

FY 2017 GOVERNOR'S BUDGET RECOMMENDATIONS - PROGRAM PERFORMANCE MEASURES

1	AGENCY NAME:	Agency of Agriculture, Food & Markets
2	DEPARTMENT NAME:	
3	DIVISION NAME:	Food Safety/Consumer Protection
4	PRIMARY APPROPRIATION #	2200020000
5	PROGRAM NAME	
6	PROGRAM NUMBER (if used)	
7	FY 2017 Appropriation \$\$	\$ 7,120,624.00
8	Budget Amounts in Primary appropriation not related to this program:	\$ -
9	Program Budget Amounts from other appropriation:	\$ -
10	Program Budget Amounts from other appropriation:	\$ -
11	Program Budget Amounts from other appropriation:	\$ -
12	Program Budget Amounts from other appropriation:	\$ -
13	Program Budget Amounts from other appropriation:	\$ -
14	TOTAL PROGRAM BUDGET FY 2017	\$ 7,120,624.00 n/a

15	POPULATION-LEVEL OUTCOME:	(4) Vermont's communities are safe and supportive.
----	---------------------------	--

16	POPULATION-LEVEL INDICATOR:	Number of Vermont food recall incidents
----	-----------------------------	---

		Performance Measure Data				
		FY 2014	FY 2015	FY 2016 Budget	FY 2016 BAA	FY 2017 Budget
17	Performance Measure A: Number of licenses/registrations/permits overseen by the Division	25	18,876	18,677	19,514	21,914
18	Type of PM A: 1. How much did we do? (a.k.a. quantity or output) (Good PM)					
19	Performance Measure B: Number of inspections completed by the Division	26	15,136	17,135	17,135	17,135
20	Type of PM B: 1. How much did we do? (a.k.a. quantity or output) (Good PM)					
21	Performance Measure C: Number of compliance activities completed by the Division that go beyond the level of field staff (action taken by management)	27	331	282	282	282
22	Type of PM C: 3. Is anyone better off? (a.k.a. effectiveness or result/outcome) (Best PM)					

23 **NARRATIVE/COMMENTS/STORY: Describe the program. Who/what does it serve? Are there any data limitations or caveats? Explain trend or recent changes. Speak to new initiatives expected to have future impact.**

24 The Food Safety and Consumer Protection Division (FSCP) of the Agency of Agriculture, Food and Markets performs regulatory and technical assistance work in order to meet its objective of advancing a safe and secure food supply within a marketplace that provides fair and equal access to consumers and processors. The measures chosen for the performance based budgeting initiative were picked because they are the easiest to quantify and represent a large proportion of the work performed by Division employees. The number of licenses, registrations, and permits overseen by the Division indicates the scope of businesses falling under the regulatory authority of the Division. The number of inspections indicates the activities undertaken by staff to ensure compliance and provide outreach services to constituents. Administrative actions taken above the level of the field staff demonstrate the follow-through by the Division management to assure it is meeting its objective.

Although these measures are relatively objective, there are nuances associated with the data the reviewer should keep in mind when attempting to draw conclusions from the information. The definition of an "inspection" is different for each of the four sections of the Division: one inspection completed by Meat Inspection Program staff does not constitute the same scope or type of work as one inspection performed by an Animal Health section employee. A daily slaughter inspection performed by a Meat Inspection Program employee is comprised of multiple sub-inspections of procedures that vary from day to day, while a livestock dealer inspection performed by an Animal Health section employee consists of reviewing a defined set of parameters to ensure compliance at one snapshot in time.

The Division is tracking the number of compliance activities completed that go beyond the level of the field staff, and these include Letters of Warning, Notices of Violation, Assurances of Discontinuance, etc. Again, this is a quantifiable measure, but the data provided does not capture the intangible amount of technical assistance and proactive compliance work done by the managers and field staff during almost every interaction with regulated constituents, including that which occurs during phone conversations, investigating consumer complaints, site/facility inspections, and via email. As a result, the data provided grossly underestimates the total amount of "compliance work" completed by the Division on an ongoing basis.

The FSCP Division might be unique in that the measures chosen for this project, while relatively objective, are entirely linked to Vermont's private business sector, which the Division does not control. This makes it difficult to provide accurate data projections for future fiscal years for all three measures. Although the Division strives to meet its goal of ensuring 100% of the individuals and businesses operating in Vermont under Division jurisdiction are appropriately licensed/registered/permited and inspected in accordance with statutory requirements, attaching accurate projected numbers to this is not possible. The compliance activities anticipated for completion during any given year also correlates with the number of businesses in existence at that time and so can only be fully known in retrospect. The Division anticipates trends in regulated business growth will be easier to predict after multiple years of data collection in association with this project.

FY 2017 GOVERNOR'S BUDGET RECOMMENDATIONS - PROGRAM PERFORMANCE MEASURES

1	AGENCY NAME:	Agency of Agriculture, Food & Markets
2	DEPARTMENT NAME:	
3	DIVISION NAME:	Agricultural Development
4	PRIMARY APPROPRIATION #	2200030000
5	PROGRAM NAME	Working Lands Enterprise Initiative
6	PROGRAM NUMBER (if used)	26813
7	FY 2017 Appropriation \$\$	\$ 3,035,882.00
8	Budget Amounts in Primary appropriation not related to this program:	\$ 2,324,392.00
9	Program Budget Amounts from other appropriation:	\$ -
10	Program Budget Amounts from other appropriation:	\$ -
11	Program Budget Amounts from other appropriation:	\$ -
12	Program Budget Amounts from other appropriation:	\$ -
13	Program Budget Amounts from other appropriation:	\$ -
14	TOTAL PROGRAM BUDGET FY 2017	\$ 711,490.00 n/a

15	POPULATION-LEVEL OUTCOME:	(1) Vermont has a prosperous economy.
----	---------------------------	---------------------------------------

16	POPULATION-LEVEL INDICATOR:	Increase in Gross Working Land Income over previous year for grantees of
----	-----------------------------	--

		Performance Measure Data				
		FY 2014	FY 2015	FY 2016 Budget	FY 2016 BAA	FY 2017 Budget
17	Performance Measure A:					
	Number of raw jobs created	25	12	82	100	110
18	Type of PM A:	3. Is anyone better off? (a.k.a. effectiveness or result/outcome) (Best PM)				
19	Performance Measure B:					
	Total increase in gross income	26	\$ 247,100	\$ 8,876,727	\$ 2,500,000	\$ 11,000,000
20	Type of PM B:	3. Is anyone better off? (a.k.a. effectiveness or result/outcome) (Best PM)				
21	Performance Measure C:					
	Average percentage increase in products output	27	46	93	55	70
22	Type of PM C:	2. How well did we do it? (a.k.a. quality or efficiency) (Better PM)				

23	NARRATIVE/COMMENTS/STORY: Describe the program. Who/what does it serve? Are there any data limitations or caveats? Explain trend or recent changes. Speak to new initiatives expected to have future impact.
24	Our FY 2015 RBA Results include increase in jobs, total gross income dollars, and average percentage increase in products outcome across reporting FY13 and FY14 Grant Recipients. We are reporting our RBAs in aggregate, meaning, we are reporting here changes from the implementation of a reporting grantee's working lands project up to calendar year 2015. We are reporting in aggregate so we can adequately see the changes in our RBA metrics due to the implementation of the project. A few things to note about reporting on the Working Lands Program: Impacts from grant recipient projects may or may not be immediate, depending on the project; grant recipient reporting up to this point has not been easy to capture at a moment in time due to varying project lengths and timelines; our small and emerging businesses may see incredible changes in product output immediately (depending on the goals of their project), whereas our mature businesses may see a vast increase in gross income. Our New 2016 Targets are based on additional grantees who will be reporting next year: FY14 Capital and Infrastructure Grant Recipients and FY15 Enterprise Investment Recipients, as well as additional changes from our FY13 Business One Year Post Survey, our FY14 Business One Year Post Survey, and our FY13 Business Two Year Post Survey. This year's Performance Measure Data includes results from the 44 businesses that have completed their projects (representing \$898,987, or approximately 30% of over \$3 million in total grants to date). The data we have reported INCLUDES FY2014 RBA data, and builds off of this data as more FY13 and FY14 grantees have completed their final reports in 2015.