STATE OF MINNESOTA

COUNTY OF HENNEPIN

CLERK TO THE COUNTY BOARD

I, Karen Keller, Deputy Clerk to the County 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. 19-0234 adopted by the County Board of Commissioners on June 18, 2019

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 28th day of June A.D. 2019

Karen Keller Deputy Clerk to the County Board

Deputy Clerk to the County Board

HENNEPIN COUNTY

MINNESOTA

Hennepin County, Board of Commissioners

RESOLUTION 19-0234

2019

The following resolution was moved by Commissioner Debbie Goettel and seconded by Commissioner Angela Conley:

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, 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 is committed to performance management and reporting; and

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

WHEREAS, Hennepin County does not have jurisdiction for Parks and, therefore, will not participate in the Parks' performance measurement in 2019; and

WHEREAS, Hennepin 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 2019 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 2018 results of the ten adopted performance measures on the county's web site by the end of the 2019 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, 2019 of Hennepin County's commitment to participate in the 2019 Performance Measurement Program.

The question was on the adoption of the resolution and there were 6 YEAS and 0 NAYS, as follows:

County of Hennepin Board of County Commissioners

YEAS NAYS **ABSTAIN** Marion Greene

ABSENT

Mike Opat

Debbie Goettel

Jan Callison

Jeff Johnson

Irene Fernando

Angela Conley

RESOLUTION ADOPTED ON

6/18/2019

ATTEST:

M. Roge

Deputy/Clerk to the County Board



HENNEPIN COUNTY

Model Performance Measures for Counties

2018

Office of Enterprise Analytics 330 South 6th Street, Minneapolis, MN 55415

Contents

Public Safety	1
Probation/Corrections	5
Public Works	6
Public Health	8
Social Services	9
Taxation	11
Elections	12
Veterans' Services	13
Library	19
Budget and Financial	20
Environment	21
Contact information	22

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 - 2018

Population 1,269,052	Grand Total	Total Part 1	Total Part 2
Offenses	83,722	38,417	44,201
Clearances	30,367	7,745	21,811
Clearance Rate	36%	20%	49%
Crime Rate Per 100,000 pop	6,597	3,027	3,483

Offenses, Clearances, Percent Cleared, and Crime Rate by Agency - 2017

Population	Grand Total	Total Part 1	Total Part 2	
1,254,137			iotai i ai t L	
Offenses	92,295	42,686	48,324	
Clearances	33,152	9,235	22,968	
Clearance Rate	36%	22%	48%	
Crime Rate Per 100,000 pop	7,359	3,404	3,853	

Offenses, Clearances, Percent Cleared, and Crime Rate by Agency - 2016

Population 1,239,456	Grand Total	Total Part 1	Total Part 2
Offenses	95,299	40,922	52,962
Clearances	34,250	9,608	23,590
Clearance Rate	36%	23%	45%
Crime Rate Per 100,000 pop	7,689	3,302	4,273

Offenses, Clearances, Percent Cleared, and Crime Rate by Agency - 2015

Population 1,229,084	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

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 - 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	6,449	3,736	2,763

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 - 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 - 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	3,869	5,509

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	45z5	25%	59%
Crime Rate Per 100,000 pop	9,806	3,997	5,809

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

Probation/Corrections

Recidivism for the purposes of this report means the percent of adult clients with a conviction of a misdemeanor or higher-level offense within three years of their supervision start date. This information shows one-year recidivism rates for adult supervision clients. It does not contain juvenile clients, nor does it include convictions for new offenses outside of Minnesota.

Measure: One-year recidivism rates for adult supervision clients					
2013 2014 2015 2016					
1-year Recidivism	42.1%	39.3%	39%	37.5%	

Public Works

Hours to plow complete system during snow event

Year (2 A.M. Events Only)	Urban	Rural
2018-2019	4:45	4:20
2017-2018	4:25	4:06
2016-2017	4:30	4:19
2015-2016	4:01	4:04
2014-2015	4:01	4:06
2013-2014	4:54	4:42
2012-2013	4:42	4:36
2011-2012	4:36	4:36
2010-2011	4:36	4:23
2009-2010	4:26	3:41
2008-2009	4:29	4:08
2007-2008	4:41	4:36
2006-2007	5:00	4:36
2005-2006	4:28	4:34

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 "Very Poor" (0.0) to "Excellent" (5.0).

Average county pavement condition rating

Year	Percent of lane miles rated good or better
2018	67%
2017	63%
2016	66%
2015	63%
2014	59%
2013	62%
2012	61%
2011	53%
2010	54%
2009	47%
2008	48%
2007	52%
2006	49%
2005	47%
2004	33%
2003	29%
2002	44%
2001	49%
2000	51%
1999	53%
1998	51%
1997	44%

Contact Christopher Sagsveen, Public Works, 612-596-0330

Public Health

Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System Rating

• Client Survey: Excellent, Very Good, Good, Fair, Poor

SHAPE 2018 – Adult Data Book:

"Overall Health - In general, would you say your health is...?

	Sample Size (N+		Fair, poor	
Male	3,855	88.5%	11.5%	
Female	7,255	89.7%	10.3%	
Hennepin County Total	11,080	89.0%	10.1%	

SHAPE 2014 – Adult Data Book:

"Overall Health – In general, would you say your health is...?

	Sample Size (N=)	Excellent	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor
Male	3,118	18.8%	44.1%	30.4%	5.7%	1.1%
iviale	3,118	±2.2	±2.6	±2.5	±1.1	±0.5
Female	F 1 5 422	18.1%	45.8%	27.6%	7.5%	1.0%
remaie	5,422	±1.5	±1.8	±1.7	±1.1	±0.4
Hennepin	0.544	18.5%	45.0%	28.9%	6.6%	1.0%
County Total	8,541	±1.3	±1.6	±1.5	±0.8	±0.3

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

Year	Annualized TANF Work Participation Rate				
2018	59.2%*				
(April 2017- March 2018)	39.276				
2017	65.9%*				
(April 2016- March 2017)	03.376				
2016	60.4%*				
(April 2015-March 2016)	00.476				
2015					
(April 2014 – March 2015) Published 07/2015	38.18%				
2014					
(April 2013 – March 2014)	38.10%				
Published 7/2017					
2013					
(April 2012 – March 2013)	37.40%				
Published 7/2013					

^{*} The 2016 and 2017 data provided in the annualized SS-I average the three-year SS-I for quarters two, three, and four of 2015 and the first quarter of 2016, weighted by the number of adult sin each baseline quarter. This is a change in methodology from prior computations of this measure.

Data Source: Minnesota Department of Human Services Publication. Minnesota Family Investment Program Annualized Self-support Index (SS-I) 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

Federal or State Target: 100%

Year	Percentage
July 2017 – June 2018	86.7%
July 2016 – July 2017	83.3%
July 2015 – June 2016	88.3%
July 2014 – June 2015	92.5%
July 2013 – June 2014	91.1%
July 2012 – June 2013	90.9%
July 2011 – June 2012	89.9%
July 2010 – June 2011	90.2%
July 2009 – June 2010	89.2%

Data Source: SSIS; Of all children who were victims of substantiated or indicated maltreatment report during the year prior

Contact Jodi Wentland, Human Services Department Director, 612-543-4344.

Taxation

Level of assessment ratio

Note: If the median ratio falls between 90% and 105%, the level of assessment is determined to be acceptable.

Year	Median Ratio (%)	Mean Ratio (%)
2019	95.2	94.4
2018	95.2	95.8
2017	95.0	95.6
2016	94.9	95.5
2015	92.3	93.3
2014	93.3	91.1
2013	95.3	97.3
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

Elections

Accuracy of post-election audit (percentage of ballots counted accurately)

Year	Accuracy
2018	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.
2017	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 2016 data.
2016	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.
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.
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.
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.
2012	The last even-year election — 13 precincts were randomly selected for audit: All 13 precincts had 100% accuracy.
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.
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.

Veterans' Services

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

Full Year – 2018 (N=2)

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.	100%	0%	0%	0%	2
Staff members at this location pay attention to what I say.	50%	50%	0%	0%	2
I have opportunity to make choices that are important to me.	100%	0%	0%	0%	2
The services I receive at this service location make me better able to do the things I want to do now.	100%	0%	0%	0%	2
Staff members give me clear information on the different service choices available to help me.	50%	50%	0%	0%	2
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%	2

Full Year – 2017 (N=238)

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%	37
Staff members at this location pay attention to what I say.	61%	39%	0%	0%	41

I have opportunity to make choices that are important to me.	54%	46%	0%	0%	41
The services I receive at this service location make me better able to do the things I want to do now.	54%	46%	0%	0%	39
Staff members give me clear information on the different service choices available to help me.	55%	43%	3%	0%	40
Staff members here clearly explain to me what I need to do next to get the services I need or want.	58%	43%	0%	0%	40

Full Year – 2016 (N=233)

Question	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Total Responses
I am able to get what I need	48%	49%	3%	0%	223
at this service location, when					
I need it.					
Staff members at this location	68%	30%	2%	0%	227
pay attention to what I say.					
I have opportunity to make	55%	43%	2%	0%	223
choices that are important to me.					
The services I receive at this	49%	49%	2%	0%	221
service location make me					
better able to do the things I					
want to do now.					
Staff members give me clear	50%	46%	4%	0%	221
information on the different					
service choices available to					
help me.					
Staff members here clearly	57%	40%	2%	0%	224
explain to me what I need to					
do next to get the services I					
need or want.					

First Quarter 2015

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

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	49%	51%	0%	0%	39
I need it.					
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	51%	49%	0%	0%	37

better able to do the things I want to do now.					
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 2013

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

First Quarter 2012

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

First Quarter 2011

Question	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Total Responses
I am able to get what I need	26%	63%	11%	0%	19
at this service location, when I need it.					
Staff members at this location	57%	43%	0%	0%	21
pay attention to what I say.					
I have opportunity to make choices that are important to	47%	47%	5%	0%	19
me. The services I receive at this	45%	50%	5%	0%	20
service location make me	4370	JU /6	J /0	0 70	20

better able to do the things I want to do now.					
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

Contact Neil Doyle, Director of Veterans Services, Health and Human Services.

Library

Library Visits

Year	Number of Residents	Library Visits	Visits per Resident
2018	1,249,512	5,530,078	4.43
2017	1,237,604	5,316,242	4.30
2016	1,223,149	5,379,722	4.40
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 Janet Mills, Acting - Library Director, 612-543-8535.

Budget and Financial

Bond rating, Standard & Poor's Rating Services *					
Year Rating					
2018	AAA				

^{*}Reported in the Hennepin County Comprehensive Financial Report

Environment

Recycling percentage*YearRecycling Percentage201730.56%

^{*}Reported in the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency SCORE Report

Contact information

Office of Enterprise Analytics 330 South 6th Street, Minneapolis, MN 55415

