delivered more cost-efficiently. This fact is because while the jail inmate population increased greatly (22%) over the past year (558 to 679), nursing capacity has remained relatively unchanged from 2010-11 to 2011-12. During 2011-12 expenditures did rise \$185K or 11%, but this was almost exclusively the result of increased medical claims and pharmaceutical costs. The cost-efficiency pendulum has swung too far and in 2011-12 staff worked at an unreasonable pace, with some work, such as filing of charts and updating clinical protocols, lagging behind norms. The staffing levels are anticipated to increase in 2012-13 in order to safely and effectively meet the additional inmate population demand for medical care. Therefore, medical cost per inmate day can be expected to return to rates seen in the previous four years. Also, uncertain is the effect on costs due to longer sentences and the ensuing need for attention to chronic diseases and standard preventive health care services, as well as for a potentially sicker inmate population with higher rates of HIV and hepatitis C infection.

GOALS AND PERFORMANCE MEASURES

Department Goal: Provide veterans, their dependents, and survivors with advice on monetary, healthcare, insurance, and other government benefits.

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

1. Performance Measure: Percentage of customer satisfaction surveys which rated the services performed by the Veterans Services Department as "satisfied" or "very satisfied".

07-08 Actual Results	08-09 Actual Results	09-10 Actual Results	10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Adopted	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Target
100%	100%	100%	97%	100%	99.8%	100%

What: A customer satisfaction exit is given to clients throughout the year to evaluate client satisfaction level.

Why: Ensure high quality service and continually assess client needs.

How are we doing? The surveys that the department receives back have consistently maintained a rating from clients of "very satisfied" or "satisfied". The department conducted more than 3,200 interviews and over 12,000 phone calls assisting veterans and their families in FY 2011-12. Due to the continued economic downturn, veterans have been applying for Veterans Administration benefits at a higher than normal rate. This trend continues from FY 2010-11 and is expected to continue at this level until the economy recovers. As the department and the U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs continue to streamline and improve the time it takes to process claims, it is expected that client satisfaction will remain high.

Department Goal: Determine eligibility and file claims for monetary benefits (monthly disability, disability pension, death benefits) and healthcare benefits (medical, dental, vision, prosthetic devices) to ensure that eligible individuals receive the maximum benefit from entitled services.

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

2. Performance Measure: Dollar amount in cash benefits secured for new monetary claims filed (monthly disability, disability pension, death benefits).

07-08 Actual Results	08-09 Actual Results	09-10 Actual Results	10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Adopted	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Target
\$1,813,726	\$1,704,634	\$2,084,287	\$1,500,000	\$2,922,751	\$3,708,374	\$3,500,000

What: The total cash received by clients as a result of the efforts of the department.

Why: This illustrates the desired outcome of ensuring that clients receive maximum entitled benefits.

How are we doing? The total number of claims awarded in FY 2011-12 dropped from 652 in FY 2010-11 to 458 in FY 2011-12. Though the number of claims awarded dropped significantly the value of the claims that were awarded increased substantially. Now that staffing is at full capacity within the department we expect the amount of claims filed to increase and the number of awarded claims to increase as well. Comparable County data is not available.

Department Goal: Obtain free college tuition for eligible dependents of veterans (with service-related disabilities) by authorizing and processing College Fee Waivers with California Community Colleges, California State Universities, or University of California campuses.

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

**Veterans Services
Fiscal Year 2012-13 Proposed Budget**

Fund Center 186

3. Performance Measure: Dollar amount of college tuition saved by eligible dependents due to the College Fee Waiver Program (based upon state negotiated fees with colleges).						
07-08 Actual Results	08-09 Actual Results	09-10 Actual Results	10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Adopted	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Target
\$357,970	\$402,631	\$465,425	\$570,097	\$500,000	462,114	\$465,000
<p>What: Money saved on tuition by eligible dependents.</p> <p>Why: To maximize use of entitled benefits.</p> <p>How are we doing? The State waives fees (California Universities/State Colleges/Colleges) for children of veterans who either have a service connected disability or were killed while on active duty. 114 students applied and 111 were granted this benefit. This is down from 150 last year. The amount of fees waived is dependent upon the type of higher learning institution that the student is attending. The California Department of Veterans Affairs will no longer be recognizing this as auditable claim information, so it is the Veterans Services Department's intent to continue to track this performance measure internally.</p>						
<p>Department Goal: Provide effective veterans assistance to county veterans and their families in a cost-effective manner.</p> <p>Communitywide Result Link: <input type="checkbox"/> Safe <input type="checkbox"/> Healthy <input type="checkbox"/> Livable <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Prosperous <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Well-Governed Community</p>						
4. Performance Measure: Veterans Services expenses as a percentage of the County Budget.						
07-08 Actual Results	08-09 Actual Results	09-10 Actual Results	10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Adopted	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Target
.065%	.065%	.065%	.076%	.075%	.070%	.065%
<p>What: This measure shows the relationship of County Veterans Services expenses to the County's budget by dividing the County Veterans Services net county cost by the County's total budget.</p> <p>Why: County Veterans Services strives to keep costs as low as possible, while providing effective assistance to the County's more than 23,500 civilian veterans and their families (not including active duty military).</p> <p>How are we doing? County Veterans Services operating budget remains consistent with prior years, but is trending downward. The department is applying for new and larger grants to help offset costs to the county. Over all the cost of the Veterans Services Office is about 9% of what the department generates for funds coming into the county for veterans and their dependents from the Federal and State levels. Veterans are provided services by the Veterans Services Office staff consisting of; 1 department head, 3 Veterans Service Representatives (1 temp), 1 Administrative Assistant and 2-3 veteran work studies.</p>						

GOALS AND PERFORMANCE MEASURES

Department Goal: Maintain the water distribution and wastewater collections systems at the County Operations Center to provide safe drinking water, maintain adequate reserves for irrigation and fire fighting to protect the public and environmental health, and ensure regulatory compliance. The County Operations Center customers are other county departments and one private agency, Woods Humane Society.

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

1. Performance Measure: Percentage of days per year that the water system is able to meet mandated water quality standards.

07-08 Actual Results	08-09 Actual Results	09-10 Actual Results	10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Adopted	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Target
100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

What: This measures the percentage of time during the year that the water distribution system is able to meet State and Federal water quality standards.

Why: To insure that the water system provides safe drinking water.

How are we doing? As in the recent past there are no issues to report and the water system continues to meet all Federal, State and local safe drinking water requirements. There is not any standardized comparable data available.

2. Performance Measure: Number of wastewater collection system and water system failures per year.

07-08 Actual Results	08-09 Actual Results	09-10 Actual Results	10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Adopted	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Target
4	2	0	0	0	0	0

What: A count of all incidents of blockages, spills and unscheduled interruption in wastewater service and water system failures.

Why: The number of failures per year can be a reflection of the system integrity. Monitoring the location and frequency of failures will help to identify areas where additional resources may need to be focused in order to assure continued system integrity and to protect the environment.

How are we doing? As in the past 3 reporting periods, no system failures occurred during FY 2011-12.

Construction of the new 10-inch waterline between Chorro Creek Bridge and the new jail facility was completed in FY 2011-12 and included new service lateral installations and replacement of old fire hydrants. The only original piping that remains in the system is on property not owned by the County between the new jail facility and the connection to the State water main on the west end of the County Operations Center.

As previously reported, the sewer line in Oklahoma Avenue at the County Operations Center continues to be an on-going concern with several areas of sewer line with dips that accumulate solids and restrict flow. There are also cracks in the line which allow infiltration to occur. The sewer line is located in an area with a high ground water table so infiltration of ground water can be a serious problem. Operators have to clean the line on a regular basis in order to improve flow. The replacement project is funded at \$330,000 for FY 2012-13. It is anticipated that design of the project will be completed by the end of FY 2012-13 and construction will take place in FY 2013-14. There is not any standardized comparable data available.

Department Goal: Review and approve applications, maps and plans for new development projects in a timely manner to ensure compliance with regulatory requirements, enhance customer service, and protect the public's safety.

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

3. Performance Measure: Annual number of improvement plan reviews per Full Time Equivalent (FTE) employee.

07-08 Actual Results	08-09 Actual Results	09-10 Actual Results	10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Adopted	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Target
66	69	69	90	66	84	85

What: Total number of Improvement Plan reviews by Plan Check Unit divided by the number of Full Time Equivalent (FTE) employees.

Why: Measures the efficiency of the Plan Check Unit in reviewing improvement plans.

How are we doing? We continue to see a leveling-out in the number of public improvement plans being submitted for checking and inspection services (51 plans in FY 2009-10, 49 plans in FY 2010-11 and 41 plans in FY 2011-12), about half of what we processed in FY 2008-09 (98 plans). With only one seasoned staff overseeing the plan check and inspection program our efficiency remains high. We will

continue to adjust staff responsibilities as necessary to best match the economic situation while achieving our target performance standards. No standardized comparable county data available.

4. Performance Measure: Number of weeks to review improvement plans.

07-08 Actual Results	08-09 Actual Results	09-10 Actual Results	10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Adopted	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Target
3.2 weeks 1st submittals	2.0 weeks 1st submittals	2.5 weeks 1st submittals	1.1 weeks 1st submittals	2.5 weeks 1st submittals	1.3 weeks 1st submittals	2.5 weeks 1st submittals
2.2 weeks re-submittals	1.2 weeks re-submittals	2.2 weeks re-submittals	1.0 weeks re-submittals	2.0 weeks re-submittals	1.1 weeks re-submittals	2.0 weeks re-submittals

What: Average time it takes to review public improvement construction plans associated with development after receipt from engineers.

Why: State law requires that improvement plans be acted upon within sixty working days (approximately 12 weeks) of submittal. This measures accomplishment of our goal of timely service.

How are we doing? Staff consistently provides our clients a favorable response time in commencing first submittal and resubmittal plan checks when compared to State law requirements. The depressed economic climate in the development industry continues to equate to fewer projects being processed but this appears to have leveled off. We have adjusted staffing requirements accordingly and have a single experienced staff member overseeing this program while sharing his remaining time on encroachment, special event permits and special projects. No standardized comparable county data available.

5. Performance Measure: Annual number of survey map reviews per Full Time Equivalent (FTE) employee.

07-08 Actual Results	08-09 Actual Results	09-10 Actual Results	10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Adopted	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Target
1,070	1,122	1,330	1,178	1,215	1,212	1,215

What: Total number of survey maps (i.e. any land surveying map that falls under the professional land surveyor act such as records of survey, subdivision maps and corner records) reviews by Surveying Unit divided by the number of Full Time Equivalent (FTE) employees.

Why: Measures the efficiency of the Surveying Unit in reviewing survey maps.

How are we doing? The favorable efficiency continues to be associated with the reduced complexity of the maps being checked and our extremely experienced map check staff. We propose no changes to our FY 2012-13 target because it closely reflects a target efficiency that is achievable by staff. No standardized comparable county data available.

6. Performance Measure: Performance Measure: Number of weeks to review survey maps.

07-08 Actual Results	08-09 Actual Results	09-10 Actual Results	10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Adopted	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Target
1.1 weeks	1.0 weeks	1.1 weeks	1.3 weeks	1.0 Weeks	1.3 weeks	1.0 Weeks

What: Average time from receipt of maps (i.e. any land surveying map that falls under the professional land surveyor act such as records of survey, subdivision maps and corner records) from engineers and surveyors, until response.

Why: State law requires that survey maps be acted upon within 20 working days (approximately 4 weeks) of submittal. This measures accomplishment of our goal of timely service.

How are we doing? For the past four fiscal years our performance continues to closely fluctuate about 1-week, but remains well below the statutory requirement of processing maps within 20 working days (4 weeks). This consistency can be attributed to the fewer number of maps being processed and to the experience of map check staff. No standardized comparable county data available.

7. Performance Measure: Percentage of local engineering and design firms that rate the services provided by Public Works as satisfactory or better.

07-08 Actual Results	08-09 Actual Results	09-10 Actual Results	10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Adopted	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Target
N/A	87%	88%	85%	90%	89%	90%

What: Measures customer satisfaction with Development Services.

Why: Information derived from this survey has historically been used to improve customer service.

How are we doing? Our next annual customer survey will be conducted in May 2013 when we will again solicit customer feedback in at least five areas of Development Services' work. These areas include Surveying Services, Plan Check Services, Inspection Services, Permit Services and response to Public Inquiries. Of the 153 surveys distributed by email in May 2012 we received only 8 responses. Of those respondents we achieved 89% satisfaction, which is just shy of our 90% target. All respondents continue to favorably comment on our staff's excellent customer service.

GOALS AND PERFORMANCE MEASURES

Department Goal: To strengthen our agricultural industries. To conserve our natural resources. To help youth and families grow strong.

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

1. Performance Measure: Percentage of program participants that report a useful gain of knowledge as a result of their participation in an educational program.

07-08 Actual Results	08-09 Actual Results	09-10 Actual Results	10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Adopted	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Target
98%	99%	98%	97%	98%	93%	98%

What: This measure tells us how many participants gained useful information as a result of participating in our educational programs related to agricultural sustainability, natural resource conservation, quality parenting skills, positive youth development, wise nutritional choices or food safety practices.

Why: Knowledge gain is a key factor for positive behavior change.

How are we doing? Program evaluations completed by 220 individuals participating in a random sample of programs conducted during FY 2011-12 indicated there was a useful knowledge gain by 204 or 93% of participants based on information presented in our programs. This was close to our goal for FY 2011-12. Because of the high-quality of our department's educational programming we believe we will be able to attain our projected goal of 98% for FY 2012-13.

2. Performance Measure: Percentage of program participants that report a positive behavior change as a result of their participation in an educational program.

07-08 Actual Results	08-09 Actual Results	09-10 Actual Results	10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Adopted	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Target
94%	90%	89%	87%	92%	80%	92%

What: This measure tells us how many people made a positive behavior change as a result of participation in our education programs related to agricultural sustainability, natural resource conservation, quality parenting skills, positive youth development, wise nutritional choices or food safety practices.

Why: Positive behavior contributes to a livable, prosperous, and/or healthy community.

How are we doing? During FY 2011-12, follow-up surveys conducted after attending an educational program indicated 80% of program participants reported a positive behavior change based on information presented in our programs. Even though this goal was lower than adopted, it is still very high for behavioral change. Surveys are usually conducted 6 to 12 months after completion of educational workshops and seminars and because of the scheduling of the majority of the workshops during the year, follow-up behavioral change surveys were only conducted on two very small workshops for a total of 10 participants, This indicates that the 80% outcome is an not a representative number. More behavioral change surveys will be conducted during FY 2012-13 on workshops conducted both in the FY 2011-12 as well as the FY 2012-13.

3. Performance Measure: Percentage of first year of 4-H Club members that re-enroll for a second year of 4-H membership.

07-08 Actual Results	08-09 Actual Results	09-10 Actual Results	10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Adopted	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Target
65%	66%	70%	68%	72%	71%	72%

What: This measure tracks the number of first year 4-H club members that re-enroll for a second year in the program.

Why: Re-enrollment of 4-H members is an indicator of the quality of the program for members and their parents/guardians.

How are we doing? During FY 2011-12, the 4-H retention rate for eligible first year becoming second year members was 71%. A 71% retention rate was an excellent rate for reenrollment of first-year 4-H members, often reported to be only 50-55% in other locales. The number of members reenrolling for a second year was very impressive at 340 members. Through continued high quality programming efforts during FY 2012-13, we hope to meet our target goal of 72%.

Department Goal: To cost-effectively manage the Farm Advisor Department.

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

4. Performance Measure: San Luis Obispo County fiscal contributions to the Farm Advisor budget based on agricultural acreage as compared to the five county-utilized benchmark counties.

**Farm Advisor
Fiscal Year 2012-13 Proposed Budget**

Fund Center 215

07-08 Actual Results	08-09 Actual Results	09-10 Actual Results	10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Adopted	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Target
\$0.36/ag acre for San Luis Obispo County compared to \$0.69/ag acre for benchmark counties	\$0.35/ag acre for San Luis Obispo County compared to \$1.52/ag acre for benchmark counties	\$0.35/ag acre for San Luis Obispo County compared to \$1.50/ag acre for benchmark counties.	\$0.36/ag acre for San Luis Obispo County compared to \$0.70/ag acre for benchmark counties	\$0.39/ag acre for San Luis Obispo County compared to \$0.71/ag acre for benchmark counties	\$0.38/ag acre for San Luis Obispo County compared to \$0.64/ag acre for benchmark counties	\$0.40/ag acre for San Luis Obispo County compared to \$0.71/ag acre for benchmark counties
<p>What: This measure indicates the County's cost per acre of agricultural land for services provided by the Farm Advisor Department. There are nearly 1.15 million agricultural acres (harvested and rangeland) in the County.</p> <p>Why: This measure demonstrates the cost efficiency of available resources to fund Farm Advisor's programs.</p> <p>How are we doing? San Luis Obispo County continues to receive similar Farm Advisor services at a lower cost per ag acre than the County's utilized benchmark counties. During FY 2011-12, San Luis Obispo County's fiscal contribution to the Farm Advisor Department was \$0.38/agricultural acre, compared to an average of \$0.64/ag acre for our benchmark counties. We expect our FY 2012-13 target goal to reflect a similar spread of cost between SLO County and the benchmark counties at the end of FY 2012-13.</p>						

GOALS AND PERFORMANCE MEASURES

Department Goal: Maintain a good quality county-road system.						
Communitywide Result Link: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Safe <input type="checkbox"/> Healthy <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Livable <input type="checkbox"/> Prosperous <input type="checkbox"/> Well-Governed Community						
1. Performance Measure: Pavement Condition Index (PCI) for ALL county roads.						
07-08 Actual Results	08-09 Actual Results	09-10 Actual Results	10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Adopted	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Target
65	62	65	60	60	58	60
<p>What: Pavement Condition Index, (PCI, also called Pavement Condition Rating) is used to determine the structural condition of road pavement. A PCI of 100 represents a newly constructed road and 70 represents a road that is in fair to good condition.</p> <p>Why: To determine the maintenance needs of the road system and to effectively serve the traveling public. The Board of Supervisors has established the goal of maintaining an overall PCI of 65 or better, with no one road category falling below a PCI of 60.</p> <p>How are we doing? The average overall condition of all County roads has continued to decline slightly from last year. This downward trend is to be expected until the general economic conditions allow for a significant budget increase. To offset this trend the Roads division has made significant changes in maintenance strategy. These changes include much greater use of seal coating, chip sealing and thin pavement overlay treatments. These treatments will not repair bad roads but will arrest deterioration in most cases and help prolong the life of roads in fair to good condition. A long range maintenance strategy has been developed to concentrate efforts on urban streets and roads used most by the traveling public.</p> <p>As of August 2012 the major Arterial roads averaged 62 PCI, the average for all collector roads is 57 and the minor roads are at an average of 59 PCI, down from 62 last year. North County collector roads remain the lowest category of roads with an average PCI of 53, (these roads include some very long and little used roads).</p> <p>In the past year there have been some new roads accepted and some roads annexed by cities to result in a slight net gain in County maintained paved roads from 1,090 miles last year to 1,092 miles this year, (note that this is only "paved" roads, there are 1,337 miles of paved and unpaved county maintained roads). This change in road mileage results in a distribution of; 84.4 miles of Arterial roads, 413.8 miles of major and minor Collector Roads, and 594.1 miles of local roads.</p>						

2. Performance Measure: Collisions per 100 million entering vehicles at non-signalized intersection.						
07-08 Actual Results	08-09 Actual Results	09-10 Actual Results	10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Adopted	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Target
31	29	28	26	28	27	26
<p>What: Number of collisions per 100 million entering vehicles within the unincorporated area of the County (5-year average).</p> <p>Why: To determine if this component of the road system is maintaining its expected safety level. To review possible safety problem areas if the measure exceeds expectations and determine which improvements are warranted.</p> <p>How are we doing? Collisions in unsignalized intersections continue to be significantly below the statewide average of 29 per 100 million entering vehicles at similar State Highway intersections.</p>						

3. Performance Measure: Collisions per 100 million entering vehicles at signalized intersections.						
07-08 Actual Results	08-09 Actual Results	09-10 Actual Results	10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Adopted	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Target
32	30	27	25	27	27	25
<p>What: Number of signalized intersection collisions per 100 million entering vehicles within the unincorporated area of the County (5-year average).</p> <p>Why: To determine if this component of the road system is maintaining its expected safety level. To review possible safety problem areas if the measure exceeds expectations.</p> <p>How are we doing? Collisions at signalized intersections continue to remain below the statewide average of 53 per 100 million vehicles entering signalized intersections. It is anticipated that the collision rate overall will remain constant. However, Public Works will focus efforts on improving those intersections with a higher than average collision rate; this will include evaluating signal timing while looking for other opportunities to improve performance.</p>						

Roads
Fiscal Year 2012-13 Proposed Budget

Fund Center 245

4. Performance Measure: Collisions per 100 million miles on rural roads.						
07-08 Actual Results	08-09 Actual Results	09-10 Actual Results	10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Adopted	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Target
188	172	166	172	166	164	170
<p>What: Number of rural road collisions per 100 million miles traveled within the unincorporated area of the County (5-year average).</p> <p>Why: To determine if this component of the road system is maintaining its expected safety level. To review possible safety problem areas if the measure exceeds expectations. These are arterial, collector, or local roadways that are located outside the urban reserve lines of the communities.</p> <p>How are we doing? The County's rate remains below the statewide average of 189 per 100 million vehicle miles on similar State Highways. Public Works is developing plans to make significant safety improvements on La Panza and Templeton Roads. These should be ready to construct in summer 2013. Public Works will also review roadside delineation in key locations as a means to reduce run-off road collisions.</p>						
5. Performance Measure: Collisions per 100 million miles on suburban roads.						
07-08 Actual Results	08-09 Actual Results	09-10 Actual Results	10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Adopted	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Target
248	248	250	289	248	263	248
<p>What: Number of suburban road collisions per 100 million miles traveled (5-year average). Roads that fall within the urban designation line are considered urban roads and all others are rural.</p> <p>Why: To determine if this component of the road system is maintaining its expected safety level. To review possible safety problem areas if the measure exceeds expectations. These roads are located within the urban reserve lines.</p> <p>How are we doing? The collision rate on suburban roads decreased from what it was in the 2011 calendar year and is lower than the statewide average of 278 per 100 million for collision rates on State highways. The lower collision rates could be the result of continued attention to improved signage, stripping and traffic signal adjustments. Public Works will continue to focus attention on those individual roadways with a higher collision concentration and evaluate opportunities for improvement.</p>						
6. Performance Measure: Bridge sufficiency rating.						
07-08 Actual Results	08-09 Actual Results	09-10 Actual Results	10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Adopted	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Target
90%	91	91%	90%	91%	92%	92%
<p>What: Percentage of bridges with State assigned sufficiency rating over 50.0 (above 50.0 indicates a bridge is in good repair.)</p> <p>Why: To review maintenance and funding needs in order to keep the structures in a good state of repair.</p> <p>How are we doing? FY 2011-12 results are slightly higher than adopted target due to correction on the Bridge List administered by Caltrans. Progress continues on various phases of eight County bridge replacement projects. Construction on the Main Street Bridge at Santa Rosa Creek in Cambria is expected to begin spring 2013. Preliminary Engineering has begun for the replacement of the following five bridges: River Grove Drive at the Estrella River, Cypress Mountain Drive at Klau Creek, Branch Mill Road at Tar Springs Creek, El Camino Real at Santa Margarita Creek, and Air Park Drive at Ocean Beach Lagoon. In addition Preliminary Engineering has begun for seismic retrofit of three bridges; Lopez Drive over Lopez Lake, South Bay Boulevard over Los Osos Creek and Avila Beach Drive over San Luis Obispo Creek (all have bridge sufficiency rating greater than 50).</p>						

GOALS AND PERFORMANCE MEASURES

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

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

1. Performance Measure: Overall average participant satisfaction rating (on a 5 point scale) of training programs offered by the Employee University.

07-08 Actual Results	08-09 Actual Results	09-10 Actual Results	10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Adopted	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Target
4.5	4.6	4.6	4.6	4.6	4.6	4.6

What: Provides data on participant overall satisfaction with Employee University training courses (on a scale of 1-5 with 1 = "poor" and 5 = "outstanding"). This is the first level of program evaluation.

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

How are we doing? Current results indicate that overall, County employees who participated in these classes are highly satisfied with the classes they attended.

GOALS AND PERFORMANCE MEASURES

Department Goal: Cost-effectively operate and maintain County-owned and/or operated parks and recreation facilities to enhance recreational opportunities that meet or exceed customer expectations.

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

1. Performance Measure: Square footage of high maintenance intensive park facilities maintained per full time equivalent employee.

07-08 Actual Results	08-09 Actual Results	09-10 Actual Results	10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Adopted	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Target
185,589 sq.ft./FTE	197,562 sq.ft./FTE	185,807 sq.ft./FTE	185,952 sq.ft./FTE	106,532 sq.ft./FTE	110,832 sq.ft./FTE	106,532 sq.ft./FTE

What: The ratio of full time equivalent Ranger and Maintenance employees to the square feet of park facilities requiring regular, intense maintenance.

Why: County Parks manages over 13,000 acres of parks, trails and open space. However, the developed park facilities such as playgrounds, pools and campsites have the greatest direct impact on field staff resources. These field staff must provide for visitor services and facility needs such as general maintenance, lifeguards, gatehouse, patrol duties, etc. This ratio will track the direct impact of adding or eliminating developed facilities to the County Park system and/or adding or eliminating field staff labor hours for their related maintenance.

How are we doing? County Park's actual results of 110,832 sq.ft./FTE for FY 2011-12 are 4% higher than plan due to decreased work hours available because of staff vacancies. Fewer staff hours were available for park maintenance. These vacant positions have been filled and staff does not anticipate similar vacancies for FY 2012-13. This performance measure continues to include seasonal worker hours along with County Park's regular and supervisory staff hours. Prior to FY 2011-12, only permanent staff hours were included in this calculation. The inclusion of all staff provides a more consistent year over year view of all resources that support high use recreational facilities and parks.

2. Performance Measure: Percentage of reported imminent safety hazards that are abated within one work day.

07-08 Actual Results	08-09 Actual Results	09-10 Actual Results	10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Adopted	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Target
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	98%	97%	98%

What: All reported imminent safety hazards (fallen trees, broken glass, broken play equipment, etc.) are documented and the percentage of imminent safety hazards abated within one work day is tracked and analyzed for trends and recurring hazards. This measure provides a view of staff's ability to abate imminent safety hazards in a timely fashion and provides an overview of how safe the park environment is for visitors.

Why: To ensure a positive recreational experience and limit liability exposure, it is essential that County Parks provides a safe environment for our visitors and staff. Tracking imminent safety hazards and the time necessary for their abatement helps staff to focus on areas of concern, ensures resources are employed effectively and demonstrates our commitment to providing a safe park environment.

How are we doing? County Park's actual results for FY 2011-12 were 1% below the adopted target for this measure. Throughout the park system, staff abated 114 of the 118 identified hazards within one work day. Staff will increase attention to this task and strive to meet the adopted target for FY2012-13.

3. Performance Measure: Percentage of responses to Customer Satisfaction Survey rating overall park and recreation experience as "Satisfactory" or better.

07-08 Actual Results	08-09 Actual Results	09-10 Actual Results	10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Adopted	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Target
N/A	N/A	N/A	93%	90%	95%	93%

What: Customers are randomly surveyed yearly throughout County Regional Parks. This annual customer survey measures overall satisfaction with our customers' parks and recreation experience.

Why: Quality parks and recreation facilities and positive customer satisfaction with their recreational experiences are a key component of any safe, healthy, livable, prosperous and well-governed community. Regularly surveying our customers to find out how they rate their recreational experiences at our facilities provides us with valuable customer information on which to base future resource decisions. Higher customer satisfaction would correlate with increased customer referrals, more visitors and increased revenues.

How are we doing? Approximately 1,200 customers received surveys by e-mail and all customers received hard copy surveys as they entered campgrounds from mid-June to mid-July 2012. The survey received a 19% response rate overall. Of those who responded specifically to Customer Satisfaction questions related to Parks, 95% rated Park's customer service as Satisfactory or better. This strong performance is attributed to staffs' efforts to promote and market park services while enhancing efforts to please customers that arrive in our parks.

Parks
Fiscal Year 2012-13 Proposed Budget

Fund Center 305

4. Performance Measure: Number of Volunteer Work Hours performed yearly in County Parks and facilities.						
07-08 Actual Results	08-09 Actual Results	09-10 Actual Results	10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Adopted	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Target
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	80,000 hrs	109,182 hrs	84,000 hrs

What: Volunteer work hours for County Parks and Facilities are tracked and reported yearly. This data indicates the level of support the public provides in assistance of staff's that maintain County Parks and Facilities. At the same time it provides a measure of the amount of active, health-building hours volunteers spend in County Parks.

Why: Volunteer resources are extremely important to County Parks. As resources and revenues have declined, volunteer resources have become increasingly important to the provision of safe and usable parklands. Staff's efforts to attract and retain volunteers for work in County Parks is critical to ensuring that those who would like to volunteer are provided opportunities, are trained for their work and are guided to perform tasks essential to maintaining the County Park system.

How are we doing? County Park's actual results for FY 2011-12 exceeded the target by 36% with a total of 109,182 volunteer hours. County Parks has seen a significant increase in the number of hours provided by our volunteers. New Adopt A Trail agreements were completed for three separate trails and volunteer work days have increased in number and popularity. Data is not sufficient to determine whether the large increase in volunteerism will be sustained in future years but

GOALS AND PERFORMANCE MEASURES

Department Goal: The overall goal of the County Medical Services Program (CMSP) is to provide access to health care for the medically indigent by efficiently determining program eligibility, authorizing medical care and arranging for services to promptly diagnose and treat medical conditions.

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

1. Performance Measure: Percentage of clients rating CMSP's overall performance as Very Satisfied or Extremely Satisfied.

07-08 Actual Results	08-09 Actual Results	09-10 Actual Results	10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Adopted	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Target
100%	84%	55%	80%	75%	78%	75%

What: The CMSP client satisfaction survey tool is provided as a means of measuring the level of client satisfaction based on their overall CMSP experience. In addition to providing an overall program ranking, the survey questions focus on the client's experience with discrete program components, some of which include the eligibility determination process, utilization review, accounting interaction, and hours of operation. The survey is included as part of the application paperwork process and submitted at the client's convenience.

Why: Because the CMSP is committed to providing high quality service, client satisfaction is one indication of program quality. The client satisfaction survey provides information that contributes to program improvement. The survey is based on the following levels of satisfaction: Extremely Satisfied, Very Satisfied, Satisfied, Unsatisfied, and Very Unsatisfied.

How are we doing? The increase in demand for CMSP services continues to be met without a reciprocal increase in CMSP staffing levels. Longer client wait times during the normal application process as well as increased time to process MediCal pending applicants are a contributing factor in our predicted decline in client satisfaction from the previous year to the current and upcoming year. In FY 2010-11, of the 6,657 applications processed, 201 surveys were completed resulting in 80% satisfaction rate indicating Very Satisfied or Extremely Satisfied with CMSP's overall performance. In 2011-12, of the 6,986 applications processed, 319 Client Satisfaction Surveys were completed with an overall satisfaction rate of 78% (248) of these rated CMSP as Extremely and Very Satisfied. The satisfaction rate should improve this coming year if we continue to stay fully staffed and thus reduce the wait times. Response rates overall continue to be low, and while the percentage of clients rating CMSP services as very or extremely satisfied declined by 2%, the actual number of those who took the time to complete a survey increased by 59%. CMSP staff will continue to seek an increased consumer feedback. (Data Source: CMSP Client Satisfaction Survey)

2. Performance Measure: Percentage of day surgeries referred to surgery centers.

07-08 Actual Results	08-09 Actual Results	09-10 Actual Results	10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Adopted	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Target
14%	19%	44%	31%	45%	43%	40%

What: This measure tracks the percentage of day surgeries that are performed at local surgery centers rather than performed at hospitals. CMSP's Utilization Review nurses have been working with local medical providers and are currently referring day surgery clients to less costly surgery centers when appropriate.

Why: It is well documented that hospitals have much higher overhead and charge approximately twice what a licensed surgery center charges for the same medical procedure. A patient at a licensed surgery center will receive the same level of care as they will at a hospital. CMSP recognizes that it is important to be a good steward of the money entrusted to us by the public. Therefore, when appropriate, we will refer patients to licensed surgery centers in San Luis Obispo County versus the more expensive hospital alternative.

How are we doing? In FY 2011-12, the percentage of day surgeries performed at local surgery centers instead of local hospitals was 43% (76 out of a total of 176 day surgeries). CMSP saved an estimated \$53,200 in 2011-12 by referring patients to licensed day surgery centers (cost of \$500/surgery) instead of performing the surgeries at local hospitals (cost \$1,200/surgery). The CMSP utilization review nurses will continue to balance the needs of patients and the most economical day surgery provider.

There is no comparable county data available. (Data Source: CMSP Medical Payment Tracker)

3. Performance Measure: Average number of CMSP applications pending eligibility determination.						
07-08 Actual Results	08-09 Actual Results	09-10 Actual Results	10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Adopted	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Target
New Measure	New Measure	60	35	50	38	40
<p>What: This measure tracks the quarterly average number of CMSP applications that are awaiting eligibility determination by each of the three Eligibility Technicians (ET's) currently working in CMSP.</p> <p>Why: This measure indicates efficiency in processing CMSP client applications, thus providing access to medical care funding in a timely manner. The lower the number of applicants waiting for their applications to be processed, the faster these clients can receive medical care assistance.</p> <p>How are we doing? In FY 2011-12, the average number of CMSP applications pending eligibility determination on any given day was 38. Given the economic downturn, the total number of CMSP applications continues to increase. Nonetheless, the results are better than the target for the year but just three (3) average cases above last year. The main factor leading to the improved efficiency last fiscal year was the reduction in time permitted for applicants to provide asset verification documentation, down from 21 days to 7 days. This change, initiated in late May 2011, resulted in many fewer open cases, as the vast majority of applicants were able to adjust to the tightened timeline and get all of their verifications in within the 7 day time limit. The increase in pending cases is due to a 4-month leave for one of the three ET's in the 2nd half of FY 2011-12.</p> <p>There is no comparable county data available. (Data Source: MIAMI: Eligibility Update for Pending Eligibility Report and Monthly Eligibility Statistical Report).</p>						

**Driving Under the Influence (DUI) Program
Fiscal Year 2012-13 Proposed Budget**

Fund Center 375

GOALS AND PERFORMANCE MEASURES

Division Goal: To enhance public safety by providing efficient and effective intervention and education to court ordered individuals referred for driving under the influence of alcohol or other drugs.

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

1. Performance Measure: Percentage of First Offender Driving Under the Influence (DUI) program completers who re-offend and are remanded to our Multiple Offender Program within 12 months of First Offender Program completion.

07-08 Actual Results	08-09 Actual Results	09-10 Actual Results	10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Adopted	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Target
New Measure	New Measure	2.7%	1.65%	3%	1%	2%

What: Measures recidivism and effectiveness of the First Offender program.

Why: If our First Offender DUI program is effective, graduates will not be arrested for another alcohol-related driving offense within the first 12-months of graduation from the program. If they do reoffend, they will be remanded to the Multiple Offender program.

How are we doing? For FY 2011-12, the calculated recidivism rate for First Offender DUI program participants was 1%. The recidivism rate was calculated by reviewing each client that graduated from the First Offender DUI program during the time period from 7/1/2010 through 6/30/2011 and determining how many of these clients were remanded to the Multiple Offender DUI program within 12-months of their First Offender completion. Specifically, 594 First Offender DUI program participants completed their program between 7/1/2010 through 6/30/2011 and six (6) re-offended and were remanded to the Multiple Offender DUI Program within 12-months of their completion date, representing the re-offense rate of 1%. The CA State re-offense rate after one year is 3.75%, according to DMV data published in 2012.

(Data Source: Standard Report from DUI Database)

2. Performance Measure: Percentage of participants completing our Client Satisfaction Survey who rate Driving Under the Influence services at the levels of "Very Satisfied" or "Extremely Satisfied".

07-08 Actual Results	08-09 Actual Results	09-10 Actual Results	10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Adopted	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Target
85%	87%	84%	87%	86%	85%	86%

What: Measures client satisfaction with the services provided by Driving Under the Influence staff.

Why: Because Drug and Alcohol Services is committed to providing high quality service, client satisfaction is an indication of program quality. The client satisfaction survey allows us to improve our programs based on participant feedback. The DUI Client Satisfaction Survey offers the following levels of satisfaction: Extremely Satisfied, Very Satisfied, Satisfied, Unsatisfied and Very Unsatisfied. Rates of "high satisfaction" measure the percent of survey respondents who mark "Extremely Satisfied" or "Very Satisfied".

How are we doing? From 1,176 program participants surveyed during FY 2011-12, 869 Scantron surveys were returned for a survey return rate of 74%. Based on the results, 85% (739) of survey respondents rated their experience with the program as Very Satisfied or Extremely Satisfied. Because satisfaction rates are not part of a statewide database, no comparison data is available.

(Data Source: Client Satisfaction Survey)

**Driving Under the Influence (DUI) Program
Fiscal Year 2012-13 Proposed Budget**

Fund Center 375

3. Performance Measure: Percentage of actual Driving Under the Influence (DUI) fees collected.						
07-08 Actual Results	08-09 Actual Results	09-10 Actual Results	10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Adopted	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Target
108%	105%	94%	92%	100%	102%	100%
<p>What: The annual budgeted revenue for Driving Under the Influence Programs is composed entirely of client fees for DUI services. Actual client fees are tracked monthly and are compared to their budgeted target to predict funding availability.</p> <p>Why: Client fees are the only source of revenue for the DUI Program and since it does not receive County General Fund support, the client fees and the collection efforts are critical to the success of County's ability to provide this service.</p> <p>How are we doing? Budgeted DUI fees for FY 2011-12 were \$1,409,207. The actual fee amount collected for FY 2011-12 was \$1,438,987, 2% or \$29,780 greater than targeted. The increased revenue can be attributed to greater collections and increased enrollments for first time offenders.</p> <p>There is no statewide data on DUI Program fee collection trends. (Data Source: Quarterly Dashboard Data Report)</p>						

GOALS AND PERFORMANCE MEASURES

Department Goal: Maximize onsite and remote public access to library materials, services and programs.

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

1. Performance Measure: Annual expenditures per capita for total Library budget.

07-08 Actual Results	08-09 Actual Results	09-10 Actual Results	10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Adopted	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Target
\$33.75	\$38.43	\$35.35	\$35.49	\$35.00	\$35.25	\$34.21

What: The average annual expenditure per capita for the total library budget in libraries serving comparable populations is \$38.62. One hundred seventy-three public libraries serving a population of 100,000 to 249,999 across the nation were used for the statistical sample (*Public Library Data Service 2011*).

Why: Adequate funding is vital to providing excellent library service. Public library funding pays for two services, above all else, 1) staff salaries/benefits, which enable branch libraries to be open to the public and, 2) current books and other library materials. More funding creates more open hours and newer materials for consultation and borrowing. Less funding has the opposite effect. For example, all branch libraries are now closed on Mondays due to inadequate funding.

How are we doing? The total FY 2011-12 per capita expenditures for the Library were slightly below the average for public libraries with comparable populations as reported in a survey by the Public Library Data Service (Statistical Report 2011). This report shows the upper quartile (75%) to be \$49.15 and the lower quartile (25%) to be \$22.40 with a mean of \$38.62. The Library strives to move into the upper quartile. Additional funding would enable the San Luis Obispo County Library to reach its goals of offering adequate, convenient and dependable open hours, materials, and services. Fundraising efforts will continue and may increase the per capita expenditure in the future. The Library's FY 2011-12 amount of \$35.25 was calculated using an estimated population of 241,258 and an \$8,505,077 expenditure amount. *Note – the population of the City of Paso Robles is not included given that the City operates its own library. The population number for the County Library service area is determined by the California Public Library Fund.*

2. Performance Measure: Percentage of hours per week the 15 Branch libraries and the Bookmobile are open to the public as compared to an ideal schedule of hours.

07-08 Actual Results	08-09 Actual Results	09-10 Actual Results	10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Adopted	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Target
367 = 68%	375 = 70%	364 = 68%	360=67%	357 = 66%	360 = 67%	359=67%

What: As noted in the Library's staffing plan, the ideal weekly schedule of open hours is defined by the size of the library (square footage) and the population served. Using these criteria, five library levels have been defined. Ideal open hours per week for the regional branches, (San Luis Obispo City, Atascadero and Arroyo Grande), are 60; large library branches (Los Osos, Morro Bay and Nipomo) are 54; mid-sized library branch (Cambria) are 46; 20 for the small libraries (Cayucos, Creston, Oceano, Santa Margarita, San Miguel, Shandon, and Shell Beach) and 10 hours for Simmler. The total ideal weekly schedule of open hours, system wide, is 538.

Why: Ideal open hours ensure maximum access and utilization by community members.

How are we doing? The Library continues to work towards improving service by creating open schedules that are easier to remember for the public, and offer the maximum number of hours possible with the existing Library staff. With possible additional budget cuts in the near future, the Library's challenge is to keep open hours at existing levels. Increased fund raising and volunteerism may help.

There are no benchmark data available from the Public Library Data Service.

Department Goal: To provide a diverse collection of books, materials and resources to meet research, educational and recreational needs of the community.

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

3. Performance Measure: Annual number of items circulated per capita.

07-08 Actual Results	08-09 Actual Results	09-10 Actual Results	10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Adopted	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Target
7.5	9.2	9.4	10.0	9.9	10.1	10.2

What: The average annual number of items circulated per resident for public libraries serving comparable populations is 9.31. One hundred seventy-four public libraries serving a population of 100,000 to 249,999 across the nation were used for the statistical sample (*Public Library Data Service 2011*).

Why: High circulation reflects success in meeting the educational, and informational needs and recreational reading viewing and listening interests of the community.

How are we doing? The Library exceeded the average annual number of items circulated per resident for public libraries serving comparable populations. Items circulated rates continue to increase as a result of a new approach to displaying and marketing materials to entice the public and encourage browsing (i.e. displaying materials similar to a retail book store and improving the overall décor of the facility). Morro Bay, Oceano, Arroyo Grande and Santa Margarita Libraries have fully incorporated these user-friendly approaches to how services are provided. Other branches will be renovated over the next 5 years. The Library's FY 2011-12 amount of 10.1 is based on an estimated population of 241,258 and a total circulation of 2,436,670. *Note – the population of the City of Paso Robles is not included given that the City operates its own library. The population number for the County Library service area is determined by the California Public Library Fund*

4. Performance Measure: Annual expenditures per capita for library materials to include new and replacement copies.

07-08 Actual Results	08-09 Actual Results	09-10 Actual Results	10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Adopted	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Target
\$3.39	\$3.40	\$2.74	\$2.86	\$2.51	\$2.16	\$2.21

What: The average annual expenditure per capita for library materials in libraries serving comparable populations is \$4.43. One hundred seventy-two public libraries serving a population of 100,000 to 249,999 across the nation were used for the statistical sample (*Public Library Data Service 2011*).

Why: Adequate per capita spending is needed to keep and distribute a viable and current collection of library materials.

How are we doing? Expenditures per capita continue to be low compared to similar public libraries throughout the nation. The Library is well below the national average of \$4.43 as noted above. A future challenge for the Library will be to find additional book/material funding, considering the downsizing of the real estate market and a decrease in property tax revenue (a significant source of funding for the Library). Unfortunately, it is expected the per capita spending growth rate will be slower than hoped in the next few years. The Library's FY 2011-12 amount of \$2.16 was calculated using an estimated population of 241,258 and an expenditure amount of \$522,193. *Note – the population of the City of Paso Robles is not included given that the City operates its own library. The population number for the County Library service area is determined by the California Public Library Fund.*

5. Performance Measure: Percentage of the science, technology, consumer law and consumer health materials, system wide, which are current.

07-08 Actual Results	08-09 Actual Results	09-10 Actual Results	10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Adopted	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Target
Not Available	Not Available	77%	88%	84%	84%	85%

What: Consumer health and medicine, computer technology and software, and consumer law materials, system wide, should be current. Current is defined as published within the last 5 years, although some materials (e.g. consumer law) go out of date more rapidly.

Why: These subjects are time critical and become obsolete quickly.

How are we doing? Branch Library staffs have worked hard and have been very successful in both their efforts to remove outdated materials in these critical areas of the collection and in adding current titles. The Library continues its efforts to be vigilant in maintaining an up-to-date collection. It should be noted, access to this information is expanding in digital format, and the future increases in digital access may mean that the best up-to-date information is online and publishers may limit print access in the future. Due to a computer software change, the FY 2007-08 and FY 2008-09 Actual Results statistic could not be generated.

Department Goal: To provide excellent customer service (access to library services and programs, reference assistance and advice on finding reading materials) to County residents, both in person and electronically via home and business computers.

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

6. Performance Measure: Percentage of library users who are extremely or very satisfied with library services in the county.

07-08 Actual Results	08-09 Actual Results	09-10 Actual Results	10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Adopted	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Target
93%	Biennial Survey	92%	Biennial Survey	93%	97%	Biennial Survey

What: This measures the extent to which library users are satisfied with library service in the County.

Why: Libraries provide access to information in a wide variety of formats that increase the educational, cultural and recreational opportunities in a community. This measure is our report card from our customers, telling us not only how we are doing, but giving us specific, useful feedback that we use to further improve our service to the community.

How are we doing? The Library worked with Taylor Consulting Group to develop and distribute customer satisfaction exit surveys on a regular biennial basis. Library users were "extremely satisfied" (71%) or "very satisfied" (26%) with overall library service when surveyed in May 2012 (total 97%). 1,424 Library visitors received and returned complete and useable survey forms. The continuing high percent in "extremely/very satisfied" responses is an indication that the emphasis placed on excellent customer service and training to support staff in their efforts has proven to be beneficial for library visitors. One interesting point disclosed by the survey was, of the Library visitors who checked out materials, approximately 57% used the self-checkout machines. The next scheduled exit survey will be conducted in May 2014.

GOALS AND PERFORMANCE MEASURES

Additional Goals and Performance Measures for Public Works can be found in the following Fund Centers: Roads (Fund Center 245), Public Works Special Services (Fund Center 201), and Waste Management (Fund Center 130).]

Department Goal: Deliver Capital Projects on time and on budget.						
Communitywide Result Link: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Safe <input type="checkbox"/> Healthy <input type="checkbox"/> Livable <input type="checkbox"/> Prosperous <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Well-Governed Community						
1. Performance Measure: Percentage of capital projects that are completed on time.						
07-08 Actual Results	08-09 Actual Results	09-10 Actual Results	10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Adopted	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Target
42%	56%	64%	78%	80%	78%	85%
What: This measures the percentage of Public Works Capital Project phases actually completed compared to the phase estimated to be complete as stated in each year's budget.						
Why: To determine the timeliness of capital project completion which enhances public health and safety by correcting potentially dangerous problems identified in the need for each project.						
How are we doing? The Department ended FY 2011-12 with a favorable outcome of 78%, falling just shy of our 80% target for this performance measure. Overall, 39 of 50 approved phases were completed on schedule. There were 11 projects that were delayed for the following reasons: one project was delayed by a regulatory agency, two projects had a schedule slip, four projects were delayed due to design issues, two projects had a change in scope and two projects were reassigned a lower priority. There is no standardized comparable county data available.						
2. Performance Measure: Percentage of capital projects that are completed at or under budget.						
07-08 Actual Results	08-09 Actual Results	09-10 Actual Results	10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Adopted	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Target
83%	89%	86%	89%	90%	87%	90%
What: This measures the percentage of Public Works Capital Projects where actual costs are at or under the budget for the particular project phase approved by the Board of Supervisors in a given fiscal year.						
Why: To determine how accurately project costs are estimated so that funds are allocated and projects are prioritized properly.						
How are we doing? With an outcome of 87%, the Department ended FY 2011-12 with a favorable result that was just shy of our 90% target. Of the 39 projects that were completed on schedule, 34 projects were completed within the allocated budget. There were 5 projects that exceeded their budget for the following reasons: one project budget was underestimated, one project incurred unanticipated construction conditions, two projects had a schedule slip and a change in scope and one project had a funding agency delay. There is no standardized comparable county data available.						

GOALS AND PERFORMANCE MEASURES

<p>Department Goal: Provide timely, reliable and cost-effective reprographic services that meet or exceed customer expectations. Communitywide Result Link: <input type="checkbox"/> Safe <input type="checkbox"/> Healthy <input type="checkbox"/> Livable <input type="checkbox"/> Prosperous <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Well-Governed Community</p>						
<p>1. Performance Measure: Percentage of customer survey respondents who rate quality of reprographics services as satisfactory or better.</p>						
07-08 Actual Results	08-09 Actual Results	09-10 Actual Results	10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Adopted	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Target
100%	100%	100%	100%	97%	100%	Deleted
<p>What: Survey results of internal County department customers. Why: To ensure effective customer service. How are we doing? Reprographics achieved results of 100% satisfaction for FY2011-12. This singular focus on quality is being replaced by a broader customer satisfaction rating that includes measures such as overall value, quality, timeliness, and cost. This measure is being deleted for FY 2012-13 and is replaced with Performance measure # 2 below.</p>						
<p>2. Performance Measure: Percentage of Customers rating their experience with Reprographics as "satisfactory" or better.</p>						
07-08 Actual Results	08-09 Actual Results	09-10 Actual Results	10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Adopted	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Target
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	97%
<p>What: Survey results of internal County department customers which includes customer feedback on overall value, timeliness, quality and cost. Why: To ensure effective customer service. The metric is expected to encourage timely processing of requests and high quality transactions by measuring customers satisfaction related to the services provided. How are we doing? This is a new metric for FY2012-13. The target is based on customer service metrics in the customer survey which focused on the quality of Reprographics services. This measure will provide a broader perspective of how customers view Reprographic services as survey questions incorporate overall value, quality, timeliness of service delivery and cost.</p>						
<p>3. Performance Measure: Rates charged by Reprographics for common print jobs compared to rates charged by private vendors for the same jobs.</p>						
07-08 Actual Results	08-09 Actual Results	09-10 Actual Results	10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Adopted	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Target
Repro Rates below market (private companies)	Repro Rates below market (private companies)	Repro Rates below market (private companies)	Repro Rates below market (private companies)	Repro Rates below market (private companies)	Repro Rates below market (private companies)	Deleted
<p>What: Job rates charged by Reprographics to perform common print jobs as compared to local private vendors' rates. Why: To demonstrate Reprographics cost competitiveness with local private vendors. How are we doing? Following a thorough study of the FC 406 business by an outside consultant, it was determined that cost is not an effective measure for the County's Reprographics business and this measure is being deleted. For many Reprographics customers, there is a value beyond just simple cost comparison between individual job costs, particularly on more complex jobs. Reprographics continues to compare their rates to local, private-sector vendors who provide similar services. An analysis of Reprographics provided services was performed in 2011 with comparisons to three local, private-sector vendor costs. The analysis done by Reprographics focused on a selected sample of print jobs. This analysis identified that for the selected sample, County printing costs were lower than two of the three local vendors. An independent consultant evaluated the full range of print costs and determined that utilizing overall, County print costs were higher than private sector printing costs. As a result, the County has determined to cease operating its own print shop and will transition to contract printing services by the end of FY 2012-13. The performance measure is being deleted for FY 2012-13.</p>						

Fleet Services
Fiscal Year 2012-2013 Proposed Budget

Fund Center 407

GOALS AND PERFORMANCE MEASURES

Department Goal: Provide timely, reliable and cost-effective fleet services to County Departments and public safety agencies that meet or exceed customer expectations.

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

1. Performance Measure: Percentage of vehicles brought in for either preventive or non-preventative maintenance completed within 24 hours of delivery of vehicle, if parts are available.

07-08 Actual Results	08-09 Actual Results	09-10 Actual Results	10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Adopted	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Target
84%	83%	84%	76%	85%	80%	80%

What: County Fleet Services' policy is to perform preventive maintenance on each vehicle every 4 months or 4,000 miles. For Public Safety vehicles, the intervals are every two months or 5,000 miles. Fleet Service's goal is to perform service requests within 24 hours of receiving the vehicle.

Why: To minimize costly repairs and enhance productivity for vehicle drivers and to insure departments have sufficient vehicles to perform their duties.

How are we doing? Fleet Services obtained an 80% rating regarding the service completed within 24 hours in FY 2011-12. There was a 4% improvement over the previous year; however the target of 85% was not achieved. The primary drivers were increased business in two areas; conversion of the Sheriff's Patrol vehicles from the Ford Crown Victoria to the Chevrolet Caprice and the continuous high demand from Public Works for maintenance and repair work of their equipment. Both of these drivers to workload are expected to continue next year.

2. Performance Measure: Percentage of survey respondents who rated quality of vehicle maintenance as satisfactory or better.

07-08 Actual Results	08-09 Actual Results	09-10 Actual Results	10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Adopted	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Target
99%	100%	100%	99%	98%	98%	98%

What: Continuous surveys (point-of-service) of vehicle users measure how effective Fleet Services' staff is at maintaining vehicles to their customers' satisfaction.

Why: To insure satisfied customers and meet their vehicle needs.

How are we doing? Fleet Services met its customer satisfaction target in FY 2011-12. To obtain customer satisfaction input, the General Services Agency sent surveys to 1,932 County employees. The survey received a 21% response rate overall. Additionally 566 responses out of 3648 (the number of light fleet vehicles serviced) point-of-service surveys were received, or a 16% response rate. Of those who responded specifically to Customer Satisfaction questions related to Fleet, 98% rated their services as satisfactory or better. Results showed that 1% of those surveyed were Dissatisfied or lower, while 91 were Neither Satisfied or Dissatisfied. The 2012 survey was streamlined for GSA business units providing services to other County departments to reduce the number of surveys our customers receive. The previous methodology included 3 of the 5 survey choices reflecting Satisfied or better, the new methodology included only 2 of 5 choices as Satisfied or better. In FY 2012-13, Fleet Services will begin surveying heavy equipment customers to assist with making meaningful improvements in the heavy equipment side of Fleet Services' business.

3. Performance Measure: Cost per brake service compared to a private vendor.

07-08 Actual Results	08-09 Actual Results	09-10 Actual Results	10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Adopted	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Target
\$619.39 Fleet Svcs/ \$1,048.81 Private vendor	\$644.13 Fleet Svcs/ \$1,170.78 Private vendor	\$674.17 Fleet Svcs/ \$974.60 Private vendor	\$606.90 Fleet Svcs/ \$941.53 Private vendor	\$707.88 Fleet Svcs/ \$931.12 Private vendor	\$571.74 Fleet Svcs/ \$883.45 Private vendor	\$631.18 Fleet Svcs/ \$979.19 Private vendor

What: This measure shows the labor and parts costs incurred by Fleet Services to carry out a routine front and rear brake replacement on a Sheriff's patrol vehicle compared to the quoted price from local private vendors. This includes parts and labor cost for like model vehicles.

Why: This measure helps to demonstrate Fleet Services' cost competitiveness.

How are we doing? A survey of local private vendors and an internal study was conducted in July of 2012. This study revealed Fleet Services' actual cost had lowered by 6% to \$571.74. This is 19% below the FY 2011-12 adopted cost of \$707.88. The study also revealed that estimated pricing for outside vendors' services had lowered by 6%. The average outside vendor price was \$883.45, compared to an adopted price of \$931.12. The study reveals that Fleet Services remains 35% less expensive than the average outside vendor.

GOALS AND PERFORMANCE MEASURES

<p>Department Goal: Manage the San Luis Obispo and Oceano Airports in a manner that ensures the safety of the traveling public and complies with Federal, State, and local aviation and airport rules, regulations and advisories.</p> <p>Communitywide Result Link: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Safe <input type="checkbox"/> Healthy <input type="checkbox"/> Livable <input type="checkbox"/> Prosperous <input type="checkbox"/> Well-Governed Community</p>						
<p>1. Performance Measure: Percentage compliance with annual Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) inspections of appropriate safety and security measures.</p>						
07-08 Actual Results	08-09 Actual Results	09-10 Actual Results	10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Adopted	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Target
100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	90%	100%
<p>What: Annual safety and security inspection of certified airports conducted by FAA staff.</p> <p>Why: To ensure the safety of passengers and the public.</p> <p>How are we doing? The Airport has been very successful in meeting safety and security compliance. The May 2012 FAA inspection was completed with 90% compliance. During this inspection the Sign and Marking plan was found to be out of date and not accurately reflecting installed sign and markings on the field. Painted markings were also identified to be in need of updating at various locations on the field. A requirement to review the Wildlife Hazard Management Plan within the prior 12 months and staff training had not been appropriately documented. The existence of the discrepancies does not create unsafe conditions and have been corrected. Based upon communications with the FAA inspector the Airport anticipates full compliance in the next inspection.</p>						
<p>Department Goal: Provide timely, reliable and cost effective operations and maintenance of County Airports that meet or exceed customer expectations.</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>2. Performance Measure: Percentage of airport comments or complaints processed in a timely manner.</p>						
07-08 Actual Results	08-09 Actual Results	09-10 Actual Results	10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Adopted	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Target
N/A	N/A	N/A	80%	60%	90%	60%
<p>What: Measures Airport Services response to comments or complaints regarding services or operations. The goal is to process complaints within 24 hours of receipt Monday – Friday and within 48 hours for weekends. While many complaints such as those relating to noise are generally beyond the control of the Airport, a timely response to a comment demonstrates the Airport’s commitment to the community.</p> <p>Why: This measure helps to show the public that Airport Services will respond to comments and complaints in a timely manner.</p> <p>How are we doing? The Airports exceeded its target and achieved the results of 90% as compared to the target of 60%. While many complaints such as those relating to noise are generally beyond the control of the Airport, a timely response to a comment demonstrates the Airport’s commitment to the community. The system is working successfully as we exceeded our goal for FY 2011-12 to process comments and complaints within the timeframe specified in the measure.</p>						
<p>3. Performance Measure: Percentage of airport users that believe Airport Administration communicates effectively with them.</p>						
07-08 Actual Results	08-09 Actual Results	09-10 Actual Results	10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Adopted	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Target
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	70%	80%	70%
<p>What: Measures Airport Services effectiveness in communications with tenants.</p> <p>Why: This measure helps to show the public that Airport Services will respond to comments and complaints in a timely manner.</p>						

How are we doing? This measure began in FY 2011-12. Airport Services conducted a survey in July 2011 sending 150 surveys with a response rate of 18% or 27. Of those that responded 60% of the tenants felt that the Airport communicated effectively with them. Airport Services developed and implemented a communication plan based on input from tenants to make information available to all airport users. A tenant communication satisfaction survey was conducted again in July 2012 sending 200 surveys with a response rate of 25%. The results found that 71% of the respondents were satisfied or very satisfied with the effectiveness of communications from Airport Management. Based on the survey we will make modifications to our communications plan and will continue to conduct surveys with our customers annually.

4. Performance Measure: Percentage of Airport work orders processed in a timely manner.

07-08 Actual Results	08-09 Actual Results	09-10 Actual Results	10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Adopted	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Target
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	72%	60%

What: Measures Airport Services response to maintenance issues identified at both County Airports. The goal is to process any work order to completion within 72 hours of it being opened.

Why: This measure helps to show the public how Airport Services responds to maintenance and safety issues in a timely manner.

How are we doing? Work order tracking began in FY 2011-12 and has continued until now to establish a benchmark for how long it takes to complete a work order. Based upon that data and the variables attached to the variety of work orders, e.g. staff time to complete, parts requirements, and the complexities of tasks, a benchmark of 60% of the work orders being completed within 72 hours was been established. This goal was exceeded in FY 2011-12.

GOALS AND PERFORMANCE MEASURES

Department Goal: Provide cost-effective operations and maintenance for County golf courses to enhance recreational opportunities that meet or exceed customer expectations.

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

1. Performance Measure: Annual operating costs per golf round played at County-managed golf courses.

07-08 Actual Results	08-09 Actual Results	09-10 Actual Results	10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Adopted	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Target
\$18.92/round	\$17.85/round	\$19.88/round	\$20.59/round	\$21.50/round	\$21.58/round	\$21.50/round

What: The ratio of total operating expenses (salaries/benefits, services/supplies, depreciation of fixed assets) to the total number of rounds played at County-managed golf courses.

Why: This figure reflects our commitment to provide well-maintained golf courses and amenities for those who visit County golf courses. This benchmark is useful in developing the fee structure as well as assessing the value of services provided in a very competitive market.

How are we doing? County Golf results for FY 2011-12 were 0.04% above the adopted target at \$21.58 of expenses per golf round. Golf rounds finished above the targeted goal however expenses were higher than budget due to an unanticipated capital project. Staff is tracking expenses closely, while completing small maintenance projects that will have a positive impact on golf rounds.

2. Performance Measure: Annual operating revenue per golf round played at County-managed golf courses.

07-08 Actual Results	08-09 Actual Results	09-10 Actual Results	10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Adopted	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Target
N/A	N/A	N/A	\$20.86	\$20.96	\$20.70	\$20.39

What: The ratio of total operating revenues (green fees, cart revenues, and miscellaneous revenue) to the total number of rounds played at County-managed golf courses.

Why: This figure reflects the perceived value (amount golfer is willing to pay) golfers hold for our golf courses. It is companion to the Operating Expense per Round Played measure and is useful in developing the fees and fee structure for future years.

How are we doing? County Golf results for FY 2011-12 were 1.2% below the adopted target with \$20.70 of revenue received for each golf round. Golf rounds exceeded the projected target, however, rounds played in discounted play categories (off-peak and sundown) were higher than anticipated. This shift in play patterns resulted in a reduced amount of revenue per golfer. Staff is placing promotions efforts to provide higher numbers of market-based fee rounds to improve the revenue per round.

3. Performance Measure: Percentage of responses to Customer Satisfaction Survey rating overall golf experience as "Satisfactory" or better.

07-08 Actual Results	08-09 Actual Results	09-10 Actual Results	10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Adopted	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Target
77%	88%	86.5%	79.4%	85%	91%	85%

What: An annual customer survey is conducted of those who play golf on County managed golf courses. This survey measures customer satisfaction with their recreation experience. The level of golfers' satisfaction is directly linked to the likelihood that they will recommend the course to a friend and play more frequently.

Why: Efforts to set appropriate fees and provide quality, safe facilities affects the satisfaction of our customers and golfers' perceptions of the value of our products. Periodic surveying of customers helps staff measure golfers' opinions and allows an avenue for their input to improve our courses.

How are we doing? Approximately 1,700 golf customers were surveyed through e-mail with a response rate of 1195. The actual performance for FY 2011-12 was 6% above the adopted target with 91% of customers expressing Satisfied or better. For the previous 5 years customers were surveyed using the National Golf Foundation's survey program. This fiscal year the surveys were performed internally in an effort to reduce costs and to have better control of when and how the surveys were administered. The surveys were linked to Golf's Point of Sale System and based upon the numbers of players per day, surveys were sent randomly from November 2011 – March 2012. Deferred maintenance at each of our three courses may prevent ratings to reach significantly higher than the existing level.

Golf Courses
Fiscal Year 2012-13 Proposed Budget

Fund Center 427

Department Goal: Increase the number of golf rounds played on an annual basis.

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

4. Performance Measure: The total number of golf rounds played at County-managed golf courses.

07-08 Actual Results	08-09 Actual Results	09-10 Actual Results	10-11 Actual Results	11-12 Adopted	11-12 Actual Results	12-13 Target
152,695	142,563	128,722	124,908	120,000	129,242	127,500

What: This measurement examines the total number of rounds played at all three County golf courses relative to the prior year.

Why: The ultimate measure of success for our golf program is reflected in the volume of play we can attract in this very competitive golf market. While golf rounds played are subject to the negative impacts of weather and the general economy, the total rounds played reflects the perceived value of golf experienced on our courses and indicates the numbers of persons taking part in healthy, active recreation.

How are we doing? County Golf results for FY 2011-12 were 7.7% above the adopted target with combined 129,242 rounds played at the three courses. This improved performance is attributed to the success of marketing and promotional efforts such as special tournament rates, women's golf month, active military and student promotions. SLO Golf Card sales also increased 6.7% from the previous year. Each SLO Golf Card sold indicates a golfer that is committed to playing our three courses throughout the year.