

BACKGROUND

INTRODUCTION

This is the first annual report on the City of Stockton's Service Efforts and Accomplishments (SEA). The purpose of the report is to

- Provide consistent, reliable information on the performance of City services,
- Broadly assess trends in government efficiency and effectiveness, and
- Improve City accountability to the public.

The report contains summary information on spending and staffing, workload, and performance results for the fiscal year (FY) ended June 30, 2007. It also includes results of a resident survey rating the quality of City services. The report provides two types of comparisons:

- Up to five-year historical trends for fiscal years 2003 through 2007.
- Selected comparisons to other cities.

There are many ways to look at services and performance. This report looks at services on a department-by-department basis. All City departments are included in our review.

Chapter one provides a summary of overall spending and staffing over the last five years. Chapters two through 19 present the mission statements, description of services, background information, workload, performance measures, and survey results (where applicable) for:

- Administrative Services
- City Attorney
- City Auditor
- City Clerk
- City Manager
- Community Development
- Economic Development
- Fire
- Housing
- Human Resources
- Information Technology
- Library Services

- Municipal Utilities
- Non-Departmental
- Parks & Recreation
- Police
- Public Works
- Redevelopment

COMMUNITY PROFILE

The City of Stockton is one of California's fastest growing communities. Stockton is currently the 13th largest city in California with a dynamic, multi-ethnic and multi-cultural population of 289,789. It is situated along the San Joaquin Delta waterway which connects to the San Francisco Bay and the Sacramento and San Joaquin Rivers. Stockton is located 60 miles east of the San Francisco Bay Area, 83 miles east of San Francisco, and 45 miles south of Sacramento, the capital of California.

DEMOGRAPHICS

Stockton is a highly diverse community. According to the US Census Bureau (2006 American Community Survey), 45 percent of residents speak a language other than English at home. Of residents aged 25 years and over:

- 76 percent had a high school diploma or higher
- 18 percent had a bachelor's degree or higher

The median household income was \$45,615, with 15 percent of households earning \$100,000 or more, and 38 percent of households earning less than \$35,000.

The largest occupation groups are management-professional (27 percent); sales and office (26 percent); service (18 percent); and production, transportation, and material handling (17 percent).

Service Efforts and Accomplishments FY 2007

According to the 2006 American Community Survey, 37 percent of Stockton residents were Hispanic, 27 percent are White, and 21 percent were of Asian descent:

Race-ethnicity	Population	Percent
Hispanic	106,268	37%
White	75,336	27%
Asian	60,090	21%
Black or African American	31,797	11%
Other	10,927	4%
Total	284,418	100%

Source: 2006 American Community Survey

The median age was 29.8 years.

The following table shows population by age:

Age	Population	Percent
Under 18	83,470	29%
18 - 34	80,429	28%
35 - 54	71,103	25%
Over 55	49,416	18%
Total	284,418	100%

Source: 2006 American Community Survey

The majority of residents own their homes, but a large number of dwellings are renter occupied:

Housing occupancy	Number	Percent
Owner occupied	50,129	52%
Renter occupied	40,107	41%
Vacant	6,512	7%
Total	96,748	100%

Source: 2006 American Community Survey

QUALITY OF LIFE

Residents give low ratings to the local quality of life. When asked to rate the overall quality of life in Stockton, three percent of residents said "excellent," 27 percent said "good," 50 percent said "fair," and 20 percent said "poor."

In comparison to other jurisdictions¹, residents ranked Stockton well below the norm as a place to live, as a place to raise children, as a place to work, and as a place to retire.

Quality of life ratings	Percent rating Stockton good or excellent	National ranking
Stockton as a place to live	32%	1 st ile
Stockton as a place to raise children	23%	1 st ile
Neighborhood as a place to live	46%	0 th ile
Stockton as a place to work	29%	9 th ile
Stockton as a place to retire	25%	1 st ile
Overall quality of life	30%	0 th ile

Source: National Citizen Survey™ 2007 (Stockton)

Stockton residents give the highest marks to the City's shopping opportunities (47th percentile compared to other jurisdictions). Educational opportunities, job opportunities, and opportunities to attend cultural events are also ranked higher than other community characteristics, but still below the norm. Thirty nine percent rated the community's openness and acceptance towards people of diverse backgrounds as good or excellent. Residents give low marks to the City's overall image/reputation, overall appearance, sense of community, and recreational opportunities.

Community characteristics	Percent rating Stockton good or excellent	National ranking
Educational opportunities	54%	25 th ile
Overall image/reputation of Stockton	15%	1 st ile
Opportunities to attend cultural events	42%	26 th ile
Overall appearance of Stockton	30%	6 th ile
Recreational opportunities	27%	7 th ile
Shopping opportunities	50%	47 th ile
Openness and acceptance	39%	13 th ile
Sense of community	22%	1 st ile
Job opportunities	19%	29 th ile

Source: National Citizen Survey™ 2007 (Stockton)

Residents give high ratings to the ease of bus travel and access to affordable quality food in Stockton – ranking in the 37th and 34th percentile respectively, compared to other jurisdictions. On the other hand, Stockton ranks in the 12th and 13th percentile when rating the accessibility of affordable quality health care and child care.

Community access and mobility	Percent rating Stockton good or excellent	National ranking
Ease of walking in Stockton	27%	4 ^{%ile}
Ease of bicycle travel in Stockton	33%	17 ^{%ile}
Ease of car travel in Stockton	38%	15 ^{%ile}
Ease of bus travel in Stockton	32%	37 ^{%ile}
Access to affordable quality food	51%	34 ^{%ile}
Access to affordable quality health care	30%	12 ^{%ile}
Access to affordable quality child care	23%	13 ^{%ile}
Access to affordable quality housing	25%	20 ^{%ile}

Source: National Citizen Survey™ 2007 (Stockton)

As shown below, when asked to rate potential problems in Stockton, the top four concerns were drugs, crime, graffiti, and unsupervised youth.

Potential problems	Percent "major problem"
Drugs	84%
Crime	78%
Graffiti	61%
Unsupervised youth	55%
Homelessness	47%
Too much growth	38%
Run down buildings, weed lots, or junk vehicles	37%
Traffic congestion	35%
Taxes	26%
Weeds	25%
Noise	19%
Toxic waste or other environmental hazard(s)	19%
Absence of communications from the City of Stockton translated into languages other than English	13%
Unwanted local businesses	7%

Source: National Citizen Survey™ 2007 (Stockton)

The rate of population growth in Stockton was viewed as “too fast” by 73 percent of survey respondents. Twenty six percent said retail growth was too slow. The percent of respondents who said that job growth was too slow was 80%.

Seventeen percent of Stockton residents thought the economy would have a positive impact on their family income in the next 6 months, and 33 percent said it would have a negative impact. Forty nine percent were neutral.

COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION

Stockton residents participate actively in their community. When asked about their participation in various activities in Stockton in the last 12 months, 90 percent reported they recycled, 83 percent visited a Stockton park, 68 percent used the library or its services, and 47 percent used a Stockton recreation center.

Stockton residents are active on-line. Eighty percent of residents said they used the internet, 65 percent said they purchased an item over the internet, and 47 percent said that they had used the internet to conduct business with the City. Additional categories are listed below.

Percent engaging in various activities in the past year:	Percent
Recycled used paper, cans or bottles from your home	90%
Visited a Stockton park	83%
Used the internet for anything	80%
Purchased an item over the internet	65%
Used Stockton public library or its services	68%
Voted in the last election	66%
Used Stockton recreation centers	47%
Used the internet to conduct business with Stockton	47%
Participated in a recreation program or activity	44%
Volunteered your time to some group/activity in Stockton	48%
Ridden a local bus within Stockton	28%
Watched a meeting of local elected officials or other local public meeting on cable television	50%
Attended a meeting of local elected officials or other local public meeting	20%

Source: National Citizen Survey™ 2007 (Stockton)

GOVERNMENT

Stockton is a charter city, operating under a council/manager form of government. There is a seven member City Council, and a number of Council-appointed boards and commissions.¹ The City Council's top priorities for fiscal year 2008 included:

- Reduce crime and improve safety.
- Maintain open and thorough processes for monitoring the fiscal health of the City.
- Articulate a vision for the ongoing revitalization of downtown, the waterfront, and continued infrastructure, economic development, and redevelopment initiatives throughout the City.
- With regional sensitivity, develop a vision for long-term growth for Stockton to provide for appropriate and viable development and economic growth.
- Evaluate the integration of technology into operations in the delivery of services.
- Develop a strategy to meet the diverse housing needs of the City.

These priorities may change in fiscal year 2009 as they are subject to annual review by the City Council.

SCOPE AND METHODOLOGY

The City Auditor's Office prepared this report in accordance with the 2008 Annual Audit Plan.

The City Auditor's Office compiled data and information included in this report. We reviewed the content for reasonableness. In some cases, data was traced to the source.

Workload and performance results that are outlined here reflect current City operations. The report provides insights into service results, but is not intended to thoroughly analyze those results.

We used Government Auditing Standards to guide the conduct of this work. However, our objective was to provide information, and not to

¹ Additional information about the City's boards and commissions can be found at www.stocktongov.com.

conduct an audit. Therefore, the procedures used were not sufficient to consider this an audit.

SERVICE EFFORTS AND ACCOMPLISHMENTS REPORTING

In 1994, the Governmental Accounting Standards Board (GASB) issued *Concepts Statement No. 2, Service Efforts and Accomplishments Reporting*. The statement broadly describes "why external reporting of SEA measures is essential to assist users both in assessing accountability and in making informed decisions to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of governmental operations." According to the statement, the objective of SEA reporting is to provide more complete information about a governmental entity's performance than can be provided by the traditional financial statements and schedules, and to assist users in assessing the economy, efficiency, and effectiveness of services provided.

Other organizations including the Government Finance Officers Association (GFOA) and International City/County Management Association (ICMA) have long been advocates of performance measurement in the public sector. For example, the ICMA Performance Measurement Program provides local government benchmarking information for a variety of public services.

SELECTION OF INDICATORS

We limited the number and scope of workload and performance measures in this report to items that we thought would be the most useful indicators of City government performance and would be of general interest to the public. This report is not intended to be a complete set of performance measures for all users.

From the outset of this project, we decided to use existing data sources to the extent possible. We worked with individual departments to identify measures that they felt were important. We also invited departments to list measures where no data is available and where they intend to collect data. We reviewed the City's adopted budget documents,² performance measures from other jurisdictions, and

² The budget is on-line at www.stocktongov.com/budget.pdf.

benchmarking information from the ICMA³ and other professional organizations. We used audited information from the City’s Comprehensive Annual Financial Reports (CAFR).⁴ We cited departmental mission statements and performance targets that were taken either from the City’s annual operating budget, or provided by the department. We held numerous discussions with City staff to determine what information was available and reliable, and best summarized the services they provide.

Wherever possible we have included five years of data. Generally speaking, it takes at least three data points to show a trend.

As the process evolves, future SEA reports may incorporate new performance information. Consistency of information is important to us. However, to accommodate new information, we may occasionally delete some information that was included in previous reports. We will continue to use City Council, public, and staff feedback to ensure that the information items that we include in this report are meaningful and useful. We welcome your input. Please contact us with suggestions at Vanessa.DSouza@ci.stockton.ca.us.

THE NATIONAL CITIZEN SURVEY™

The National Citizen Survey™ is a collaborative effort between the National Research Center, Inc., and the International City/County Management Association (ICMA).⁵ Respondents in each jurisdiction are selected at random. Participation is encouraged with multiple mailings and self-addressed, postage-paid envelopes. Results are statistically re-weighted, if necessary, to reflect the proper demographic composition of the entire community.

Surveys were mailed to a total of 1,200 Stockton households in August 2007. Completed surveys were received from 294 residents, which

³ International City/County Management Association (ICMA), *Comparative Performance Measurement FY 2005 Data Report*. This report summarizes data from 140 jurisdictions, including several from California.

⁴ The CAFR is on-line at www.stocktongov.com/adminservices/reports/documents/2007CAFRandSAR.pdf.

⁵ The full text of Stockton’s survey results can be found in attachments 1-3.

results in a 25 percent response rate after accounting for vacant properties. Typical response rates obtained on citizen surveys range from 25 to 40 percent.

It is customary to describe the precision of estimates made from surveys by a “level of confidence” (or margin of error). The 95 percent confidence level for this survey of 1,200 residents is generally no greater than plus or minus five percentage points around any given percent reported for the entire sample.

The scale on which respondents are asked to record their opinions about service and community quality is “excellent,” “good,” “fair,” and “poor.” Unless stated otherwise, the survey data included in this report displays the responses only from respondents who had an opinion about a specific item – “don’t know” answers have been removed.

The National Research Center, Inc. has collected citizen survey data from more than 500 jurisdictions in the United States. Inter-jurisdictional comparisons are available when similar questions are asked in at least five other jurisdictions. When comparisons are available, ranks are expressed as a percentile to indicate the percent of jurisdictions with identical or lower ratings.

POPULATION

We used the most recent estimates of Stockton’s resident population from two sources; the California Department of Finance, as shown in the following table, and the U.S. Census Bureau, 2006 American Community Survey.⁶

Fiscal Year	Population
2003	261,300
2004	269,100
2005	279,513
2006	286,041
2007	289,789
Percent change over last 5 years:	+10.9%

⁶ The Department of Finance population estimates are taken from the Stockton 2007 CAFR.

INFLATION

Financial data has not been adjusted for inflation. In order to account for inflation, readers should keep in mind that the Consumer Price Index for Urban Wage Earners and Clerical Workers' United States City Average has increased by 15.9 percent over the five years of financial data that is included in this report. The index increased as follows:

Date	Index
June 2002	175.9
June 2003	179.6
June 2004	185.3
June 2005	190.1
June 2006	198.6
June 2007	203.9
Percent change over last 5 years:	+15.9%

ROUNDING

For readability, most numbers in this report are rounded. In some cases, tables or graphs may not add to 100 percent or to the exact total because of rounding. In most cases the calculated "percent change over the last 5 years" is based on the percentage change in the underlying numbers, not the rounded numbers. However, where the data is expressed in percentages, the change over five years is the difference between the first and last year.

COMPARISONS TO OTHER CITIES

Where possible we included comparisons to nearby California cities. The choice of the cities that we use for our comparisons may vary depending on whether data is easily available. Regardless of which cities are included, comparisons to other cities should be used carefully. We tried to include "apples to apples" comparisons, but differences in costing methodologies and program design may account for unexplained variances between cities. Expenditure data for comparator cities was obtained from their respective Comprehensive Annual Financial Reports. Where data was unavailable, expenditures were obtained from the city's annual budgets. We used this information

where possible, but noted that cities provide different levels of service and categorize expenditures in different ways.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This report could not have been prepared without the cooperation and assistance of City management and staff from every City department. Many thanks to all of them for their thoughtful contributions and hard work.

We would like to thank the City of Palo Alto Auditor's Office for graciously allowing us to borrow heavily from their expertise and established processes. Without their assistance and support this report likely would not have been completed on schedule.

We would also like to acknowledge the City of Portland Auditor's Office that pioneered local government accountability for performance through its "City of Portland Service Efforts and Accomplishments" report – now in its seventeenth year of publication.

Both have received the Association of Government Accountants (AGA) - Certificate of Excellence in Service Efforts and Accomplishments Reporting Award in multiple years:

- Palo Alto – FY 2006 & 2005
- City of Portland Auditor's Office – FY 2006, 2005, & 2004

For FY 2006 reports, only seven local and state governments in the United States were recognized with this award.

This page intentionally left blank.