

Core Services in Olmsted County

February 11, 2010

SERVICE RANKING GRID



A dynamic, world-class County delivering excellence every day

Introduction

- ① Why? Background
- ② The Grid – that gets us to Core Services
- ③ How It's Used
- ④ The Upsides and Downsides

Why? Background

- Created 20 years ago in a budget cutting era
- To avoid “across the board” cuts
 - Popular because it’s very easy
 - Cuts all services/programs equally
 - Some programs forced to limp along




“Across the board cuts are like high altitude bombing – you do a lot of damage but you don’t know to what.” Unknown

Why? Background (continued)

- To avoid a tendency to cut what you don't like or isn't popular
- To provide a rational framework for the reduction discussions



The Grid

	PROTECT LIFE	PROTECT FUTURE/ AVOID LAWSUITS	EMPOWERMENT/ MAINTAIN EXISTING INFRASTRUCTURE	QUALITY OF LIFE
Strategic Priorities	* Assure a Safe and Healthy Community	* Environmental Stewardship * Sound Fiscal Management * Well Trained and Responsive Leadership	* Effective, Accessible and Responsive * Operational Excellence * Excellent Staff	* Innovation and Collaboration * Learning and Growth
MANDATORY WITH SANCTIONS	(16)	(13)	(9)	(4)
COUNTY PRIORITY	(15)	(12)	(8)	(3)
MANDATORY WITH NO SANCTIONS	(14)	(11)	(7)	(2)
OPTIONAL	(10)	(6)	(5)	(1)

How It's Used

- ⦿ Its use has evolved over the years
- ⦿ Service list created by each department
- ⦿ Ranking done by:
 - Commissioners (all services)
 - Department head (their own services)
 - Administrator (all services)
 - Associate Administrator (all services)
 - Finance Director (all services)

How It's Used (continued)

- In the early years.....just a general “guide”
 - A communication tool
 - Services listed and ranked (no costs)
- In 2003, more sophisticated and better accepted
 - Service list more detailed (no costs)
- For the 2010 budget, much more sophisticated and widely accepted as a part of the budget reduction discussions
 - Aligned with the County's strategic priorities
 - Proportional budget cuts
 - Costs and FTEs added



How It's Used (continued)

Service Ranking List – A *Sampling*

Dept	Brd Ave Rank	Admin Ave Rank	Description	Est Cost	Est Levy	Total FTEs	Proj 2010 Cut
Appropriations	2	1	Fair Board (County Fair)	\$53,040	\$53,040	0	20%
U of MN Extension	3	3	Master Gardener Program	\$33,506	\$31,895	.4 FTE	20%
PW – Highway Engineering	6	3	Cleaning ditches/weed control	\$885,032	\$617,605	4.5 FTE	7%
PH – Interpreter Services	8	8	Medical interpreting and translation services	\$251,910	\$160,910	4.3 FTE	7%
Co Admin – Env. Services	10	12	Coordination of environmental services	\$142,993	\$138,426	1.0 FTE	4%
Comm. Serv. Children's MH	12	12	Children's mental health services mandated by the state	\$3,067,518	\$1,631,725	8.0 FTE	4%
Finance – Accts Payable	13	13	County-wide accounts payable	\$755,540	\$453,324	9.2 FTE	.5%
County Attorney	14	14	Mental Health Commitments	\$62,810	\$53,558	.7 FTE	.5%
Sheriff - ADC	15	16	Adult Detention Center services	\$7,458,576	\$6,993,192	68.1 FTE	.5%

Reductions based on "rank": 1 – 4: 20% 5 – 8: 7% 9 – 12: 4% 13 – 16: .5%

How It's Used (continued)

2010 FTE Reductions

Rank	FTEs	% of FTEs	% to Cut	Prop FTEs to Cut	Actual FTEs Cut	Comments
1 - 4	6.40	.6%	20%	1.28	<p><i>More positions were held open throughout the year county wide than needed to balance the budget. Depart. directed to use the rankings to determine which to eliminate.</i></p>	Includes Library appropriations and other outside agency appropriations; some park services/programs
5 - 8	94.88	8.7%	7%	6.64		Some housing services; park services/programs (zoo, etc); cleaning ditches/weed control; victim services; surveying
9 - 12	554.42	50.7%	4%	22.17		Hold orders; "poor relief"; road and bridge construction; Public Health general, school based services, planning; jail program and transport; law enforcement contracts; adolescent services; juvenile detention; MFIP employment; foster care licensing; HRA rental housing; civil process (Sheriff); home, community, and long term care for disabled, elderly, TBI; probation; income maintenance; overlays; long range land use planning; CD treatment; child support enforcement; snow and ice removal; investigations
13 - 16	436.98	40.0%	.5%	2.18		Child placements; road and bridge construction – safety related; tax collection; Sheriff's patrol; adult mental health; child protection; adult protection; adult criminal prosecution; adult detention center; dispatch
	1092.68	100%		32.27		31.00

How It's Used (continued)

2010 Levy Reductions

Rank	Total Levy	% of Levy	% to Cut	Proposed Cut	Actual Exp Cut	Comments
1 - 4	\$2,120,292	2.3%	20%	\$424,058	\$308,253	Includes Library appropriations and other outside agency appropriations; some park services/programs
5 - 8	7,191,056	7.6%	7%	503,374	\$464,800	Some housing services; park services/programs (zoo, etc); cleaning ditches/weed control; victim services; surveying
9 - 12	44,996,857	47.8%	4%	1,799,874	\$2,846,975	Hold orders; "poor relief"; road and bridge construction; Public Health general, school based services, planning; jail program and transport; law enforcement contracts; adolescent services; juvenile detention; MFIP employment; foster care licensing; HRA rental housing; civil process (Sheriff); home, community, and long term care for disabled, elderly, TBI; probation; income maintenance; overlays; long range land use planning; CD treatment; child support enforcement; snow and ice removal; investigations
13 - 16	39,768,631	42.3%	.5%	198,843	\$233,644	Child placements; road and bridge construction – safety related; tax collection; Sheriff's patrol; adult mental health; child protection; adult protection; adult criminal prosecution; adult detention center; dispatch
	\$94,076,836	100%		\$2,926,149	\$3,853,672*	

*Includes capital expense reductions (NOT included in service rankings)

The Upsides

- The grid and service listing provide a place to start the discussion
- Provides a management framework to discuss programs in a comparative manner
- A rational framework for decision-making, using thoughtful, reasonable criteria



The Upsides (continued)

- A great communication tool about how and why decisions were made (with both staff and the public)
 - Shows the vast array of services – and their priority
 - Encourages discussion with the public and with the media at a time when community engagement is most important
 - The criteria shows the staff and the community stakeholders what the County values and/or must prioritize

The Upsides (continued)



- Board members and Administration “balance” the natural tendency of dept staff to rank their services high
- Allocating the FTEs and costs to specific services brings forward the question: “Is this worth what we are paying for it?”
- It has held up well over the years and the consistency improves the dialogue



The Upsides (continued)

- Broad participation makes it more valuable and better accepted
- The Board members rankings (2010) increased their ownership/buy-in (and the department heads' buy-in)



...and the Downsides

- Personal preference versus the real criteria still “creeps” in, particularly at the Board level
- Public influence, i.e., Parks are ranked low, but citizens can put significant pressure on the Board to prioritize Parks over higher ranked priorities
- It is difficult to determine appropriate ranking of some services



...and the Downsides (continued)

- It does not take into account the LEVEL of service needed for high priority/mandated services (i.e, how MANY snowplow operators, deputies, social workers, etc, do we need?)
- Funding streams are not factored into the ranking system
- Not all Board members ranked the services

...and the Downsides (continued)

- ⦿ Services broken down into varying levels of detail – some very broad, some extremely detailed
- ⦿ It is still extremely difficult to cut any services that have a constituency
- ⦿ Staff fear that the ranking of a program may lead to an elimination of their work and position



...and the Downsides (continued)

- ⦿ Grid primarily address resources needed for actual program delivery
- ⦿ Departments may “skew” their values; Administration, Finance and Board members rank programs without adequate information – the averaging provides an “opinion”, not a truly comparable score
- ⦿ This is an art, not a science



Summary

- ⦿ This is a tool that we have used for a long time and it continues to evolve
- ⦿ The “grid” and resulting list of ranked services, provides an excellent starting point for further discussions
- ⦿ It is one way to comparatively rank programs across the entire county – all 12 lines of business
- ⦿ It becomes a better tool each year