

The Council on Local Results and Innovation 2011
Legislative Report

February 14, 2011

February 14, 2011

To the Property and Local Sales Tax Division of the House of Representatives, Taxes Committee and the Taxes Division on Property Taxes of the Senate Tax Committee,

Per the requirements of 2010 Minnesota Laws Chapter 389, Article 2, Sections 1 and 2, the Council on Local Results and Innovation is submitting its recommended "... standard set of approximately ten performance measures for counties and ten performance measures for cities that will aid residents, taxpayers, and state and local elected officials in determining the efficacy of counties and cities in providing services, and measure residents' opinion of those services." The recommended model performance measures are attached. Local government and public feedback was solicited on the proposed benchmarks.

The members of the Council include:

- Patricia Coldwell, Association of Minnesota Counties
- John Gunyou, City of Minnetonka
- Mark Hintermeyer, City of Moorhead
- Jay Kiedrowski, Humphrey School, University of Minnesota
- Katie Nerem, Blue Earth County
- Rebecca Otto, Minnesota State Auditor
- Jay Stroebel, City of Minneapolis
- Matt Stemwedel, City of Woodbury
- Wendy Underwood, City of St. Paul
- Tim Walsh, Scott County
- Ben Woessner, City of Pelican Rapids

The Council received no funding to conduct their work. Meeting minutes were taken by volunteers, and the Office of the State Auditor posted all meeting materials and meeting dates on the Office of the State Auditor website. All meetings were open to the public.

The Council sees value in having all counties and cities in Minnesota develop performance measures that they use to manage their jurisdictions and having results of those performance measures shared with citizens and property tax payers. Our recommended performance measures should be considered examples to assist counties and cities in developing their own performance measures. The Council was concerned about the misuse of these performance measures by the legislature or others in the appropriation of funds or for comparisons among counties and cities. The general performance measures recommended are simply inadequate for those purposes.

The Council on Local Results and Innovation is proceeding to meet the additional requirements of the statute, which is to "develop recommended minimum standards for comprehensive

performance measurement systems by February 15, 2012.” We interpret “performance measurement system” to mean more broadly a performance management system that uses performance measures to manage counties and cities.

Representatives of the Council would welcome the opportunity to discuss the Council’s work, our recommended model performance measures, and our concerns about the use of these measures.

Sincerely,

Jay Kiedrowski, Chair

Minnesota Council on Local Results and Innovation

Cc: House Speaker, House Minority Leader, Senate Majority Leader, and Senate Minority Leader

Attached: Model Performance Measures for Counties, Model Performance Measures for Cities

Model Performance Measures for Counties

The following are the recommended model measures of performance outcomes for counties, with alternatives provided in some cases. Key output measures are also suggested for consideration by local county officials.

Public Safety:

1. Part I and II crime rates (*Submit data as reported by the Minnesota Bureau of Criminal Apprehension. Part I crimes include murder, rape, aggravated assault, burglary, larceny, motor vehicle theft, and arson. Part II crimes include other assaults, forgery/counterfeiting, embezzlement, stolen property, vandalism, weapons, prostitution, other sex offenses, narcotics, gambling, family/children crime, D.U.I., liquor laws, disorderly conduct, and other offenses.*)

OR

Citizen's rating of safety in their county. (*Citizen Survey: very safe, somewhat safe, neither safe nor unsafe, somewhat safe, very unsafe*)

Output Measure:

Deputy Response Time (*Time it takes on top-priority calls from dispatch to the first officer on scene.*)

Probation/Corrections:

2. Percent of adult offenders with a new felony conviction within 3 years of discharge

Public Works:

3. Hours to plow complete system during a snow event
4. Average county pavement condition rating

OR

Citizen's rating of the road conditions in their county. (*Citizen Survey: good condition, mostly good condition, many bad spots*)

(Under legislation passed in 2009 (Minn. Stat. § 402A.15), counties are engaged with the Department of Human Services and community organizations in a three-year process to develop comprehensive performance measures across all areas of human services, for which all counties will be held accountable. The following measures here are intended to serve as 'placeholders', not to replace the more comprehensive measures scheduled to be completed by December 2012.)

Public Health:

5. Life Expectancy generally and by sex and race

OR

Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance system rating (Citizen Survey: excellent, very good, good, fair, or poor)

Social Services:

6. Workforce participation rate among MFIP and DWP recipients
7. Percentage of children where there is a recurrence of maltreatment within 12 months following an intervention

Taxation:

8. Level of assessment ratio (*If the median ratio falls between 90% and 105%, the level of assessment is determined to be acceptable.*)

Elections:

9. Accuracy of post-election audit (*Percentage of ballots counted accurately.*)

Veterans' Services:

Output Measure:

Percent of veterans surveyed who said their questions were answered when seeking benefit information from their County Veterans' Office

Parks:

10. Citizens' rating of the quality of county parks, recreational programs, and/or facilities. (*Citizen survey: excellent, good, fair, poor*)

Library:

11. Number of annual visits per 1,000 residents

Model Performance Measures for Cities

The following are the recommended model measures of performance outcomes for cities, with alternatives provided in some cases. Key output measures are also suggested for consideration by local city officials.

General:

1. Rating of the overall quality of services provided by your city (*Citizen Survey: excellent, good, fair, poor*)
2. Percent change in the taxable property market value
3. Citizens' rating of the overall appearance of the city (*Citizen Survey: excellent, good, fair, poor*)

Police Services:

4. Part I and II crime rates (*Submit data as reported by the Minnesota Bureau of Criminal Apprehension. Part I crimes include murder, rape, aggravated assault, burglary, larceny, motor vehicle theft, and arson. Part II crimes include other assaults, forgery/counterfeiting, embezzlement, stolen property, vandalism, weapons, prostitution, other sex offenses, narcotics, gambling, family/children crime, D.U.I., liquor laws, disorderly conduct, and other offenses.*)

OR

Citizens' rating of safety in their community (*Citizen Survey: very safe, somewhat safe, neither safe nor unsafe, somewhat unsafe, very unsafe*)

Output Measure:

Police response time (*Time it takes on top priority calls from dispatch to the first officer on scene.*)

Fire Services:

5. Insurance industry rating of fire services (*The Insurance Service Office (ISO) issues ratings to Fire Departments throughout the country for the effectiveness of their fire protection services and equipment to protect their community. The ISO rating is a numerical grading system and is one of the primary elements used by the insurance industry to develop premium rates for residential and commercial businesses. ISO analyzes data using a Fire Suppression Rating Schedule (FSRS) and then assigns a Public Protection Classification from 1 to 10. Class 1 generally represents superior property fire protection and Class 10 indicates that the area's fire suppression program does not meet ISO's minimum criteria.*)

OR

Citizens' rating of the quality of fire protection services (*Citizen Survey: excellent, good, fair, poor*)

Output Measure:

Fire response time (*Time it takes from dispatch to apparatus on scene for calls that are dispatched as a possible fire*).

Emergency Medical Services (EMS) response time (if applicable) (*Time it takes from dispatch to arrival of EMS*)

Streets:

6. Average city street pavement condition rating (*Provide average rating and the rating system program/type. Example: 70 rating on the Pavement Condition Index (PCI)*)

OR

Citizens' rating of the road condition in their city (*Citizen Survey: good condition, mostly good condition, many bad spots*)

7. Citizens' rating the quality of snowplowing on city streets (*Citizen Survey: excellent, good, fair, poor*)

Water:

8. Citizens' rating of the dependability and quality of city water supply (centrally-provided system) (*Citizen Survey: excellent, good, fair, poor*)

Output Measure:

Operating cost per 1,000,000 gallons of water pumped/produced (centrally-provided system) (*Actual operating expense for water utility / (total gallons pumped/1,000,000)*)

Sanitary Sewer:

9. Citizens' rating of the dependability and quality of city sanitary sewer service (centrally provided system) (*Citizen Survey: excellent, good, fair, poor*)

Output Measure:

Number of sewer blockages on city system per 100 connections (centrally provided system) (*Number of sewer blockages on city system reported by sewer utility / (population/100)*)

Parks and Recreation:

10. Citizens' rating of the quality of city recreational programs and facilities (parks, trails, park buildings) (*Citizen Survey: excellent, good, fair, poor*)