

STATE OF MINNESOTA

COUNTY OF HENNEPIN

CLERK OF THE BOARD

I, Deputy Clerk to the Board of the above named County, do hereby certify that I have compared the papers writing, to which this certificate is attached, with the original

Resolution No. 16-0238 adopted by the County Board of Commissioners on June 21, 2016

as the same appears of record and on file in the said Clerk to the Board's office, at the Government Center in said Hennepin County, and find the same to be true and correct copy thereof.

IN TESTOMONY WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the seal of said County at the City of Minneapolis, this 7th day of July A.D. 2016

YOLANDA C CLARK
Deputy Clerk to the County Board

by: Yc Clark
Deputy or Clerk to the County Board

Hennepin County, Minnesota
RESOLUTION NO. 16-0238



www.hennepin.us

[2016]

The following Resolution was offered by Commissioner Greene and seconded by Commissioner Higgins:

WHEREAS, the Minnesota Legislature created the Council on Local Results and Innovation in 2010; and

WHEREAS, the Council on Local Results and Innovation released a standard set of eleven performance measures for counties that will aid residents, taxpayers, and state and local elected officials in determining the efficacy of counties in providing services and measure residents' opinion of those services; and

WHEREAS, Hennepin County (the County) is committed to performance management and reporting; and

WHEREAS, the County has implemented a local performance measurement system as developed by the Council on Local Results and Innovation; and

WHEREAS, the County does not have jurisdiction for Parks and, therefore, will not participate in the Parks' performance measurement in 2016; and

WHEREAS, the County has adopted and implemented the minimum ten performance measures for counties developed by the Council on Local Results and Innovation; and

WHEREAS, a county that elects to participate in the standard measures program for 2016 may be eligible for a reimbursement of \$.014 per capita in government aid, not to exceed \$25,000;

BE IT RESOLVED, that the county will publish the 2015 results of the ten adopted performance measures on the county's web site by the end of the 2016 calendar year; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Hennepin County Board of Commissioners authorizes staff to notify the Office of the State Auditor by July 1, 2016 of Hennepin County's commitment to participate in the 2016 Performance Measurement Program.

The question was on the adoption of the resolution and there were 7 YEAS and 0 NAYS, as follows:

County of Hennepin Board of County Commissioners	YEAS	NAYS	ABSTAIN	ABSENT
Mike Opat	X			
Peter McLaughlin	X			
Randy Johnson	X			
Linda Higgins	X			
Marion Greene	X			
Jan Callison	X			
Jeff Johnson	X			

Hennepin County 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.

1. Public Safety:

- Part I and II crime rate
 - 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, Driving Under the Influence, liquor laws, disorderly conduct, and other offenses.

Offenses, Clearances, Percent Cleared and Crime Rate by Agency - 2009			
Population 1,138,316	Grand Total	Total Part 1	Total Part 2
Offenses	111,630	45,502	66,128
Clearances	50,175	11,274	38,901
Clearance Rate	45%	25%	59%
Crime Rate Per 100,000 pop	9,806	3,997	5,809

Offenses, Clearances, Percent Cleared and Crime Rate by Agency - 2010			
Population 1,211,265	Grand Total	Total Part 1	Total Part 2
Offenses	107,654	44,349	66,305
Clearances	49,564	10,773	38,791
Clearance Rate	46%	24%	61%
Crime Rate Per 100,000 pop	9,386	3,859	5,509

Offenses, Clearances, Percent Cleared and Crime Rate by Agency – 2011			
Population 1,211,265	Grand Total	Total Part 1	Total Part 2
Offenses	104,380	44,335	60,045
Clearances	45,548	10,787	34,761
Clearance Rate	44%	24%	58%
Crime Rate Per 100,000 pop	6,855	3,798	3,057

Offenses, Clearances, Percent Cleared and Crime Rate by Agency – 2012			
Population 1,163,318	Grand Total	Total Part 1	Total Part 2
Offenses	103,625	44,839	58,786
Clearances	42,800	10,425	32,375
Clearance Rate	41%	23%	55%
Crime Rate Per 100,000 pop	8,923	3,861	5,052

Offenses, Clearances, Percent Cleared and Crime Rate by Agency – 2013			
Population 1,179,108	Grand Total	Total Part 1	Total Part 2
Offenses	102,697	44,253	58,444
Clearances	41,544	10,780	30,764
Clearance Rate	40%	24%	53%
Crime Rate Per 100,000 pop	6,499	3,736	2,763

Offenses, Clearances, Percent Cleared and Crime Rate by Agency – 2014			
Population 1,211,265	Grand Total	Total Part 1	Total Part 2
Offenses	99,441	43,045	56,396
Clearances	37,274	10,250	27,024
Clearance Rate	37%	24%	48%
Crime Rate Per 100,000 pop	8,210	3,554	4,656

Offenses, Clearances, Percent Cleared and Crime Rate by Agency – 2015			
Population 1,229,284	Grand Total	Total Part 1	Total Part 2
Offenses	95,521	40,984	54,537
Clearances	30,919	10,068	20,851
Clearance Rate	32%	25%	38%
Crime Rate Per 100,000 pop	8,310	3,334	4,976

State of Minnesota, Department of Public Safety, 2009-2016, Bureau of Criminal Apprehension Minnesota Justice Information Services, Uniform Crime Report.

2. Probation/Corrections:

DOCCR has defined recidivism as a conviction (adult) or adjudication (juvenile) within Minnesota for a new offense that occurs after a selected client is sentenced (or disposed) on an initial offense.

1. Recidivism events for juveniles include all adjudications for petty misdemeanor offenses and above. Status and CHIPS cases are excluded.
2. Recidivism events for adults include convictions at the misdemeanor level and above. Petty misdemeanors are excluded.
3. No effort is made to identify out-of-state convictions for adults or juveniles.

Monthly client groups include adults and juvenile and are based on the start date of DOCCR service (i.e., ACF booking, probation/supervised release start, or STS referral) for the governing case.

Measure: Percent of Adult Probation Offenders with new felony conviction

Felony Recidivism	2008	2009	2010
No – Did <u>NOT</u> recidivate	80.8%	84.4%	82.4%
Yes - DID recidivate	19.2%	15.6%	17.6%
Total	100%	100%	100%

Produced by MN Data Definition Team; Department of Corrections Planning & Performance-Research Unit. Contact Chester Cooper, Director of Community Corrections and Rehabilitation Department, 612-348-5762, for more information about this department- specific measure.

3. & 4. Public Works:

Hours to plow complete system during a snow event

Year (2 a.m. events only)	2005 - 2006	2006 - 2007	2007 - 2008	2008 - 2009	2009 - 2010	2010 - 2011	2011- 2012	2012 - 2013	2013 - 2014	2014 - 2015	2015- 2016
Urban	4:28	5:00	4:41	4:29	4:26	4:36	4.36	4.42	4:54	4:01	4:01
Rural	4:34	4:36	4:36	4:08	3:41	4:23	4.36	4.36	4:42	4:06	4:04

Average county pavement condition rating - Hennepin County roadway system is monitored via an annual inspections program which rates pavements for their ride quality. This data is used by the pavement management system to produce the Pavement Serviceability Rating (PSR). The rating varies from 0.0 (Very Poor) to 5.0 (Very Good).

Year	Percent of Lane Miles Rated "Good" (4.0) or "Very Good" (5.0)
2015	62.8%
2014	58.7%
2013	61.9%
2012	60.5%
2011	52.9%
2010	54.3%
2009	46.6%
2008	48.1%
2007	51.5%
2006	49.4%
2005	47.0%
2004	32.6%
2003	28.7%
2002	43.5%
2001	48.5%
2000	51.1%
1999	52.7%
1998	50.6%
1997	44.0%

Contact James Grube, Director of Transportation, Public Works Department, 612-596-0307

5. Public Health

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

SHAPE 2014 - Adult Data Book: "Overall Health - In general, would you say your health is?"

	Sample Size N =	Excellent	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor
Hennepin County Total	8,541	18.5% ± 1.3	45.0% ± 1.6	28.9% ± 1.5	6.6% ± 0.8	1.0% ± 0.3
Male	3,118	18.8% ± 2.2	44.1% ± 2.6	30.4% ± 2.5	5.7% ± 1.1	1.1% ± 0.5
Female	5,422	18.1% ± 1.5	45.8% ± 1.8	27.6% ± 1.7	7.5% ± 1.1	1.0% ± 0.4

6. & 7. Social Services

* Workforce participation rate among Minnesota Family Investment Program (MFIP) and Diversionary Work Program (DWP) recipients

Minnesota Department of Human Services MFIP Management Indicator: TANF Work Participation Rates			
Performance Measure	2013 (April 2012 – March 2013) <i>Published 7/2013</i>	2014 (April 2013 – March 2014) <i>Published 7/2014</i>	2015 (April 2014 – March 2015) <i>Published 7/2015</i>
Annualized TANF Work Participation Rate	37.40%	38.10%	38.18%

Minnesota Department of Human Services Publication. Minnesota Family Investment Program Annualized Self-support Index and Work Participation Rate for the year (For Determination of Performance-Based Funds for the Following Year).

* Percentage of children where there is NOT a recurrence of maltreatment within 12 months following an intervention

Who Applied To	All children who were victims of substantiated child abuse and/or neglect during the reporting period
Time of Measure	12 months
Data Source	SSIS Charting & Analysis
Federal or State Target	100%
July 2009 – June 2010 (drawn on 5/20/2013)	90.4%
July 2010 – June 2011 (drawn on 5/20/2013)	89.7%
July 2011 – June 2012 (drawn on 6/30/2013)	90.3%
July 2012 – June 2013	90.7%
July 2003 – June 2014	92.4%
July 2014 – June 2015	87.9%

Contact Rex Holzemer, Assistant County Administrator, Human Services and Public Health Department, 612-348-3456.

8. Taxation

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

Year	Median Ratio (%)	Mean Ratio (%)
2013	97.8	101.7
2012	95.4	97.1
2011	95.3	96.9
2010	95.3	97.4
2009	95.0	96.3
2008	95.0	95.9
2007	95.8	96.0
2006	95.9	96.2
2005	95.8	96.3
2004	95.7	96.1
2003	95.9	96.3
2002	95.4	95.6

Contact James Atchison, County Assessor, 612-348-4567.

9. Elections

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

In 2015, the County Canvassing Board did not conduct a post-election audit because, by law, these are only conducted in even years. There is no change from 2014 data.

In 2014, the County Canvassing Board randomly selected 13 precincts to be hand counted and compared against the election night machine count. All 13 had 100% accuracy.

In 2013, the County Canvassing Board did not conduct a post-election audit because, by law, these are only conducted in even years. There is no change from 2012 data.

In 2012 — the last even-year election — 13 precincts were randomly selected for audit: All 13 precincts had 100% accuracy.

In 2011, the County Canvassing Board did not conduct a post-election audit because, by law, these are only conducted in even years. There is no change from 2010.

In 2010, the County Canvassing Board randomly selected 13 precincts to be hand counted and compared against the election night machine count. Listed below were the precincts selected and the difference by percentage on how the hand count compared to the election night results.

Contact Mark Chapin, Resident and Real Estate Services Department. 612-348-5297.

10. Veterans' Services

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

First Quarter 2011

Question	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Total Responses
I am able to get what I need at this service location, when I need it.	26%	63%	11%	0%	19
Staff members at this location pay attention to what I say.	57%	43%	0%	0%	21
I have opportunity to make choices that are important to me.	47%	47%	5%	0%	19
The services I receive at this service location make me better able to do the things I want to do now.	45%	50%	5%	0%	20
Staff members give me clear information on the different service choices available to help me.	33%	67%	0%	0%	18
Staff members here clearly explain to me what I need to do next to get the services I need or want.	44%	56%	0%	0%	18

First Quarter 2012

Question	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Total Responses
I am able to get what I need at this service location, when I need it.	35%	65%	0%	0%	20
Staff members at this location pay attention to what I say.	35%	65%	0%	0%	20
I have opportunity to make choices that are important to me.	53%	47%	0%	0%	19
The services I receive at this service location make me better able to do the things I want to do now.	45%	55%	0%	0%	20
Staff members give me clear information on the different service choices available to help me.	50%	45%	0%	5%	20
Staff members here clearly explain to me what I need to do next to get the services I need or want.	50%	50%	0%	0%	20

First Quarter 2013

Question	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Total Responses
I am able to get what I need at this service location, when I need it.	49%	51%	0%	0%	40
Staff members at this location pay attention to what I say.	69%	31%	0%	0%	39
I have opportunity to make choices that are important to me.	59%	38%	0%	3%	39
The services I receive at this service location make me better able to do the things I want to do now.	51%	49%	0%	0%	37
Staff members give me clear information on the different service choices available to help me.	47%	53%	0%	0%	36
Staff members here clearly explain to me what I need to do next to get the services I need or want.	53%	47%	0%	0%	36

First Quarter 2014

Question	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Total Responses
I am able to get what I need at this service location, when I need it.	49%	51%	0%	0%	39
Staff members at this location pay attention to what I say.	69%	31%	0%	0%	39
I have opportunity to make choices that are important to me.	59%	38%	0%	3%	39
The services I receive at this service location make me better able to do the things I want to do now.	51%	49%	0%	0%	37
Staff members give me clear information on the different service choices available to help me.	47%	53%	0%	0%	36
Staff members here clearly explain to me what I need to do next to get the services I need or want.	53%	47%	0%	0%	36

First Quarter 2015

Question	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Total Responses
I am able to get what I need at this service location, when I need it.	37%	59%	4%	0%	75
Staff members at this location pay attention to what I say.	62%	36%	1%	0%	77
I have opportunity to make choices that are important to me.	47%	49%	3%	1%	77
The services I receive at this service location make me better able to do the things I want to do now.	48%	47%	4%	1%	75
Staff members give me clear information on the different service choices available to help me.	52%	45%	1%	1%	73
Staff members here clearly explain to me what I need to do next to get the services I need or want.	57%	40%	1%	1%	75

Contact Milt Schoen, Director of Veterans Services, Human Services and Public Health Department 612-348-3499.

10. Library

Year	Number of Residents	Library Visits	Visits Per Resident
2015	1,210,720	5,462,859	4.51
2014	1,195,058	5,568,480	4.66
2013	1,180,138	5,240,918	4.44
2012	1,184,576	5,400,000	4.56
2011	1,152,425	5,856,792	5.08
2010	1,168,983	5,764,193	4.93

Contact Lois Thompson, Library Director, 612-543-8541.