

CITY COUNCIL
CITY OF NEW YORK

----- X

TRANSCRIPT OF THE MINUTES

Of the

COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND
INVESTIGATIONS JOINTLY WITH
COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENTAL OPERATIONS

----- X

December 10, 2014
Start: 10:18 a.m.
Recess: 12:54 p.m.

HELD AT: Committee Room - City Hall

B E F O R E: VINCENT GENTILE
Chairperson

BENJAMIN KALLOS
Chairperson

COUNCIL MEMBERS:

Inez E. Dickens
Daniel Dromm
Costa G. Constantinides
Chaim M. Deutsch
Rory I. Lancman
Helen Rosenthal
David G. Greenfield
Mark Levine
Ritchie J. Torres
Steven Matteo

A P P E A R A N C E S (CONTINUED)

Mindy Tarlow, Director
NYC Mayor's Office of Operations

Tina Chiu, Deputy Director
Performance Management
NYC Mayor's Office of Operations

Guinevere Knowles, Associate Director
Performance Management
NYC Mayor's Office of Operations

Doug Turetski
Chief of Staff/Communications Director
NYC Independent Budget Office, (IBO)

Prudence Katze, Policy Coordinator
Reinvent Albany

Rachael Fauss, Director
Public Policy
Citizens Union

Douglas Muzzio, Professor
Baruch College - School of Public Affairs

Paul Epstein, Consultant
Author of Results that Matter

COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND INVESTIGATIONS JOINTLY
WITH COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENTAL OPERATIONS

3

CHAIRPERSON GENTILE: Well, good morning
and happy holidays. I see the public is breaking
down the doors to get into this hearing. So they
tell me we have to get started. Okay. [laughs] I
am Council Member Vincent Gentile, and I am the Chair
of the Council's Committee on Oversight and
Investigations. I want to acknowledge and thank my
co-chair, Council Member Benjamin Kallos, Chair of
Council's Government Operations Committee and his
staff and my staff for putting together this hearing
and for co-chairing this important topic. Today, we
are having an oversight hearing on the Mayor's
Management Report, also known as the MMR. The MMR
was first published in 1977, and it has been and
continues to be an annual public report card on City
services and operations. It serves as a key public
tool in evaluating the performance of city
government, and has done so in varying degrees of
effectiveness since that time. Over the past several
years, the Council has held yearly hearings by a
pertinent committee evaluating the usefulness of the
information put forth in the Preliminary MMR related
to the subject matter of committees that oversee
particular agencies. Such as the Public Safety

Committee that oversees the Police Department or the
Fire and Criminal Justice Services Committee that
oversees the Fire Department.

During the PMMR hearings, Council Members
evaluate and make suggestions and recommendations for
changes to the way the particular agency they are
overseeing captures and reports pertinent data that
ends up in the MMR. Less frequently, the Council
assesses the MMR itself, and focuses on more global
issues such as the structure and programmatic content
of the MMR cross-agency indicators rather than a
particular agency. And that is what we are here
today to do. That programmatic content cross-agency
indicators.

At today's hearing we expect to hear
testimony and evaluate some of the key programmatic
indicators and narratives being utilized to measure
agency performance with an eye on making sure that
the results reported are accurate and helpful. And
in a format that keeps the public informed as to the
quality of the delivery of agency services. In doing
do, we will be discussing the most recent MMR, which
was released in September in accordance with the City

Charter, and taking a critical look at whether it is meeting expectations.

I want to thank the representatives from the Mayor's Office of Operations, which is responsible for coordinating, reviewing, and revising the PMMR and MMR, for being here today to testify. We hope to learn what efforts the Administration has made to improve the current MMR, and how they plan to address the concerns we and others raise today. And generally, what efforts they are making to improve the usefulness of the MMR. We hope to start a dialogue with the Administrations and stakeholders to critically discuss whether the methods used in evaluating the performance are the best methods available to provide accurate and helpful information. And what we can all do to make this best tool it can be. With that, I will turn it over to my Co-Chair Council Member Ben Kallos for his opening and Council Member, I just want to make sure - I have no members of my committee here yet. So I will let you introduce your members. Let me just introduce my staff that is with us. We have the Committee Counsel Josh Hanshaft. We have Jennifer Montalvo, our Policy Analyst, and I don't believe

Ellen Eng is here yet. Oh, there's Ellen. Okay,
Ellen Eng, our Legislative Financial Analyst. And my
staff member and Liaison to the Committee, Michael
Bistro [sic] Council Member Ben Kallos.

CHAIRPERSON KALLOS: Good morning and
welcome to this joint hearing of the Committees on
Governmental Operations and Oversight and
Investigations. I am sorry that we don't have enough
seats for all the attendees. For those of you
[background comments] who are in attendance, thank
you for being here. This is, in fact, an important
issue. I'm Ben Kallos. I'm Chair of the Committee
on Governmental Operations. You can Tweet me at Ben
Kallos. I'd like to thank my Co-Chair of the
Committee Vincent Gentile. It is always a pleasure
to co-chair committees with you, and yes we do. This
is our second time in just under a year, hopefully we
can continue to work together on issues of operations
and oversight.

I would like to acknowledge that we are
joined by one of my committee members Council Member
Steve Matteo, who actually has perfect attendance and
is one of the most substantive members of our
committee, often bringing issues of importance

1
2 regarding different legislation. Believe it or not,
3 we don't rubber stamp everything. We have tough
4 negotiations within our committee about which bills
5 we would like to pass, and what changes we might want
6 to make to them. So I just want to thank Council
7 Member Matteo for his participation, and attendance,
8 and we are lucky to have you.

9 We will be discussing the Mayor's
10 Management Report, often called the MMR this morning.
11 The Mayor's Office of Operations, which is
12 responsible for putting the report together is here
13 to testify. This is the first hearing on the subject
14 since Mindy Tarlow became Director, and we look
15 forward to hearing her plans for the MMR.
16 Performance measurement is critical for evaluating
17 how all of us in government are doing our jobs and
18 delivering results for the public. As in so many
19 areas, New York City has been a leader in performance
20 management. With the MMR being a key tool since it
21 was first acquired in 1977. The document has changed
22 over the years to become more user-friendly, add
23 across-agency initiatives, and increase the focus on
24 outcomes and unit costs rather than the less useful
25 outputs and gross expenditures. But there is still

work to be done to ensure that we are setting ambitious targets reporting the most useful data possible and improving the MMR website. I look forward to hearing about the Administration's plan for the MMR, and for advocates on how the MMR can continue to improve. I would like to turn it back to my Co-Chair.

CHAIRPERSON GENTILE: Thank you, Council Member, and we will begin then with our first panel. The first panel will consist of the Director of the Mayor's Office of Operations, Mindy Tarlow; Tina Chiu, also from the Mayor's Office, and Genevieve Knolls, also from the Mayor's Office of Operations. Come and take a seat at the table, and while you're doing that, I will recognize a member of the Oversight and Investigation Committee who has joined us, Inez Dickens, Councilwoman. Thank you.

[pause]

CHAIRPERSON GENTILE: And before you testify, we do ask as Council policy that you do take the oath. Okay, if you could raise your right hand. Do you affirm to tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth in your testimony before this

committee, and to respond honestly to Council Member questions?

MINDY TARLOW: Yes, I do.

CHAIRPERSON GENTILE: Okay, and that goes for all members of the panel there, Director Mindy Tarlow, Genevieve Knolls and Tina Chiu, all from the Mayor's Office of Operations. Just for the record.

MINDY TARLOW: Yes, it is.

CHAIRPERSON GENTILE: Okay, great. Thank you. You may begin when you're ready.

MINDY TARLOW: Thank you. Good morning, Chair Kallos, Chair Gentile, members of the Governmental Operations and Oversight and Investigation Committee. My name is Mindy Tarlow. I'm the Director of the Mayor's Office of Operations. Joining me today are Tina Chiu, Deputy Director for Performance Management on my left, and Guinevere Knowles, Associate Director for Performance Management on my right. We really appreciate the opportunity to discuss the Mayor's Management Report or MMR with you and agree with your opening remarks about its importance, and its role in helping the City manage to outcomes and hold itself accountable.

As you said, the Mayor's Management Report has been serving as a public account of the performance of City agencies since 1977, measuring whether their delivering vital services efficiently, effectively, and expeditiously. As Mayor de Blasio said in his Letter to New Yorkers, which accompanied his First Annual Mayor's Management Report in Fiscal 2014, "This is a civic duty grounded in the democratic principles of accountability and transparency." A good MMR provides all New Yorkers with an appraisal of how each aspect of their government is performing. From the delivery of basic day-to-day services to the most urgent emergency care. From citywide initiatives to neighborhood-based programs. From services that affect every New Yorkers to those that help the most vulnerable among us.

The MMR is part of our mandate to ask questions, collect data, track our progress, and hold ourselves accountable in accordance with our values. As mandated by Section 12 of the New York City Charter, the Mayor reports to the public and the City Council twice a year on the performance of each city agency. An annual MMR is released every September,

and a preliminary MMR or PMMR covers the first four months of each fiscal year from July through October and is published two weeks after the release of the January Financial Plan.

The MMR and PMMR cover the operations of city agencies that report directly to the Mayor. Three addition non-mayoral agencies are included for a total of 44 agencies and organizations. Activities that have direct impact on New Yorkers including the provision of support services to other agencies are the focus of the report. The report is organized by agency around a set of services listed at the beginning of each agency chapter. Within service areas, goals articulate each agency's aspirations. The services and goals are developed through a collaborative process between the Office of Operations and the senior members of each agency.

The Fiscal 2014 MMR reported on a total of 2,067 indicators, which includes 524 critical indicators. The MMR and PMMR are available via an interactive website, and as PDF documents. I would like to draw particular attention to the online Citywide Performance Reporting System or CPR. Throughout the year, agencies routinely report on all

critical indicators contained in the MMR and PMMR though this citywide performance reporting portal. CPR is publicly available, and allows users to easily sort information by agency and by time period. CPR also provides opportunities to view five-year trends as well as mapping information for a select and increasing number of indicators. Data can also be publicly accessed online through the City's Open Data Portal.

The MMR is part of an ongoing performance management process with agencies, and must reflect changes in strategic and operational priorities of individual agencies and the Administration as a whole. Modification are made during just about every reporting cycle, and these indicators are developed in consultation with agency leadership, operations staff and City Hall. Any proposed change in service areas, goals, performance measures or definitions is examined and evaluated by operation stuff to see whether it has a clear rationale, and provides useful and informative insight into agency performance. The review also ensures that changes are not being made to redirect attention away from lower than expected performance. The MMR explains important changes

including updates and corrections to information presented in earlier reports in what we call a noteworthy changes, additions, or deletions section that can be found at the end of each agency's chapter.

Examples of modifications in the most recent MMR include the addition of a new goal and performance measures related to accessibility for the Taxi and Limousine Commission, and revisions in the methodology used by the Human Resources Administration for calculating the number of clients the agency assisted in finding a job. Operations is currently working with agencies on the revisions to goals, services, and indicators for the Fiscal 2015 PMMR. Operations has a close working relationship with agencies. The office has a mandate to plan, coordinate, and oversee the management of City governmental operations to promote the efficient and effective delivery of agency services.

This puts Operations' staff in frequent contact with commissioners, senior managers, and other agency staff whether it's discussing cost-cutting topics or specific agency initiatives. I personally meet on a monthly basis with numerous

commissioners. Operations is thus commissioned to engage agencies in a robust and ongoing dialogue about their services and performance. And importantly, it helps us provide support that agencies need for these efforts.

The Fiscal 2014 MMR, though it covers only half of this administration's first year, begins to reflect our values and priorities as we bring a focus on equity, equality, and opportunity to our work. Agency specific focus on equity statements, featured for the very first time in this MMR, serve as an example. Every single agency produced an equity statement that articulates how it is working to promote fair delivery and quality of services among and across groups of people and places in support of the goals of equity, equality and opportunity for all New York City residents.

These statements cover widely reported initiatives like Universal Access to Early Education in the Department of Education. And also, less publicized initiatives such as the Department of Finance's Taxpayer's Advocate Office, which provides relief to low-income taxpayers. The Department of Environmental Protection's Home Water Assistance

1 Program, which will provide an annual water bill
2 credit to low-income homeowners across all five
3 boroughs. And reforms implemented by the Department
4 of Consumer Affairs to reduce fines on small
5 businesses. By applying an equity lens to the work
6 we do, we can begin the process of developing goals
7 and metrics about issues that span the work of all
8 agencies. So that we can measure our collective
9 progress towards outcomes and hold ourselves
10 accountable.
11

12 Reporting on the core functions and the
13 performance of each agency is vital to understanding
14 and appreciating how government works. To be truly
15 effective, however, government must also find ways to
16 cut across agencies and bring different disciplines
17 together. We're approaching this challenge through
18 new multi-agency initiatives like UPK for all, Vision
19 Zero, and Housing New York creating agency
20 collaborations all across the city. The Fiscal 2014
21 MMR summarizes those initiatives, and spells out
22 preliminary performance indicators related to
23 implementation. And even more important to the
24 public, related to outcomes. Future MMRs will
25 include additional multi-agency initiatives while

continuing to track these priority projects through their life cycles. As projects get implemented and mature over time, their key performance indicators will migrate into the foreset of indicators of relevant agencies, if they reflect a new or expand an existing service or goal.

The MMR and related work at the Office of Operations also serves as a tool to inform other citywide planning efforts. Our office engages directly with the Office of Management and Budget, for example, in multiple ways. It participates in the Internal Budget and Financial Planning processes throughout the year, which provide multiple opportunities to offer any insights and make recommendations where appropriate at both an agency level and across various systems. Right now, in fact, Operations is deeply engaged in the current ten-year capital planning process. Focused information sharing, issue spotting, problem solving among operations, agencies, OMB, and City Hall help the city be responsible and accountable for better performance and outcomes.

We are committed to providing information about our performance as a city, and to proactively

engaging the public in this effort. Our office is always evaluating our processes, seeking to improve how we present performance information, and identify creative ways to make the MMR more accessible to the public. We look forward to working with the Council and other stakeholders to make government information easily accessible to all New Yorkers. Thanks for listing, and I'll be happy to answer any questions.

CHAIRPERSON GENTILE: Well, thank you for that very comprehensive opening statement, and we'll get to questions from the Chair. But I understand that our colleague Council Dickens has a question, and she has to leave. So we're going to let you go first. Okay.

COUNCIL MEMBER DICKENS: Thank you so much, Chairs, and thank you for allowing me to ask a question. And good morning, and thank you for your testimony. Mine is very, very short. Does any of the 2,067 indicators that you mentioned in your testimony include accountability on MWBE/MBE actually signed contracts, and not merely outreach for bidding purposes. And if so, are the results broken down by agencies? That's the first question. The second one is the same applies to hiring practices of the

1 agencies. Not merely for the lower end of the hiring
2 process, but on the actual upper end, those who
3 affect comps?
4

5 MINDY TARLOW: The Department of Small
6 Business Services does track MWBE contracts and
7 awards, and that can be found in the Small Business
8 Services section of the MMR. I can send that to you
9 separately, but it's available under SBS.

10 COUNCIL MEMBER DICKENS: Send it to my
11 Chairs, please and they will give it to me.

12 MINDY TARLOW: Yes, I will absolutely be
13 delighted. And in terms of hiring practices, the
14 Department of Citywide Administrative Services, I
15 will check and get back to you. I do not believe
16 that those are publicly tracked in the MMR. I can
17 back to you, or my colleagues can look while this is--
18 - In the next couple of minutes and answer that.

19 COUNCIL MEMBER DICKENS: You say or
20 direct that is-- it's in the SBS section of the MMR,
21 is that just for SBS or is that for all the city
22 agencies?

23 MINDY TARLOW: All the city agencies.
24 They are-- they oversee the MWBE on behalf of the
25 City.

COUNCIL MEMBER DICKENS: What are the
five--

MINDY TARLOW: [interposing] The other
thing that I would say is that the Mayor's Office of
Contract Services also produces-- It's not a
companion volume exactly, but it is a separate report
that they put out the same day that the MMR comes
out. Which gives much more detail about all
contracting indicators including much more detail on
the delivery and the actual contracting, as you said,
for MWBE citywide.

COUNCIL MEMBER DICKENS: What are five of
the top critical indicators? Do you know. I mean
you may not know off the top of your head.

MINDY TARLOW: The top critical
indicators for the city?

COUNCIL MEMBER DICKENS: The top five.
Just five. Just five or even three. I'll take
three. What are the three top-- You said that there
were--

MINDY TARLOW: [interposing] There are
524 indicators.

COUNCIL MEMBER DICKENS: [interposing]
There's five, yes 524 critical. What-- I was asking
do you know just any five of those?

MINDY TARLOW: Of course, and I'll also
say that within the indicators in the MMR, all
critical indicators are starred with an asterisk. So
you can look through the document and see them. But
things like the crime statistics in the NYPD, they
are all critical indicators.

COUNCIL MEMBER DICKENS: Does that
include when there are accusations of police
brutality?

MINDY TARLOW: That would be I think in
the Civilian Complaint Report Section--

COUNCIL MEMBER DICKENS: [interposing]
Okay.

MINDY TARLOW: --and I can check what
their indicators are as well. [pause] Okay. Yeah, I
think in CCRB it's just total complaints. They're
not broken down by type. So crime indicators would
be considered critical indicators. Structural fires
in the Fire Department are a critical indicator.
Yeah, things like that.

COUNCIL MEMBER DICKENS: Okay. Thank you so much, Director, and I appreciate you coming here this morning to give testimony.

MINDY TARLOW: Okay.

COUNCIL MEMBER DICKENS: Thank you, Chairs, for allowing me.

CHAIRPERSON GENTILE: Thank you, Council Member Dickens. Thank you for joining us. So I just want to go over some preliminary questions with you, and then I'll hand it over to my Co-Chair. Director Tarlow, if you had to say-- if you had to describe the audience for the MMR, how would you describe it or characterize the audience?

MINDY TARLOW: Yeah, I would say that it's really twofold. It's an internal audience and an external audience. The internal audience, of course, is all of us who are doing our jobs trying to track what's happening in the city. And that's a hard thing to do day-to-day, and it's our job to help our fellow, my fellow commissioners and my fellow senior managers of government really understand what's going on. So there is a strong internal audience. And then there is, of course, a public audience. We represent the people and places that

1 this city serves, and this is meant as a vehicle for
2 an average citizen to understand that's happening in
3 their community. But there is also a secondary
4 external audience of opinion makers, policymakers.
5 My former job before I came back to the City to run
6 Operations I ran a non-profit that got jobs for
7 people coming out of prison. And I would use PMMR to
8 understand what was happening in the city, and what
9 was happening to the community that I served. So I
10 think there are people who are actively engaged in
11 government that this is meant for. And frankly,
12 we're looking for ways to make this document more
13 appealing and more useful to think tanks and
14 policymakers and the community makers in the city.

16 CHAIRPERSON GENTILE: So do you-- Well,
17 let me ask you this from an internal perspective, do
18 deputy mayors, for example, use the MMR, and if so,
19 how? Do you have an example of how it's used by
20 deputy mayors for example?

21 MINDY TARLOW: Well, in putting this MMR
22 together, and remember it was our first, and the
23 preliminary was so quick and just on the heels of
24 coming into office. This is really the first report
25 that's come out, and what we did was when the agency

actions come in, we pull the altogether. We have our own back and forth with agencies, and then we send them back to the deputy mayors for consultation, for review, for discussion, and that's--

CHAIRPERSON GENTILE: [interposing]
That's before it's published?

MINDY TARLOW: Correct.

CHAIRPERSON GENTILE: Okay.

MINDY TARLOW: And that sparks a lot of internal conversation about how things are going. More recently, if you look at the upfront sections of the MMR, and you see that there are these multi-agency sections like Housing New Yorkers, a very good example. And we work closely with Deputy Mayor Glen and her team in thinking through how we want to present preliminary indicators around the Housing Plans. A very thoughtful process, very engaged. When it comes to the outcomes themselves, I would say we're dealing mostly with the commissioners so that we can help them flag things that are going in, trending in the wrong direction, and try to help problem solve throughout the year.

CHAIRPERSON GENTILE: So post-publication, you're focused on the commissioners?

MINDY TARLOW: In general, yes, that's correct.

CHAIRPERSON GENTILE: I see. Okay. Do you think-- Well, you mentioned OMB. Could you give some specific details-- You're talking about the ten-year capital processing, but what specific example-- OMB are they involved in the preparation of the MMR, or they use the MMR? I wasn't clear about that.

MINDY TARLOW: Well, it is my office's responsibility to prepare the MMR. I mean when we get agency narratives that we can see have budget implications, we will informally check in with OMB. The prime collaboration just in the putting together of the report is, as you know, there are agency resource sections at the end of each agency. And we have to collaborate with OMB to make sure that we have the appropriate budget numbers. But then, going forward from there doing the budget process itself, as I said I participated in every internal budget meeting leading up to each of the budget publications where I can use this document and its contents to help inform the budget process. I also used to work at OMB, so--

CHAIRPERSON GENTILE: [interposing] Oh,
okay.

MINDY TARLOW: --I have a great
appreciation for the, you know, relationship between
performance management and budgeting.

CHAIRPERSON GENTILE: Okay. So there is
that relationship that's been established?

MINDY TARLOW: Yes. And again, we really
respectfully want to say that we-- this was our first
big first annual publication. And I think that the
relationship, the use of the MMR, how we think about
it going forward is understandably very involved.

CHAIRPERSON GENTILE: I'm curious then
why weren't there any budgetary numbers for the
multi-agency initiatives in the MMR?

MINDY TARLOW: I would say it were-- A
very good question. I would say we were kind of
following history. It's only in the last few years
that these multi-agency or cross-agency sections have
been there. And they've mostly been focused on
indicators, and that was the thrust of those
chapters.

CHAIRPERSON GENTILE: Do you anticipate
putting budgetary numbers in, in the future in these

multi-agency approaches? I mean we know. We've talked about the UPK numbers.

MINDY TARLOW: Right.

CHAIRPERSON GENTILE: But I was curious. It would be interesting to see across the board what the initiatives are costing or what is budgeted across those agencies.

MINDY TARLOW: Right.

CHAIRPERSON GENTILE: That's an interesting observation, and I can certainly discuss that with my partners at OMB.

CHAIRPERSON GENTILE: Great. Let's talk about the indicators for a minute. Do you feel that the MMR now-- that the indicators that you have in the MMR now are useful to all the stakeholders involved. And that they assist in-- They assist the public at the same time getting the proper information to the agency management staff, the other audience that the MMR is for? At this point with those indicators, do you think it's sufficient?

MINDY TARLOW: I think that indicators are an ongoing process, and we are working with every agency, and working through these indicators. For example, are the critical indicators, they are

critical indicators. Performance management is a two-way street. If I think it's critical and you don't think it's critical, that's a problem. So we've been working very openly with each agency to say, you know, let's take stock. Sometimes indicators become obsolete, or sometimes we want to frame it a different way. And we have an ongoing very interactive process with agencies around that that I think will evolve over time. I also think that we are trying to again look at our work through a different lens. And sort of making sure that we are capturing the kinds of indicators we want to capture. So that we can hold ourselves accountable for having the kind of city that we want to have. My overall take is that I think what is in here is really pretty good. I think that it's a good combination of customer-focused indicators, and performance focused indicators. I'm using crime data is a good example. You know, there's not much that you want to necessarily change, but I do think it's really important to keep evolving.

CHAIRPERSON GENTILE: Sure it is.

MINDY TARLOW: I do think it's very important to keep evolving and stay current with the

1 times and try to maintain the appropriate balance
2 between I think three things: Single agency
3 indicators. Everybody talks about government silos
4 and all of that, and that's true, but you really want
5 to know what's happening in each agency. And I think
6 that's something that's here to stay. I think we
7 have a growing interest in looking across
8 agencies, and combining efforts whether it's Vision
9 Zero or it be UPK or what have you. And we will to
10 see more and more of that. And then there's these
11 customer focused indicators. Am I responding to you,
12 citizen, who asked me a question about my work in a
13 responsive way. I think those things are meaningful.
14 So I think we're trying to maintain that balance
15 between single agency indicators, across-agency
16 indicators, and customer service.

18 CHAIRPERSON GENTILE: Good and you said a
19 lot there, and we'll get to some of that. But let's
20 go back to the issue of the critical indicators. As
21 you go through the report, some are critical, some
22 are not. Who decides that? What's critical? Is it
23 uniform? Is there criteria? Some are obvious, but
24 others may not be, and some that would appear to be
25 obvious are not critical in the book. So can you

1
2 explain that process of who decides what's a critical
3 indicator, and whether or not you absolutely are
4 adhering to that. [sic]

5 MINDY TARLOW: Yes. So again, we
6 inherited a very longstanding process. For the
7 record, I was in high school in 1977. So you come
8 into an administration with something that's fixed.
9 And we have, as I said, been meeting with every
10 single agency, and asking exactly that questions.
11 Are these the critical indicators that you think are
12 critical? And I asked my team, are these the
13 critical indicators that you think are critical? And
14 try to make sure that everybody agrees. Each agency
15 has the ability to define what they think is
16 critical, and that becomes an interactive process
17 with operations, and the agency heads. And like you
18 said, in general I think it's intuitive what's
19 critical and what's not, and sometimes things change.
20 So we're really just getting started down that road,
21 and I would describe it as a collaborative process
22 between operations and agency heads.

23 CHAIRPERSON GENTILE: You have a role in
24 I guess adding or deleting certain critical
25 indicators?

MINDY TARLOW: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON GENTILE: You do. Okay. So what is the practical significance in this book, in this report the MMR, of a critical indicator? What would be the practical significance of that?

MINDY TARLOW: The practical significance and going back to the Citywide Performance Reporting Portal, only the critical indicators are reported in there. So that's a very practical consideration of what's out there. And what if you were sort of an engaged citizen, and you wanted to look at what was happening in a given agency regularly over the course of the year, you're seeing just the critical indicators. I think that's the big significance.

[Pause]

MINDY TARLOW: I would also say to refer back to the goal setting itself. When you look at the front of each agency chapter, and I've said in my testimony that the goal is to represent kind of the agency's aspirations. The critical indicators fall under the goals.

CHAIRPERSON GENTILE: Under the goals?

MINDY TARLOW: Yes. So that one determines the other.

CHAIRPERSON GENTILE: I see and those are the goals that we should look at is primarily to ascertain whether the agency is performing up to par?

MINDY TARLOW: Yes, I would say that's correct.

CHAIRPERSON GENTILE: Okay. Now, you also-- The MMR contains numeric targets across the agencies, which it says the actual performance versus the projected levels of service. So do we interpret that as outcome versus output analysis?

MINDY TARLOW: I would describe it more as directional. How close are we? Because a lot of the indicators are really just compared to how did you do this last year? How did you do last year at time? You know, five-year trending, that sort of thing. The target is the aspiration for what you want to hit up or down. Sometimes it's just a direction. We want this number to go up, or we want this number to go down, you know. And sometimes there's an actual target. So, I would say that there is really just the direction that we want the number to go.

CHAIRPERSON GENTILE: So it's just the
general consensus that you want the number to go up
or you want the number to go down?

MINDY TARLOW: Right. So some of the
targets are just directional--

CHAIRPERSON GENTILE: [interposing]
Right.

MINDY TARLOW: --but some are numeric,
and those numeric targets are also setting
consultation with the agency. And they represent the
aspiration that that agency has for the number that
they want to hit for that target over the period of
time that's reflected in the report.

CHAIRPERSON GENTILE: Okay, and they
determine those?

MINDY TARLOW: Again, I think all of
these processes are collaborative.

CHAIRPERSON GENTILE: Collaborative.
Okay.

MINDY TARLOW: There's no-- You know,
the agency doesn't dictate play. The Operations
doesn't dictate play. It's meant to be a
collaborative process. So you can't just change
something or delete something, or say I don't want to

1
2 do this any more, and that's it. You know, there's a
3 process particularly if you want to remove an
4 indicator that's been in the MMR for a long time and
5 there's a process. And that's the most important
6 thing is that change is not made without a process.

7 CHAIRPERSON GENTILE: And who has the
8 ultimate decision on whether it stays in or it comes
9 out?

10 MINDY TARLOW: It's interesting, but
11 again in my limited oversight of this, we have not
12 had to, you know, escalate because I think we're all
13 looking at the same information. But I would say in
14 the end, it would be the Deputy Mayor in that
15 portfolio that would promote the government policy.
16 [sic]

17 CHAIRPERSON GENTILE: The Deputy Mayor.
18 Okay. The intro to the MMR states that because
19 resources affect an agency's ability to perform, the
20 MMR an PMMR also present each agency an overview of
21 resources used, and resources projected for use.
22 Including personnel levels, overtime, expenditures,
23 revenues, and capital commitments. That's in the
24 introduction to the MMR. While that's true, it's
25 really what you see in the MMR is really overall

1
2 expenditures per agency. There is really no
3 breakdown of those expenditures as to, for example,
4 the amount spent on headcount numbers, how many
5 overtime hours we worked in total or the total amount
6 of overtime paid. You know, you have the numbers of
7 overtime paid, but you don't know how many hours that
8 represents. We have headcount numbers but we don't
9 know how much based on the MMR was spent on the
10 headcount out of the budget. So can you address that
11 issue, the fact that there is not that breakdown that
12 might be useful?

13 MINDY TARLOW: Right. I think that the
14 MMR is meant to summarize the resources that are
15 associated with each agency. And the breakdown of
16 how those resources are spent can be found in the
17 accompanying budget documents when the budget comes
18 out. So I think they're meant to be companion
19 documents where the MMR has a lot more performance
20 information than the budget has, and the budget has a
21 lot more budget information than the MMR has. So
22 it's not meant to stand alone as a detailed budget
23 document. It's meant to provide a summary for ease
24 of use of budget information that's associated with
25

each agency. And the details of that budget are really for OMB to provide in it's budget documents.

CHAIRPERSON GENTILE: But at least from the public standpoint, maybe not the internal standpoint, but the public standpoint for ease and transparency having that information on this document makes it much easier for the public and for us to evaluate an agency's budget and performance in the same document. By matching specific amounts of resources that get paid for a specific activity within an agency. So that is something I would ask you to think about.

MINDY TARLOW: Okay.

CHAIRPERSON GENTILE: Okay. I'm curious. Do you prepare MMR data with similar government activities in similar cities?

MINDY TARLOW: We have not done that as far as I know. You know, it is one of those situations I think where New York is a pretty unique city. I know we always say that, but I think the breadth of what we do, and the amount of data that we collect is unusual. I do participate in some national efforts with my peers, but we don't specifically compare outcomes across cities.

CHAIRPERSON GENTILE: Okay. I'll leave it at that, I will have some more questions, but my Co-Chair Council Member Kallos has some questions. And we will do that. But let me just recognize the fact that we've been joined by O and I committee members, Council Member Chaim Deutsch, and Council Member Ritchie Torres. Council Member Kallos

CHAIRPERSON KALLOS: Thank you for joining us and giving us testimony, and thank you for giving us a report, which is actually 324 pages long, which makes it more of a book. So I guess one performance indicator is has this made the New York Times Best Seller List yet?

MINDY TARLOW: [laughs] Yes, actually I think it's right behind People Magazine in circulation. So, you know, that's what we're really aiming for is to be number one.

CHAIRPERSON KALLOS: Oh, thank you. I'm pretty focused on transparency. How does the Open Data Law fit into the MMR, and how are you hoping to comply with the Open Data Law through the MMR?

MINDY TARLOW: Yeah. So, the MMR is available in the Open Data Portal. So we are

certainly complying with the Open Data Law in that respect.

CHAIRPERSON KALLOS: Would it be possible to make sure that the Open Data Sets that relate to parts of the MMR are linked to directly from both areas in the MMR, both the printed version as well as the online special MMR site? So that when you're looking at data set, and you want to learn more you--

MINDY TARLOW: [interposing] Toggle back and forth?

CHAIRPERSON KALLOS: --you can just click the link and say, Okay, here's the available set. And as those links can be hard, you could even use a URL shortener.

MINDY TARLOW: Right. I don't have the answer to that question, but I can check into it and see what's feasible.

CHAIRPERSON KALLOS: Would it be possible to display the MMR information in the context of goals? So when I look at it, I see numbers, and I'm able to compare backwards and forwards based on historical. So where are we in relation to last year. But I also have no idea of the context of what that agency's goal was. Was the agency's goal that

1 they wanted things to get better or worse? Were they
2 expecting things to get better or worse? Did they
3 meet their own projections. So at least from the--
4 I come at this from a little bit of a corporate
5 standpoint. It's important to make sure that we are
6 meeting our own goals. So would it be possible to
7 include the internal goals set, or external goals
8 set? So if somebody says I'm going to get 50,000
9 seat at Pre-K, did we get 50,000 at Pre-K and where
10 are we in the scope of that goal setting?
11

12 MINDY TARLOW: So I think, and I'm going
13 to put Tina on the spot a little bit. I think what
14 we're saying is that we-- Back to the conversation I
15 was having with Council Member Gentile about targets.
16 Some indicators have targets and some don't. Some
17 just have a direction, and some don't. I think what
18 you're saying is if we set a specific target that we
19 want to achieve, you know, a thousand--

20 CHAIRPERSON KALLOS: 200,000 units of
21 affordable housing.

22 MINDY TARLOW: Well, that's a ten-year
23 goal. Like that's a-- I mean so I think what you're
24 saying is to the extent that we have publicly
25 established goals, can we not only give you the

1 facility to not only compare the actual to the year
2 before or this, you know, this time last week, and
3 all those kind of happy things? Can we just compare
4 it to the goal itself, the target effect?
5

6 CHAIRPERSON KALLOS: That's correct.

7 MINDY TARLOW: Tina.

8 TINA CHIU: Good morning. So I believe
9 there are two different websites--

10 CHAIRPERSON GENTILE: [interposing] Just
11 identify yourself.

12 TINA CHIU: Hi, I'm Tina Chiu. So in
13 answer to your question, there are two different
14 websites that provide information on the MMR. So I'm
15 not entirely sure which one you might be referring
16 to. The CPR should have information related to
17 targets. And when we talk about goals, there is also
18 sort of the clarification of goals in terms of the
19 narratives that were set for each of the agencies.
20 So I'm not entirely sure whether you're referring to
21 those sets of goals and being able to tie those in
22 with the quantitative data.

23 CHAIRPERSON KALLOS: So do you have plans
24 to improve the Citywide Performance Reporting
25 website, and integrating it fully with the MMR data

reporting site rather than having separate sites?

Before you answer that question, while you have a moment to think of it, I would like to make sure that we recognize that we've been joined by Council Members Costa Constantinides and Council Member Brad Lander as well as Council Member Chaim Deutsch, if you haven't already recognized him. Perfect.

TINA CHIU: We're looking into that. We know that the way that we provide information is really important. So we want to make sure that everything is easily accessible.

CHAIRPERSON KALLOS: With regard to data tracking, is the MMR an annual document where agencies are just trying to get you data once a year? Is it happening monthly? Is it happening weekly? Is it happening minute-by-minute?

MINDY TARLOW: Yes, that's a great question. And this is where I think CPR is so useful. It depends on the indicator. You know, some indicators are updated monthly. Some are updated quarterly. Some are updated daily, and some are updated annually. So just for example, 311 data is updated all the time because it's happening constantly. It's happening as we speak. Whereas,

1 graduation rates would happen annually. You know,
2 and the other things are updated either monthly or
3 quarterly, the kinds of garden variety indicators
4 that we track. Population based data and that sort
5 of thing. And if you go in CPR there's a lag often,
6 but you can see the data all the time, and that's
7 what we get. That's how I work with agencies monthly
8 is I'll go to CPR. I'll print out the red, yellow,
9 green indicators for that period and then we'll have
10 a dialog about how they're doing.

12 CHAIRPERSON KALLOS: We tried to do it
13 internally, but we don't have the same resources. I
14 guess one questions is--

15 MINDY TARLOW: [interposing] Well, we
16 would be happy to work with you on that, or if there
17 is anything we can do in terms of training or show
18 and tell.

19 CHAIRPERSON KALLOS: That would-- I
20 think we would love to sponsor a briefing for the
21 Council on being able to use the CPR and MMR more
22 effectively. I guess where I was headed was have you
23 done or are there plans to do an augment to the 2,067
24 different indicators, and checking how-- whether
25 these are-- how often they are being recorded versus

1 how often that data is coming in. So that where it's
2 a graduation rate, hey that's pretty straightforward.
3 It's an event that happens once a year, and one day
4 that happens instantaneously, but on items where
5 maybe 311 data isn't coming in until a month later.
6 And it should be coming in instantaneously. Would it
7 be possible to have such an audit report?
8

9 MINDY TARLOW: Such an audit report?

10 CHAIRPERSON KALLOS: An audit of like the
11 indicators and which ones are in line--

12 MINDY TARLOW: [interposing] I understand

13 CHAIRPERSON KALLOS: --with the frequency
14 of the data.

15 MINDY TARLOW: And are you asking for us
16 to do that audit and prove it to you--

17 CHAIRPERSON KALLOS: [interposing] Yes,
18 please.

19 MINDY TARLOW: --or are you asking us to--
20 -? Okay, so I will take that back. We do track this
21 regularly. We are in contact with agencies when the
22 indicator is lagging, and that sort of thing.

23 CHAIRPERSON KALLOS: And so along those
24 lines, is it possible to make similar to the-- to the
25 CPR, parts of the MMR that everyone caught it just

1 available. As that information comes out, and as
2 it's going into the MMR just making it available for
3 open data? So we don't have to wait for once a year
4 to get all the information.
5

6 MINDY TARLOW: Right. I think what I'd
7 like to take back, and then come back to you on is,
8 you know, CPR is a very useful interim stop on that
9 train. You know, I mean it can take a minute for
10 something to appear or whatever, but I do actually
11 think it's quite useful in tracking things on a more
12 regular basis. And, you know, certainly the Open
13 Data Portal things get loaded into the Open Data
14 Portal, and its data sets and all of that. But CPR
15 is actually a good tool. So let me think about the
16 best way to come back around to you on that because I
17 totally understand what you're saying. But I think
18 that CPR can sometimes get lost in the shuffle of the
19 MMR, and the Open Data Portal, and it's actually a
20 pretty useful tool.

21 CHAIRPERSON KALLOS: With regard to the
22 MMR, is there currently a process for the public, or
23 internally for the administration to provide feedback
24 or performance indicators that desired to be added to
25 the MMR or changed? You alluded to it a little bit

1 in your testimony in answer to Council Member
2 Gentile, but what is the process? Is there a
3 process, and if not, would you be open to creating a
4 process?
5

6 MINDY TARLOW: To my knowledge, there is
7 not a public engagement process around indicators for
8 the MMR. We would be working through the Council
9 this notion that we were just talking about, about
10 training Council members around using CPR and all of
11 that. You know, that might be an interesting step to
12 take as representatives of the public. Sort of how
13 we're using the MMR.

14 CHAIRPERSON KALLOS: So to the extent we
15 could do that, that would be great. In terms of
16 playing a national role, has the Mayor's Office of
17 Operations adopted a schema or a standard that other
18 cities can use. And is there any software that
19 you're using to build the MMR every year that could
20 be green open source license and shared with every
21 municipality on the face of the earth whether it's
22 city, states, or countries?

23 MINDY TARLOW: Our data is very
24 available, and we would be more than happy for other
25 cities to be looking at what we do, and to adopt the

style of measurement that we have. There has been no formal process for that up until this point.

CHAIRPERSON KALLOS: So, in the private sector, I've been a little bit spoiled. I ran a venture vehicle. We had a software company, a production company, a film production company, a drug rehab company. At the drug rehab company we were able to generate reports. I was able to see okay we have X number of beds, but we only want to fill this many beds because this month is always a slow month. And I was able to do that, and I was able say if we're spending this much on advertising, that's how many clicks we were getting, and that's how many calls we were getting just from that advertising. So on and so forth, and I was able to see the big picture. I was able to click on charts, drill down. Is there an ability because right now we have the MMR published as a PDF, and that's available on the NYC.gov website. Then there is the separate MMR subsite, which is CityofNewYork.us where the MMR is then distributed out. And so, when I click on learning about Universal Pre-K going through a separate site. And I try to drill down as far as I can on this other site, eventually I end up seeing

1 the very same content that's on the PDF. And when I
2 want to say okay, how many Pre-K seats are there on
3 the east side because all I see is one dot, and I
4 know that we've got very few seats based on--

5 MINDY TARLOW: [interposing] It's
6 cooling out though.

7 CHAIRPERSON KALLOS: Right, but I'd love
8 to be able to get further down so I can see the data
9 under it, because I keep getting stuff at and
10 stonewalled at these PDFs. And then when I go to the
11 Open Data Portal and search for UPK under your data
12 sets, I get three indicators. So I can't find the
13 data source that you used, just using your three
14 points of interaction. Where I can get a list of all
15 those UPK sites that were used to create that chart,
16 which was pulled from yet another report. And, so in
17 a perfect world, I might be able to spend as much
18 time as I could tracking that data. But it would be
19 great if all that data was actually comprehensive and
20 available and able to be drilled down. And I think
21 you're the only person who may have understood what I
22 just said.

23 MINDY TARLOW: I completely understood
24 what you said. The example that you chose, however,
25

1
2 is a hard example to follow because the UPK map that
3 we put together from one of those interagency
4 sections. It's not its own agency. If you had said,
5 I want to see street cleanliness mapped, that in CPR
6 is really available. You can go into CPR and you can
7 see the five-year trend. You can see it mapped by
8 community board. You can see what scores there are
9 by community boards. So all that underlying data is
10 there in those kind of more traditional agency-by-
11 agency sector.

12 CHAIRPERSON KALLOS: For NYPD on the MMR
13 type go through the website you have
14 data.cityofnewyork.us, and I go through the NYPD, it
15 will eventually take me through a chart that shows
16 the current crime rate versus the previous year's
17 crime rate. And if I click that and try to get
18 further, it will take me to a website from the NYPD
19 that displays the current crime stat PDFs that are
20 very hard for my computer to turn into something
21 useful.

22 MINDY TARLOW: So I think it would be
23 really helpful to follow up on this line of
24 questioning. You know, I was a citizen not that long
25 ago, right. [laughs] And, you know, and I would root

1 around on CPR, and that's where-- Like I would go to
2 the crime data, and then you can click on that and
3 you can see it at the precinct level. So, I think
4 there's a lot of different ways to get started, and I
5 tended to start with CPR, which I found got me
6 further than most other ways of looking for the data.
7 So I think-- Again, I think we should follow up. I
8 understand what you're saying, and something new like
9 the UPK map right there's probably not-- The source
10 data is probably not there.

12 CHAIRPERSON KALLOS: So one last question
13 before I turn it over to my colleagues, and I have
14 we've had enough time.

15 MINDY TARLOW: I had to put my glasses on
16 so I can read my email.

17 CHAIRPERSON KALLOS: Perfect. [laughter]
18 So I will adjust that. In an interview with the City
19 Bar Association last year, Mayor de Blasio, then a
20 candidate, answered a question: Unlocking public
21 information referral reform. And he said, I will
22 increase transparency with a series of reforms of the
23 Freedom of Information Law. I will include FOIL
24 statistics in the Mayor's Management Report, mandate
25 routine reports on outstanding FOIL requests to the

Public Advocate and the City Council, and establish a unified online source to file, process, and track all FOIL requests. Is it still the goal of the administration to incorporate those statistics into the next version of the Mayor's Management Report?

MINDY TARLOW: It is definitely a continued goal of the administration to develop a centralized FOIL system along the lines of what you discussed. Various agencies are working on that, as I think you know. As part of that development of a centralized system, there will be work that will be ongoing with agencies to develop indicators to track the FOIL in the MMR. I do not think that that will happen in the PMMR, which is coming up very shortly. But it is our goal to track FOIL in the MMR.

CHAIRPERSON KALLOS: So will we see it in the MMR for 2015?

MINDY TARLOW: My hope would be that we would be able to do this by that time, but I really can't answer that question definitively right now. What I can say is that building a centralized FOIL system is something that numerous people are working on. A subset of that system will be helping agencies develop indicators for FOIL tracking in the MMR And

our ultimate goal is to have that feature in the MMR. When we will be ready to unveil that, I really don't know. I just can tell you that the development of that system centrally is underway.

CHAIRPERSON KALLOS: Thank you very much.

CHAIRPERSON GENTILE: Thank you, Council Member Kallos, and we've been joined also by Council Member Brad Lander, and I understand Council Member Lander has some questions.

[Pause]

COUNCIL MEMBER LANDER: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman, and to both Chairs, and to you. And I really want to start by saying congratulations on all the progress that has been achieved. The website, you know, it's been almost 11 months. So we've come a long way, you know, and conceptually, I think as well as technically. So I welcome that, and I'm not surprised by it given our prior work together and your work. But I'm encouraged by it, and I think the dialogue that you've been having shows a lot of good steps forward.

I want to focus my questions on an issue that we've also discussed before, which is the issues of the equity lens, and what it means to build into

1 the MMR real attention to the issues of equity that
2 animate this administration. But that are important
3 in every administration. And I think you speak in
4 the document both to what you did in the short term
5 to build in sort of the agency introductions that
6 asked each agency to speak to how they view equity.
7 And they did some interesting things, and to
8 integrate a look across the MMR mostly through the
9 high priority initiatives of the administration.
10 Which again, in this administration are centrally
11 about equity, but there is some distinction to be
12 made between high priorities of the administration
13 and things that integrate across agencies. And
14 things that achieve equity goals. So, one thing that
15 I-- And you indicate that you're moving forward to,
16 and it certainly takes some time and thinking, is a
17 structure for integrating that equity lens more
18 firmly into the structure and nature of the MMR
19 itself. And I wonder if you have thoughts beyond
20 what's in your testimony about what you're learning
21 and seeing and thinking in how that might be
22 achieved.
23

24 MINDY TARLOW: Right. Yeah, I mean I
25 think having focus on equity statement for each

agency in the MMR is a big first step in creating that focus, but it's just that. It's a first step. It's a way of sort of organizing people's thinking. From there, our expectation is we will get more and more focused on the kinds of measures that we want to see that will help us really understand if we're achieving the kind of equitable city that we have set out to. And when I say that, I mean writ large. You know, some of the equity statements are about having things in different languages, or having things open at night. So that people who are working can go access a service. It's meant to be framed in the largest possible way. And I do think that over time we're going to see more and more indicators that reflective of that. And you pointed there are multi-agency initiatives, which as you said in this administration are the first big step towards pulling the focus together across numerous agencies to achieve an equitable or equal opportunity goal. Right? So that's kind of step one is thinking through all of that for these large initiatives. What are the performance indicators that we're going to manage to? How will we know that we did what we wanted to do, and then keep going from there and get

1
2 sort of more and more cross-cutting in the way we
3 think about this. So, it starts at the bottom agency
4 by agency, leads to these multi-agency goals and then
5 ultimately to these larger outcomes. And I think
6 that that's what we'll see more of as we go forward.

7 COUNCIL MEMBER LANDER: So, let me ask a
8 few more questions kind of at both the micro and
9 macro levels. And, as you know, I've been exploring
10 whether there's some legislative way in making this a
11 requirement long term of the MMR. So at the agency
12 levels, one can imagine many different kinds of
13 indicators that speak to equity issues that are very
14 different from each other.

15 MINDY TARLOW: [interposing] Yes.

16 COUNCIL MEMBER LANDER: And, you know,
17 one could imagine noting which ones help get at
18 equity issues. You know, you couldn't sum them up so
19 to speak, but it sounds like you are thinking about
20 for step one, you know, encouraging, developing,
21 working at agencies and ultimately committing to
22 additional level indicators that track a variety of
23 kinds of equity relevant measures.

24 MINDY TARLOW: That's correct.
25

COUNCIL MEMBER LANDER: And that we might be able to kind of get a handle over time on what that-- You know, the universe of those. I'll flag for that I do think quite a lot of Council legislation because a lot of what we have the power to do of reporting bills get at some of those things that, for example, tomorrow we have the hearing on school diversity and school segregation. And I have a reporting bill that would require the DOE to provide data on and track some things it's not currently tracking with the goal of producing a less segregated and more diverse school system. And so, there may be some other things like that where legal obligations and reporting bills would be useful to incorporate in the MMR. And the agencies are already doing it. They're just doing it over here, and not over there. In the same way actually that you and I had this conversation around the Council and your poverty reporting requirement--

MINDY TARLOW: [interposing] Yes.

COUNCIL MEMBER LANDER: --we might be able to achieve some good additional alignment. So that's number one. Now, at the integrative level, I want to ask a little bit about whether you've thought

1 about the model of something like the Maryland
2 General Progress Indicators, because I had-- I'm
3 excited about all of the initiative specific things,
4 which get at equity goals, and are certainly easier
5 to track. You know, the measurement of how many kids
6 are in Pre-K, or how many units of affordable
7 housing. Who are they for, and where are they.
8 Getting at these, you know, however one thinks of
9 them, more--

11 MINDY TARLOW: [interposing] Opportunity
12 indices, that kind of thing?

13 COUNCIL MEMBER LANDER: Quality of
14 lights, flash [sic]. Yeah, what Maryland calls their
15 general, genuine progress indicators that seek to
16 sort of-- You know, the model is to go beyond GDP to
17 some other-- Some people would think of them as the
18 happiness indicators--

19 MINDY TARLOW: [interposing] For
20 wellbeing in a sense like--

21 COUNCIL MEMBER LANDER: --the wellbeing
22 indicators. Then obviously you get to this question
23 of do you want to also do more survey based
24 reporting, which there are some of them which are
25 aggregates of other kinds of existing objective data,

1 and some of them seek to get survey data. And some
2 of those are not about equity at all, although
3 obviously if you can ask questions of, you know,
4 whether the intersection between wellbeing and
5 various cuts of equity. So I just wonder, you know,
6 whether you've been thinking about that and see that
7 as a place you might like to take the MMR.
8

9 MINDY TARLOW: We are certainly becoming
10 very informed about how other cities, both within the
11 U.S. and outside the U.S. are kind of pulling
12 together their social indices. We're developing a
13 lot of knowledge about that.

14 COUNCIL MEMBER LANDER: You're interested
15 in it. You're not yet committed to bringing it into
16 the MMR?

17 MINDY TARLOW: I think it's something
18 we're becoming very knowledgeable about and we're
19 talking about internally just about what other places
20 are doing, what other cities are doing. What's
21 inside and outside of that.

22 COUNCIL MEMBER LANDER: Well, I think
23 that's appropriate. I spent some time on the
24 Maryland side in advance of this hearing, and I think
25 it has some interesting things in it. It's not--

1
2 You know, I don't think there is yet a model out
3 there where you would say, We need that.

4 MINDY TARLOW: Right.

5 COUNCIL MEMBER LANDER: And so, I think
6 it's--

7 MINDY TARLOW: [interposing] I would say
8 that's right, and I think there's a wide diversity
9 particularly indicated as I have said. There are
10 some is it measurability? Where they have like two
11 or three indicators. That's it, you know, and then
12 there are others that are much more elaborate, and
13 it's a very interesting thought process to think
14 about how-- What is the true north? You know, how
15 are you-- what are you trying to achieve?

16 COUNCIL MEMBER LANDER: And then my last
17 question is motivated by what I really do think in a
18 certain way is state-of-the-art in government,
19 although I don't know exactly how to apply it here,
20 which is Seattle's Race and Social Justice
21 Initiative, the goal of which was to push that equity
22 lens into more places of government decision-making--

23 MINDY TARLOW: Uh-huh.

24 COUNCIL MEMBER LANDER: --of all kinds.
25 Seattle is a lot smaller place than here. So whether

1 it's procurement, or employment or service delivery
2 or budgeting or policymaking, they have a tool that
3 they are trying to get more and more people to use to
4 ask questions about, and bring data to the analysis
5 of an equity lens. Obviously, that is part of what
6 we want from the MMR. There are so many different
7 spaces of government decision-making governed by so
8 many different rule bound processes here that there
9 is not a simple way to say how we cycle the waste
10 transfer stations, and how we budget, and how we make
11 policy, and how we hire, and how we procure. It
12 could all be subject to kind of a neatly organized
13 equity lens. But I think that that idea that we're
14 not only doing more to kind of put the data and the
15 equity lens in the MMR, but use it in a some more
16 structural ways to ensure its inclusion in decision
17 making. It's a broader goal, and I guess it's the
18 same question here. I don't think there is an easy
19 let's do it that way state-of-the-art here, but I
20 wonder if you've been giving thought to what
21 institutionalizing the equity lens in government
22 decision-making might look like beyond the tracking
23 and to coordinate the data.

1
2 MINDY TARLOW: Yes, and I think looking
3 at all of the municipal levers that we have with
4 equity in mind is something we can see in various of
5 the multi-agency initiatives that have been put
6 forward. The Jobs for All New Yorkers announcement
7 that was recently. And the notion in there that
8 employers have to look at certain candidates when
9 they are hiring, and things like that. That's a
10 lever to your point.

11 COUNCIL MEMBER LANDER: [interposing] I
12 agree 100%. What I'm imagining is something sort of-
13 - I don't want to say goes beyond that. But again,
14 in this administration because those goals are the
15 goals of the administration, you can point to many
16 different policy making and processes and decisions
17 that are, that do that. What Seattle tried to get at
18 through that initiative is building that lens more
19 deeply into the decision making processes themselves.
20 So that beyond one administration there are things,
21 but we have that MWBE. We have that in the MWBE. We
22 nominally have it in the Fair Share Process for
23 deciding of infrastructure, although it's another
24 failure there. We don't have it at all in our
25 budgeting process. We don't have it at all in our

legislating process. We do it a lot. So that may be the topic for another hearing. I don't want to take this one any further, but I just think that this--

MINDY TARLOW: [interposing] Yeah, no, no, I understand what you're saying, and I certainly think we have a shared interest in examining ways to use our municipal levers towards creating a more equitable city.

COUNCIL MEMBER LANDER: Thank you, and thank you for all the work that you've done. My pushing to think it further is not an indication that I don't--

MINDY TARLOW: [interposing] Yes. No, I see.

COUNCIL MEMBER LANDER: You've done a lot of work, which I appreciate, and I really appreciate this hearing, as well. So thank you very much.

CHAIRPERSON GENTILE: Thank you, Council Member Lander. Thank you so much. We've been joined also by members of the Committee, Councilman Daniel Dromm and Councilwoman Helen Rosenthal. And our next questioner will be Council Member Chaim Deutsch.

COUNCIL MEMBER DEUTSCH: Thank you. My question is how do you-- How do you monitor the city

agencies' operations and performance? Where do you
gather the information from?

MINDY TARLOW: From the agencies
themselves.

COUNCIL MEMBER DEUTSCH: So from the
agencies. Do you also use 311 to monitor?

MINDY TARLOW: We certainly look at 311
as one of the measure of how the city is doing. We
do look at the service requests, and we look at them
to see what people are most concerned about at any
given time.

COUNCIL MEMBER DEUTSCH: So the agencies
give you direct. They have every call that comes in?
I mean they inform you? They have logged in every
call that comes in and which-- and which ones end up
being satisfactory with positive results, and which
are still lagging behind?

MINDY TARLOW: Are you talking about all
indicators or are you still focusing on one?

COUNCIL MEMBER DEUTSCH: [interposing]
For example, let's say are you talking about the
Parks Department, or, you know, any other agency. I
mean you get it directly from them?

MINDY TARLOW: Yes.

COUNCIL MEMBER DEUTSCH: How do you
monitor the NYCHA developments?

MINDY TARLOW: Similarly. There are
NYCHA indicators contained within the MMR that we
monitor on a regular basis. Again, the agencies
input the data into the citywide performance
reporting system, which is an online portal. And
that information ultimately rolls up into what we
produce in the final MMR.

COUNCIL MEMBER DEUTSCH: Because I
understand like NYCHA, for example, they don't--
They're not listed on the HPD website. So when you
call in-- When people call in complaints, right,
it's not public record. So you don't really know
like which buildings and which developments, how many
complaints actually there are open, you know. And I
know that working with my predecessor in the City
Council there were like thousands of open cases of
complaints. So since they're not listed so how do
you monitor specifically the NYCHA developments to
make sure that their performance and their operations
are well ahead, and not lagging behind?

MINDY TARLOW: Right. So I think you're
saying two things, which are really important. One

1
2 is how the agency monitors its own performance and
3 reports on its own indicators, and that is something
4 that we track regularly, and that's in the Mayor's
5 Management Report. But you're also separately asking
6 about complaints, whether it's to 311 or elsewhere,
7 and how we track those, is that right?

8 COUNCIL MEMBER DEUTSCH: Yeah, correct,
9 and also when you're talking about NYCHA
10 developments, it's not always 311 because people in
11 the building are not going to call 311. They're
12 going to call the management.

13 MINDY TARLOW: Yes, that's why I'm trying
14 to unpack your question. We monitor 311 complaints.
15 311 actually reports to Operations as it happens. In
16 terms of the NYCHA complaints specifically, I would
17 have to get back to you about that. So I don't know
18 off hand, unless either of my colleagues do. No. So
19 I can circle back to you.

20 COUNCIL MEMBER DEUTSCH: Yes, thank you
21 very much. One last question. We have Council
22 Stats. We have Council Stats, each Council member so
23 we actually when we get complaints we want to get
24 into Council Stats, and it gives you-- If there's a
25 closed complaint, if everything is satisfactory, we

close it out. We know that the agency came through, and whatever needed to get done was done. And then we have open cases. So is there any way that you could also monitor maybe by council members sending you the Council Stats statistics to see how many cases are open, and how they have been open, and this way we could actually close them out to be part of the MMR reports.

MINDY TARLOW: We would be happy to look at Council Stat and get a sense of what it looks like and how the data works.

COUNCIL MEMBER DEUTSCH: It basically breaks everything--

MINDY TARLOW: [interposing] Right, I understand.

COUNCIL MEMBER DEUTSCH: --by different categories, if it's a park issue, if it's a housing issue. It breaks everything down. It's pretty intense in the way it's broken down. So it's not difficult to look at it, and to just see how many open cases there are for each council members. So if we all try to close out 100% of the cases, which we know is almost impossible, but we continue to work and try to close them out. So I think with the MMR,

1 you know, I think it's important working together
2 with you, and trying to get 100% satisfactory for us
3 Constituent Services.
4

5 MINDY TARLOW: Uh-huh. So I would be
6 very interested in seeing how that system works. I
7 can't commit to including it in the MMR at this point
8 or anything like that. But I would be very
9 interested in seeing what the data looks like and how
10 it comes in. And I can certainly commit to doing
11 that.

12 COUNCIL MEMBER DEUTSCH: Thank you.

13 MINDY TARLOW: Uh-huh.

14 CHAIRPERSON GENTILE: Thank you,
15 Councilman Deutsch. Just following up on something
16 that Councilman Lander had asked. He talked about
17 surveys. I'm curious. I'm not sure if he focused on
18 whether or not you intend on doing resident or
19 customer satisfaction surveys. That's something that
20 we've talked about here in the Council whether or not
21 that should be in the MMR. What's your thinking on
22 that?

23 MINDY TARLOW: Well, it's an interesting
24 question. I mean obviously there are customer
25 service sections within all agencies in the MMR. You

1 know some of which have to do with did I respond to
2 your complaint or your letter within a certain period
3 of time. And some are very agency specific. So we
4 obviously take customer service very seriously, and
5 monitor it with every agency. Whether we would do a
6 sort of a writ large customer satisfaction survey--
7 I think we might have done one in 2008.

9 CHAIRPERSON GENTILE: [interposing]
10 Because again if I'm not-- If I'm correct, what you
11 have in the MMR is just the overall number of 311
12 complaints that have been responded to, or letters
13 that have been responded to--

14 MINDY TARLOW: That's by agency.

15 CHAIRPERSON GENTILE: --a percentage--

16 MINDY TARLOW: [interposing] Yes, that's
17 correct.

18 CHAIRPERSON GENTILE: --you know, in a
19 two-week, in a 14-day period. So it doesn't tell you
20 whether it was successfully done. All that it tells
21 you is that you responded. The percentage of times
22 you responded within 14 days.

23 MINDY TARLOW: Right.

24 CHAIRPERSON GENTILE: So it's really not
25 what we're actually asking about.

1
2 MINDY TARLOW: Yeah, yeah. No, I
3 understand. And I think there was a customer
4 satisfaction survey that was done I believe in 2008,
5 and I can certainly talk with City-- My folks at
6 City Hall, and the First Deputy Mayor about whether
7 we want to do something like that again. We can
8 certainly take it under consideration. And I think
9 there are a number of ways that you can conduct
10 customer satisfaction surveys, not unlike what
11 Council Member Lander was just talking about.
12 Sometimes it can be as simple as one question that
13 goes out to a tremendous number of people. And
14 sometimes it's something more elaborate.

15 CHAIRPERSON GENTILE: So that discussion
16 hasn't happened yet? It has not. Okay. We look
17 forward to that. Our next questioner is Council
18 Member Helen Rosenthal.

19 COUNCIL MEMBER ROSENTHAL: Apologies for
20 arriving late. I have another hearing going on next
21 door, and actually I'm going to ask you a question
22 about what we were talking about in the hearing next
23 door. But, again, I want to thank you, and welcome
24 you Director Tarlow. It's such a-- The City was so
25 smart hiring you. It's just a pleasure working with

1 you, and I appreciate all the work, the hard work
2 you're putting into making the city run better for
3 the citizens of New York. So next door we're having
4 a hearing talking about a bill that Council Member
5 Crowley and I have introduced, Intro 579. Which
6 would ask DCAS and the Fire Department to simply
7 report on the number of applicants disaggregated by
8 gender and ethnicity going through the entire system
9 of-- The entire process of at first applying to
10 DCAS, and then all the way through the different
11 steps. Taking the written exam, taking the physical
12 exam, but being listed as somebody who could then
13 become a firefighter, the numbers. And then going
14 into the Academy. How many go in? How many pass
15 the different tests? How many come out? And then
16 how many choose to become a firefighter? It's a
17 simple reporting, but is that something that you
18 would be willing to include in your MMR statistics?

19
20 MINDY TARLOW: We have been-- I
21 completely understand what you're saying, and thank
22 you also for your kind words. Leaving aside the MMR
23 for a moment, we have been working very closely with
24 DCAS, and others inside the administration just about
25 tracking and thinking through how we track hiring.

1
2 And all of our commitments to diverse hiring in the
3 city, which is incredibly important to all of us. So
4 in that spirit, as Director of Operations, I am very
5 interested in supporting the administration, and
6 doing whatever we can around those issues. And we
7 would certainly leave it to my colleagues who are
8 considering this reporting--

9 COUNCIL MEMBER ROSENTHAL: [interposing]
10 Right.

11 MINDY TARLOW: --structure about whether
12 they will undertake it. Whatever response will
13 happen from the hearing next door, but certainly
14 working with my colleagues, I would do whatever I
15 could to participate in that process.

16 COUNCIL MEMBER ROSENTHAL: You know, I
17 appreciate it. I hadn't thought of it until I heard
18 you talking about the MMR. But the Commissioner
19 seems interested in reporting on this information.
20 He hasn't quite laid out yet what of the whatever--
21 Six different categories or areas. He is willing to
22 provide information about it. He is still working
23 that out. But the MMR might be a nice home for it in
24 addition to other places. So I appreciate your
25 openness to working with the Commissioner on that.

1
2 I also wanted to ask just given our
3 shared background in the Budge Office, whether or not
4 you think there's a good link today between in the
5 past, you know, 2014. I guess Fiscal Year 15,
6 whether or not you think there is a good link between
7 the information coming out of the MMR and what the
8 administration and the Council could use to inform us
9 in making budget decisions?

10 MINDY TARLOW: Yeah, we talked about this
11 a little earlier.

12 COUNCIL MEMBER ROSENTHAL: [interposing]
13 I apologize.

14 MINDY TARLOW: Oh, no. Not at all. We
15 talked about this a little bit earlier, and I did
16 actually say that as a former OMB person, I had a
17 very deep appreciation of the relationship between
18 performance management and budgeting.

19 COUNCIL MEMBER ROSENTHAL: Yeah.

20 MINDY TARLOW: I have participated in all
21 the internal discussions that have gone on in
22 preparation of each budget document that's come out,
23 and have been able to kind of bring the MMR focus to
24 bear on some of that internal work. So again, this
25 is our first big annual report. So it's still a new

and ongoing process. But, yes, I think that the relationship between OMB and Operations is I think stronger than it's been at least past, you know, few years. And, you know, we're very interested in making that partnership more meaningful.

COUNCIL MEMBER ROSENTHAL: And is that something that you think would help the Council as well?

MINDY TARLOW: We were just talking earlier about the resource-- the resources that are put into the MMR, all the budget resources are there in the most rolled up possible way because it's a performance management document, not a budget document. And it's kind of meant as a companion piece to the budget. Some questions were raised about whether or not we couldn't put some more budget detail in the MMR. I don't know and I said I would discuss that with OMB.

COUNCIL MEMBER ROSENTHAL: Sure. I'm not sure that's quite my question. It's more along the lines of informing the budget and the link using the link there.

MINDY TARLOW: Right.

COUNCIL MEMBER ROSENTHAL: And whether or not the Council is getting sufficient information in our oversight, which happens in March to really have information that would help us understand the City's budget, and what needs to happen, but let's continue that.

MINDY TARLOW: [interposing] Yes, I would be happy.

COUNCIL MEMBER ROSENTHAL: And then the last question to lay out in left field. So as Chair of the Contracts Committee, one of the things that I'm starting to think about is the number of jobs that have been created through our city contracts and what kind of jobs those are, whether or not they're-- All the details about the jobs. Do you think that's something that similarly in working with the agencies, right, in your usual work with the agencies-- And in many respects that would cut to the chase much faster than going through the Director of the Office of Contracts. You could just work with the same agencies that are giving you the data. On the agency information, working with the agencies to get that same information about jobs, about how much,

1
2 you know, the wage, what people are being paid
3 through the MMR.

4 MINDY TARLOW: The contracts that the
5 agency--

6 COUNCIL MEMBER ROSENTHAL: [interposing]
7 Yep.

8 MINDY TARLOW: --the individual oversees.
9 You know, I think that's a-- I think it's an
10 interesting observation. You know, on the heels of
11 the Jobs for All New Yorkers--

12 COUNCIL MEMBER ROSENTHAL: [interposing]
13 Yes.

14 MINDY TARLOW: --the taskforce report
15 just coming out, which, you know, sort of sets forth
16 a kind of similar mandate in a way. You know, I
17 think it's an interesting question. I hesitated to
18 wonder aloud, but I think it would take more than
19 just the individual agency to actually know, to be
20 able to track jobs associated with contracting out.
21 My guess would that the Mayor's Office of Contract
22 Services would be engaged in that effort, as well as
23 just the individual agencies themselves. But I think
24 you raise a very interesting point again about this
25 enormous municipal lever that we have--

1

2

COUNCIL MEMBER ROSENTHAL: [interposing]

3

Yes.

4

5

MINDY TARLOW: --about who we contract
with. You know, it's just an enormously powerful
6 thing.

7

COUNCIL MEMBER ROSENTHAL: [interposing]

8

Well, right, it could speak to the MWBE stuff for

9

sure. But it's the agencies who write the contracts.

10

MINDY TARLOW: Yes.

11

COUNCIL MEMBER ROSENTHAL: And who--

12

MINDY TARLOW: [interposing] They write
13 the RFPs.

14

COUNCIL MEMBER ROSENTHAL: --either would

15

or could know?

16

MINDY TARLOW: Right.

17

COUNCIL MEMBER ROSENTHAL: All right.

18

Thank you very much.

19

MINDY TARLOW: It's a very, very
20 interesting point that you're asking.

21

COUNCIL MEMBER ROSENTHAL: We really

22

appreciate it. Thank you.

23

MINDY TARLOW: Very good

24

CHAIRPERSON GENTILE: Thank you, Council

25

Member Rosenthal. It just--

1

2

COUNCIL MEMBER DEUTSCH: [off mic]

3

[interposing] Mark. Mark Levine.

4

CHAIRPERSON GENTILE: Oh, yes, yes.

5

That's right. Let me recognize that we've been

6

joined by Council Member Mark Levine. So let me just

7

give you an example when we talk about the MMR, the

8

website, and then the CPR. The Department of

9

Buildings has 42 indicators in the MMR that don't

10

include the customer service indicators. They have

11

68 on the MMR website, but 14 in the citywide

12

performance reporting. (A) Isn't that-- It's

13

confusing, and might not be fully telling if you go

14

to one site, as opposed to another or look at the

15

published work as opposed to going to the website.

16

MINDY TARLOW: I think the big difference

17

there, as I was saying earlier, is that CPR just

18

contains the critical indicators, which, as you know,

19

are roughly 500 of the roughly 2,000 indicators that

20

we collect. So your questions earlier, which were

21

very on point, I think, is what makes an indicator a

22

critical indicator, and who makes that decision? I

23

think it is a very important thing. I also think you

24

are what you measure, and I personally think that

25

it's really important to have a limited number of

critical indicators because, you know, the-- If you measure too much, it's like measuring nothing, right. You want to focus on the most critical things. And so, that's why CPR houses just the critical indicators, because they are meant to be the indicators that are most important to achieve the bigger outcomes of the city. And that's that distinction, which I think is important, and right.

CHAIRPERSON GENTILE: If you look at the NYPD report in the MMR, though, it shows quality of life as a critical indicator, but I'm not sure whether-- There is no star next to graffiti arrests. So it looks like graffiti summonses are a critical indicator, but not graffiti arrests. So that makes no sense. And again, that's where we come to who made that decision not to include that. It's in the NYPD section of the--

MINDY TARLOW: [interposing] Yeah, I'm looking at it right now, and again the critical indicators are meant to speak to the goals that the agency has set out for itself, its aspirations. And so, those tend to be lined up underneath the goal itself. And so, that might offer some insight. I'm trying to find-- Oh, the quality of life summonses.

1

2

CHAIRPERSON GENTILE: Right.

3

4

MINDY TARLOW: Yeah, I think that-- I think that that is something that the department felt of these indicators were the most important, the overall number of summonses of these indicators they felt were the most critical.

8

9

CHAIRPERSON GENTILE: [interposing] So am I reading-- Am I reading wrong graffiti arrests?

10

11

MINDY TARLOW: No, you're not reading-- You're saying that why aren't graffiti arrests--

12

13

CHAIRPERSON GENTILE: [interposing] Right.

14

MINDY TARLOW: --a critical indicator.

15

CHAIRPERSON GENTILE: Right.

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MINDY TARLOW: Well, if you look at the numbers, you can see the quality of life summonses are over 400,000 summonses. And the graffiti arrests are just over 3,000. So just by virtue of that alone, you could sort of see why one would be considered critical, and the other one would not. It's such a small number. So that would be my guess that in the spirit of finding indicators that respond to this goal to reduce the incidents of quality of life violations, that the qualify of life summonses

would be the critical indicators that would fall
under that goal. It's hundreds of thousands of
summonses. That actually makes sense to me.

CHAIRPERSON GENTILE: Now, that we're
looking at that chart, let ask you something else.
If you look at it, there's no information about
graffiti either summonses or arrests until FY 13.

MINDY TARLOW: Yes, my guess is that they
weren't being tracked before that time.

CHAIRPERSON GENTILE: So FY 13 would be
the first time that graffiti arrests and graffiti
summonses were tracked?

MINDY TARLOW: In the MMR.

CHAIRPERSON GENTILE: I see. I see so--

MINDY TARLOW: Lots of things are tracked
out there in the world. You know, it just is a
certain process by which things get included in the
Mayor's Management Report.

CHAIRPERSON GENTILE: So at some point in
FY 13, the NYPD coordinated with your office or your
previous-- you predecessor to put--

MINDY TARLOW: [interposing] Yes.

CHAIRPERSON GENTILE: --to put this in
the book--

1

2

MINDY TARLOW: [interposing] Yes.

3

CHAIRPERSON GENTILE: --for the first

4

time?

5

MINDY TARLOW: Yes, and I'm guessing that

6

it was at a time when graffiti was, you know, a very

7

critical issue for the city. So there was a

8

determination that they wanted to track it in the

9

City's Performance Management Report.

10

CHAIRPERSON GENTILE: But if you look at

11

the next page, it's the same thing again when you're

12

talking about NYPD and collisions involving city

13

vehicles.

14

MINDY TARLOW: Uh-huh.

15

CHAIRPERSON GENTILE: I can't imagine

16

that the first time that they measured this was in FY

17

13.

18

MINDY TARLOW: Again, I think my--

19

Again, my guess is, and I have my historian on my

20

right, my guess is that when the Fleet Management

21

Program began, which I think was probably around that

22

time, it actually started with Operations and then

23

got fanned out to DCAS. And then, at that point all

24

agencies started to report publicly in this report

25

about their fleet. So it's not like they weren't

1 tracking information before. It's just kind of, you
2 know, how the determination was made to put it in the
3 MMR.
4

5 CHAIRPERSON GENTILE: So at somebody's
6 behest, it was now part of the MMR?

7 MINDY TARLOW: I think the whole Fleet
8 Management Program was a big project for the city at
9 that time. And then, once that rolled out to all
10 agencies, yes, there was a citywide determination
11 made to include that information across agencies.
12 And you'll find that indicator in upwards of a dozen
13 agencies.

14 CHAIRPERSON GENTILE: Okay. Let me also
15 now go on that chart. It's interesting here that the
16 NYPD was allowed to report collisions of city
17 vehicles per 100,000 miles. Rather than the actual
18 number of collisions, it's collisions per 100,000
19 miles. Whereas the FDNY and the Department of
20 Corrections had actual numbers of collisions, actual
21 numbers of collisions in their reports. Why was
22 that? Why is reporting per 100,000 miles something
23 that was allowed to be done by the NYPD?

24 MINDY TARLOW: Yeah, I don't know having
25 not been here why that decision was made, but I think

1 the NYPD was given the opportunity to present it that
2 way. If I were guessing, I would say that it's
3 probably because of how much time they're on the
4 road.
5

6 CHAIRPERSON GENTILE: I'm sorry.

7 MINDY TARLOW: I would imagine that it
8 has to do with how much time they're on the road,
9 which is different than many other cities.

10 CHAIRPERSON GENTILE: Well, obviously
11 I'm-- I would imagine the Fire Department is on the
12 road a lot also, but they have actual numbers.
13 What's your sense? What's your feeling of that type
14 of reporting per unit of measurement?

15 MINDY TARLOW: I think in Performance
16 Management world, right, that's a sort of hot topic,
17 to be honest. You know, how-- When things are most
18 meaningful? Is it most meaningful when it's in the
19 aggregate number? Is it most meaningful as a
20 percentage of something else? I think there are
21 different schools of thought about that, and
22 different sort of personal appetite. So I think
23 agencies get to make their case about how they
24 present data when they can. Sometimes things have to
25 get presented in a uniform way across all agencies.

1 But if you look through the MMR, you'll see some
2 things are raw numbers. Some things are per 100,000,
3 some things are as a percentage. I think it's making
4 the best decision you can make about the statistic
5 being as meaningful as possible. And there isn't one
6 perfect way.

7
8 CHAIRPERSON GENTILE: So, you don't have
9 a preference in general?

10 MINDY TARLOW: Me personally?

11 CHAIRPERSON GENTILE: Yeah.

12 MINDY TARLOW: I do have my own
13 preferences. I don't know that it's necessarily
14 worth sharing that, but I do have my own preferences.
15 But I think that it's appropriate to have a dialogue
16 with each agency, and let them kind of make their
17 case about how they think their statistics can be
18 most meaningfully presented.

19 CHAIRPERSON GENTILE: Because incidents
20 per 100,000 can look a lot different on a chart as
21 opposed to actual incidents that are happening,
22 right?

23 MINDY TARLOW: Yes, that is true.

24 CHAIRPERSON GENTILE: And so that's--
25 Okay, well, we've-- The fact that we've talked about

1 that and-- So, a lot of this missing information as
2 you go from chart to chart and from agency to agency,
3 even as recently as FY 12 can be attributed to the
4 fact that it was not reported in the MMR--

5 MINDY TARLOW: [interposing] Correct.

6 CHAIRPERSON GENTILE: --in those years?

7 MINDY TARLOW: Yes, that's correct.

8 CHAIRPERSON GENTILE: Throughout this
9 report?

10 MINDY TARLOW: Is there any reason that
11 it would be not applicable in any other way then?

12 [background comments]

13 MINDY TARLOW: No, I would think in
14 general that that is correct, that it just simply
15 wasn't reported before that time.

16 CHAIRPERSON GENTILE: Right. Okay.

17 Good. We also have been joined by our colleague
18 David Greenfield. Okay, I think that we-- Do my
19 colleagues have any questions at this point? No.
20 Okay, I think we're done with this panel, and we
21 thank you for spending the time with us this morning--

22 -

23 MINDY TARLOW: [interposing] Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON GENTILE: --and we'll follow
up to come. Thank you

MINDY TARLOW: All right, will do. Thank
you.

CHAIRPERSON GENTILE: Thank you.

[background comments]

CHAIRPERSON GENTILE: Okay, our next--
our next testimony will come from Doug Turetski from
the Independent Budget Office.

[Pause, background comments]

CHAIRPERSON GENTILE: Mr. Turetski, we'll
swear you in first. Okay, if you can raise your right
hand. Do you affirm to tell the truth, the whole
truth, and nothing but the truth in your testimony
before this committee, and to respond honestly to
Council Member's questions?

DOUG TURETSKI: Yes, I do.

CHAIRPERSON GENTILE: Okay. Thank you.
You may begin your testimony.

DOUG TURETSKI: Good morning. Thank you
for inviting me and the Budget Office to be here. My
name is Doug Turetski. I'm Chief of Staff and
Communications Director for IBO. You have my written
testimony. I'll just go through and sort of

1 summarize some of the highlights of it on main
2 points. I think what we really focus on actually
3 relates to some of the questions that I heard being
4 asked here. And that's really the intersection
5 between service delivery and city spending. To put
6 it in plain language, are we getting what-- are
7 citizens getting what they're paying for? So there
8 are two things to think about in that regard that we
9 focus on in our testimony. One has to do with the
10 timing of the Mayor's Management Report. The
11 Preliminary Management Report comes out the end of
12 January, early February. Four months of data in the
13 current fiscal year. It doesn't give you a whole lot
14 to go on as you're staring to go into the budget
15 process. The final one comes out in September for
16 that fiscal year. Well, that's too late. We've
17 already got an adopted budget for the next year.

18
19 So one thing we've suggested today, and
20 we have said this in the past, that the MMR be or the
21 Preliminary MMR would come out with the Executive
22 Budget. That would give you two or three more months
23 of data, and that would seem to make sense to better
24 help you inform decisions and priorities for spending
25 as you're adopting-- As is adopted in the budget.

1 The other primary suggestion has to do
2 with, and it's outside the MMR in a biggest sense,
3 but it links together very closely, and that's the
4 fundamental structure of the City Budget. And the
5 Council got at this in its response to the Mayor's
6 Preliminary Budget last spring. The basic budget
7 structure around units of appropriation really
8 doesn't in many, many cases really does not relate to
9 discrete programs. So it's very hard to link up the
10 spending to the programs that are being measured by
11 the indicators. The U of A should really be broken
12 down more into more discrete programs, and then
13 ideally you can start to integrate that. Maybe
14 integrate MMR measures directly into the budget. So
15 you have the direct relationship right there.

17 The other thing we point out in our
18 testimony, and again, I heard some of this in the
19 questions that were being asked, has to do with
20 citizens surveys. Data provides one view, one window
21 into how well services are being delivered. But the
22 perceptions of New Yorkers. Different communities,
23 and different geographic and other communities may
24 experience those services in different ways. And
25 something that could be looked at is integrating

those kinds of citizen surveys into the MMR. That summarizes our testimony, and I would be glad to answer any questions.

CHAIRPERSON GENTILE: So you're a proponent of the customer satisfaction survey?

DOUG TURETSKI: Yeah, in one form or another. Yeah.

CHAIRPERSON GENTILE: Right.

DOUG TURETSKI: We think it certainly can add another dynamic element to the MMR and give a broader picture of how services are being delivered, and how they're being experienced by city residents.

CHAIRPERSON GENTILE: Great. Yes, you have a question? One second. Let me just. Right. Okay, that's it. So I just want to be clear. When you talk about the units of appropriation as a fundamental aspect of the budget, you don't see the CPR or the MMR being helpful in deciphering those units of appropriation?

DOUG TURETSKI: I don't believe the units of appropriation-- No, I mean to take for an example from your Preliminary Budget Response, and this has been used many times, is the Department of

Education's means of appropriation 401, 402, \$6
billion--

CHAIRPERSON GENTILE: [interposing]
Right.

DOUG TURETSKI: --that's supposed to be
representative of classroom spending. Well, there
are a lot of different elements to classroom
spending. How do you start to break it down and
really know what pieces are what, and where the money
links into those different elements of classroom
spending?

CHAIRPERSON GENTILE: Agreed, agreed.
Absolutely agreed. Okay, we'll go to a question from
Council Member David Greenfield.

COUNCIL MEMBER GREENFIELD: Thank you,
Mr. Chairman and thank you Doug. So I'm reading your
testimony, and you say at one point that many
observers see it as more of the mayoral public
relation tools than a detailed review of the strength
and weakness of the City's service delivery. I want
to ask specifically to that question. You know, one
of the functions that you do in the IBO is that you
actually take an independent look at numbers that
come forward. How confident are you in the accuracy

1 of these numbers? So, for example, I just, you know,
2 flipped open the Mayor's Management Report and went
3 Parks. And the cleanliness number for Parks is
4 somewhere in the 90s. It seems a little high, quite
5 frankly, right? I mean, so who exactly is producing
6 this? I imagine not an objective third party, and
7 how confident are you in the actual statistics that
8 are provided in this report. And the follow-up
9 question to that is what could we do to make sure
10 that this is, in fact, at least very accurate?

12 DOUG TURETSKI: Your question is a good
13 one, and that's I think part of what this-- what the
14 Citizens' Survey would get at. It's one thing that
15 the Parks Department to go out and have a checklist
16 to determine-- You know, and they check things off,
17 and parks conditions, parks cleanliness. There's a
18 certain rotation they do. I actually went out once
19 with the Sanitation folks. I guess it was actually
20 the Mayor's Management-- the Mayor's Office of
21 Management folks to go out and do the checklist on
22 street cleanliness. And how they actually perform.
23 So there's a rotation when you happen to hit a
24 certain park. But the perception of residents, and I
25 think that's exactly what you're getting at, and it

1 can be very different. If you're there on a-- If
2 you're at a park on a Saturday, it might look a lot
3 different than it does on a Tuesday afternoon in the
4 winter. So that's part of what the Citizens' surveys
5 get at. You the data? You know data is messy. It
6 always is. It's something we certainly deal with all
7 the time. You have to take it on the value that the
8 folks that are doing the parks survey, for example,
9 are doing it based on their-- You know the formula
10 that they're supposed to use.

12 COUNCIL MEMBER GREENFIELD: But I guess
13 the question then that relates to that particular
14 formula. So I mean are you folks knowledgeable of
15 that formula? Is that something that you spot check?
16 I mean my concern is basically this: Certainly the
17 Mayor's Management Report is important. Obviously,
18 it's a Charter mandated report. So it's not like
19 anyone is doing us a favor by producing it. However,
20 my specific concern is that with the nature of
21 bureaucracy and the way works is when you know what
22 the checklist is, quite frankly, you can actually--
23 Like as you indicated, you can really get to the
24 results in many cases that you'd like, right? So if
25 you know that this is what to look for, and you know

1 that an 12 o'clock on Tuesday is the once a week when
2 they come and clean said park-- And I don't mean to
3 pick on parks. I just happened to literally randomly
4 open it up. This is true with every agency. Well,
5 guess what, at 12:15 on Tuesday is probably when
6 you're going to start running through your checklist.
7 And so, I guess the question is how-- What sort of
8 veracity in terms of is there any proof positive, ore
9 are we simply taking the city's work for it when they
10 give us this report? And that's really I guess what
11 I'm trying to ascertain.

13 DOUG TURETSKI: I think at a certain
14 level you're correct. You're taking the veracity of
15 it at face value. To the Mayor's Office of
16 Operations' credit, my understanding is that a lot of
17 these things stayed buried. So by the time they go
18 to it, whether they're doing the street cleanliness
19 or the parks, so they don't get a uniform 12:15 on
20 just Tuesday's work. But again, to a certain degree
21 you have to just take it as it is. I mean I know
22 this has come up for our office. For example, like
23 can you-- You know, you're doing some work to get
24 around recycling. Or can you really believe what the
25 Sanitation Department is saying in terms of the

weight or recycling and the number of tons of recycling that is being collected. So short of actually going out and weighing every truck--which we have far too small a staff do to, as does the Council--you have to at a certain level, just take it that they're not outright lying to you.

COUNCIL MEMBER GREENFIELD: To be clear, I don't think that they're lying. I want to make that clear. I think it's within the nature of a bureaucracy to try to do everything they can to work the system to make sure that they look good. I don't in any way, shape, or form believe that any city agency is lying. And I certainly understand that the Mayor's Office of Operations does their best.

Although I certainly would feel a lot better and the answer that it doesn't exist. I would feel a lot better if somebody out there was spot checking this information. You are saying perhaps the reason it's not happening. And that's okay. So the answer is that I think for the general public we should take the Mayor's Management Report with a grain of salt.

DOUG TURETSKI: Right. As far as we know, there is no spot checking. I don't know how the Office of Operations does that internally, but--

COUNCIL MEMBER GREENFIELD: Very good.

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON GENTILE: So, Mr. Turetski,
you're saying that this in effect is not a useful
tool in budgeting because of the timing of the
report?

DOUG TURETSKI: It could certainly be a
more useful tool if you had more complete information
for the current fiscal year to pick up on any trends
that may be developing. Things change from year to
year. So going by what was truly a year or two years
ago, may be accurate. It may not be. If the timing
of the volume was tied to the Executive Budget, you
would have that much more information. You have that
much more up-to-date information. I think, if I
remember correctly, and I know we had it open to this
for this for a little while, but like for the
Department of Education indicators. Of those from
July through October, we really don't have many.
Many of them in the Preliminary Mayor's Management
Report are not available.

CHAIRPERSON GENTILE: No, I understand
what you're saying. Okay, great, great. Okay, well,
I thank you for your testimony, and thank You for

your spending your time with us today. Thank you so much.

DOUG TURETSKI: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON GENTILE: I'm sorry, Council Member, did you have a question? Okay.

[background comments]

CHAIRPERSON GENTILE: Okay, our final panel will consist of Prudence Katze from Reinvent Albany, Rachael Fauss from Citizens Union, Douglas Muzzio, and Paul Epstein. If you call can come forward.

[Pause]

CHAIRPERSON GENTILE: Okay. Why don't we start with Prudence Katze from Reinvent Albany. Good. When you're ready.

[Pause]

PRUDENCE KATZE: Good morning everybody. Thank you for having me. My name is Prudence Katze. I'm the Policy Coordinator for Reinvent Albany.

CHAIRPERSON GENTILE: Sorry for mispronouncing your name, ma'am.

PRUDENCE KATZE: Oh, that's totally fine. It happens all the time. Our organization advocates for more accountability in our state and city

governments, and as co-chair of the NYC Transparency Working Group, we partner with other civil society groups to encourage city government to use technology to foster transparency.

In the era of Smart Phones and big data, the venerable Mayor's Management Report is more important and more powerful than others. The MMR is City Government's single most important accountability tool. Along with 311, the MMR's key performance indicators and performance indicators drive how agencies operate and invest resources. Some have criticized the MMR as obsolete, but we believe the MMR is a crucial public resource, which we invest in as it continues to integrate the use of new technologies. I'm going to bring up a few points that we think would help bolster the MMR as a whole.

Ensure Accuracy in Reporting: The online MMR should utilize the City's Data Bridge to ensure the accuracy and timeliness of data reported by agencies. The Data Bridge aggregates agency performance statistics for the Mayor's Office of Operations using Direct Data Feeds to between agencies. This Direct Data Feed contrasts with MMR data, which is reported to the Mayor's Office of

Operations from agencies and it is not streamed directly.

Data Quality and Not Just Data Quantity:

We hope the MMR works to increase KPI and PIs based on quality, not just quantity of agency activity.

For example, the Department of Buildings should be judged on its responsive time to complaints, and the number of well founded complaints it investigates.

Not just the total number of complaints that it responds to.

East of Use: Ideally, we would to see an online MMR, which is at least as easy to browse and uses the paper or PDF version, but which uses timely, accurate linked data, which is analytical in its open format to echo what Council Member Kallos brought up earlier. For example, if the performance indicator is the number of street trees planted, we would like to be able to click on the most recent data from the Parks Department for the number of trees. And be taken to the data in the Open Data Portal where we can download it in machine-readable format.

Despite efforts to put the MMR online, the online MMR is hard to navigate and often out of date, and incorrectly formatted on this Secrata [sic]

portal. It is thus inaccurate to say that the MMR is fully online. With that being said, the City has put impressive amounts of MMR data online and things are shaping up, but the data still needs work. To be considered truly open online, the MMR needs to have data that is (1) timely. MMR data is-- MMR online data is old, and this is in the Open Data Portal. We halfway through Fiscal Year 2015, and most downloadable data on the online MMR is from 2012. And Mindy Tarlow talked about CPR data as a great indicator that is updated often. Unfortunately, none of that data is represented on the Open Data Portal link.

Again, to echo what Council Member Kallos was saying, the MMR website is essentially a set of short descriptions of agency mission statements followed by tables of performance indicators. Those tables should be linked to the underlying data sets they are drawn from in a form that is downloadable and machine-readable. Ideally, the most recently available data should be set into the appropriate table. This would be a way to link the MMR to the Open Data Portal while retaining the ease to browse logical, graphic format of the web pages, and at last

1 complete. [sic] The three MMR data sets, which I
2 counted, that are available on the Open Data Portal,
3 are incomplete and inconsistent. And two of the
4 three MMR data set have no descriptive meta data or
5 about sections. So it's not very clear what some of
6 the columns even mean. Additionally, the formatting
7 of the data is inconsistent and confusing and that is
8 something that could be easily fixed. But it has to
9 do with like for example the agency 311 is formatted
10 as a date 3101. And that's on the Fiscal Year 2014
11 MMR Data Extract, which can be found on the Open Data
12 Portal.
13

14 And last, we would like to see additional
15 performance measures in government accountability.
16 The MMR includes 311 service and information
17 requests. We urge the Mayor and Council to add
18 performance measures for Freedom of Information
19 Requests received, responded to, denied, and
20 appealed. And that would be addressed by Intro 321,
21 the Open FOIL Bill by creating metrics of FOIL
22 requests to agencies that could be easily integrated
23 into the MMR. Additionally, it would be helpful to
24 have performance indicators for requests to a
25 particular data set from an agency to be made public

on the Open Data Portal. This would then put the onus of publishing data sets on the agencies instead of DOIT. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON GENTILE: Thank you, Ms. Katze. Now, we'll hear from Rachel Faust, Citizens Union.

RACHAEL FAUSS: Good afternoon, Chairs Gentile and Kallos. My name is Rachael Fauss and I'm the Director of Public Policy for Citizens Union, a non-partisan good government group dedicated to making democracy work for all New Yorkers. Thank you for the opportunity to testify today. We've also testified at the Council's previous hearings in 2011, 2012. And my predecessor, Alex Commado [sp?] served on the Mayor's Management Report Roundtable that the Mayor's Office of Operations Convened in 2012. So this is an issue that is something we've been following for some time. And there have been improvements over the last several years to the MMR to make it more user-friendly. For example, the inclusion of the cross-agency evaluations. There was data on the City Board of Auction for the first time in 2013. And agency goals are established and listed in specifics in the MMR. Those are some of the

1
2 improvements. Obviously, there is more than can be
3 done, and this hearing is an important step. And I
4 think along the discussions about how to engage the
5 public in specific metrics, this hearing is allowing
6 us to do that in some capacity. But I think it could
7 be something that's more formalized. Perhaps done on
8 an annual basis, and publicized to more groups who
9 may be interested in this top. Issue based groups,
10 for example.

11 Looking at some further changes for the
12 next MMR, performance targets were too often blank in
13 2014 as for previous years. We believe there should
14 be more detailed budgetary information to link the
15 performance to specific programs. The Council should
16 pass Intro No. 302, Council Member Lander's bill that
17 would specifically provide a reporting relationship
18 for the Board of Elections with the Council to
19 establish actual performance targets. Right now, the
20 way the data is reported is the Board of Elections
21 has voluntarily disclosed more data in their annual
22 report. But there's not a back and forth about
23 specific performance targets. This bill would
24 require that.

1
2 And then lastly, we believe that the MMR
3 should include important good government cross-agency
4 initiatives such as inclusion of data on the Open
5 Data Portal. So how well our agencies can find the
6 Open Data Law. Agency compliance with the Pro-Voter
7 Law, Freedom of Information Law responses and
8 requests as my colleague Prudence mentioned. Then
9 also initiatives around webcasting and recording of
10 public meetings. There are several areas where the
11 Council has had important bills passed into law for
12 several years that cut across agencies. And similar
13 to the way that information is reported for other
14 cross-agency initiatives, we think that given that
15 the MMR is a transparency tool, perhaps it could be
16 used to track transparency and accountability
17 initiatives. And with that, I will end my remarks.
18 There is more detail in the testimony.

19 CHAIRPERSON GENTILE: Thank you very
20 much. I see you have extensive testimony. Thank you
21 so much for sharing that with us. Okay. Doug Muzzio
22 from Baruch College, right?

23 DOUG MUZZIO: Good afternoon, Council
24 Members Gentile and Kallos, members of the committee
25 and staff. I'm Doug Muzzio. I'm a professor at the

1 Baruch College School of Public Affairs. I thank you
2 for inviting me to testify on this the Mayor's
3 Management Report. This is the sixth time testifying
4 before the Government Operations Committee under
5 Chairs Mary Pinkett, Will Perkins twice, Simcha
6 Felder and Gale Brewer. You folks must think I know
7 something, but we'll see.

9 CHAIRPERSON GENTILE: [laughs] Right.

10 DOUG MUZZIO: The testimony that's in
11 front of you really the opening simply talks about
12 the Charter responsibilities, a little bit of history
13 about the Bloomberg MMRs, and some comments on the de
14 Blasio MMRs that's been more than reflected in Doug's
15 testimony, and the two testimonies prior to me right
16 now. What I would like to focus on is on page 3. If
17 you're looking at the document, there are two major
18 deficiencies that have existed in the MMR from its
19 very beginning. And certainly not unique to the de
20 Blasio Administration. The first is the lack of
21 resident surveying, which was a part of the
22 conversation that the Chair had. And I would like to
23 follow that up in some detail. And the absence of
24 linkage between budget and performance was the
25 subject of both Chairs' comments.

Let's go to the lack of resident surveys. As I said, the September 2014 MMR like all its predecessors across six mayor administrations lacks comprehensive uniform and recurring surveys of its residents as an integral of its performance assessment and reporting. There is a universal consensus on the value of resident surveys, and that government should be custom and driven. This is all part of the reinvention of government that began in the 1990s at the federal level. And with Osborne and Gaebler's book on Performance Measurement.

I quote some of the outstanding institutions of state and local and county government, the International City and County Manager's Association, the Urban Institute and the Government Accounting Standards Board, which all say essentially what the ICMA says: The best way to encourage good performance is to measure it. And the best indicator of government performance is to citizen satisfaction. If you look at figure one, which is included in the document, the use of resident surveys. The term "citizen surveys" is a bit inaccurate. Resident surveys used in the United States. What I've done is I've looked at the top 20

1 cities in the United States, and as of the 2010
2 census and indicate which cities have used customer
3 satisfaction surveys. And it's really quite
4 extensive, and if you go into the second tier, the
5 next 20, even a higher percentage of cities used
6 customer satisfaction.
7

8 If you go to the next graphic, what this
9 graphic does is talks about the conduct, who conducts
10 it, how many, how it's conducted, what the modality
11 is. And are these surveys used as performance
12 indicators? And you can see that several large
13 cities, over a million cities use it. And as I
14 indicated earlier cities even smaller, 500,000 to a
15 million and the 250,000 to 500,000 use it
16 extensively. So this is a standard feature of urban
17 government in the United States, and New York City
18 doesn't do it or hasn't done it extensively. Again,
19 on page 4 I go into the massive benefits that one can
20 associate with resident surveys. Resident surveys
21 concentrate on outcomes or the results of government
22 services. How people are satisfied with their
23 schools and parks. How safe they feel in their
24 neighborhoods.
25

1
2 Most administrative measures, and those
3 are the measures that are overwhelming found in the
4 MMR including those derived from survey data, focus
5 on inputs and outputs. While these are certainly
6 valuable from internal accountability, public
7 accountability demands different types of results.
8 Additionally, resident's surveys allow for the
9 analysis of individual differences in how people use
10 and experience these services. Differences by race
11 and ethnicity, age, gender, borough, neighborhood.
12 Most administrative members-- measures of service
13 quality can identify-- can't identify who uses and
14 how they are affected by the service.

15 Moving down to that next large paragraph
16 with all the bullets which enumerates the
17 overwhelming usefulness and advantages of citizen
18 satisfaction, it determine constituent satisfaction
19 with the quality of specific services and facilities
20 including the identification of problem areas. Facts
21 such as the number and characteristic of users and
22 non-users of various services and the frequency and
23 form of use. Reasons why specific services
24 facilities are disliked or not used. Community needs
25 assessment, the identification of high priority, but

1 inadequate community services. Uncovering potential
2 demands for new services. Resident opinion on
3 various community issues including feelings of
4 confidence or trust toward government, and specific
5 agencies and officials. Residents assessments of
6 real policy options. Results provide guidance but
7 not mandates for official action. And then finally,
8 in this truncated list resident surveys can provide
9 socio-economic and demographic data to complement and
10 supplement other sources. Also, if you flip the
11 page, it's invaluable in all three areas of policy
12 format, at formulation, implementation, and
13 evaluation. A little bit of history.

14 In 2001, this body under the leadership
15 of Peter Vallone, contracted with Baruch College
16 Survey Research of which I was the Co-Director. And
17 in 2001, we conducted rather large citizen, resident
18 satisfaction surveys, which were designed to
19 determine use patterns, satisfaction, et cetera. My
20 testimony at that time was that the survey be
21 conducted by the Mayor's Office of Operations, and
22 included in the MMR. The surveys were not continued
23 by the newly elected Speaker in 2002. I can make
24 those available to you.
25

1
2 In 2009, the Bloomberg Administration
3 with Public Advocate Gotbaum conducted a citywide
4 quote, unquote "customer service" which had serious
5 conceptual and analytical flaws. And again not
6 followed up. Nor incorporated it seems in any city
7 performance measurement report database. In its
8 favor, it was extensively and clearly reported and
9 presented on the web site. If you look at 2012, I
10 was member of the Roundtable on the MMR under
11 Operations, and there was significant changes made,
12 and a massive effort by Operations to improve the
13 MMR. In some ways, it was a paradigm of public
14 policy analysis and really highly professional work.

15 Turning to the 2014 MMR, if you look at
16 it, it is upsetting at the minimum. Each agency is a
17 section-- Each agency portion has a section called
18 Agency Customer Service. A subheading is titled
19 Customer Experience. It has nothing to do with
20 customer experience. What is measured are agency
21 outputs, not customer outputs. So it's a total
22 misnomer. The three standard agency customer service
23 measures are emails routed and responded to in 14
24 days; letters routed and responded to in 14 days; and
25 completed customer requests for interpretation. We

1 don't know anything about the substance or the
2 satisfaction of these responses. It is basically a
3 meaningless number that tells you what we did, not
4 what we produced. Again, a mistake in measuring
5 outputs rather than outcomes.

6 I found--and again this may be just
7 because I was unable to do it--I found one, two,
8 three, four, five, six examples of quote, unquote.
9 It looks like customer satisfaction data, Parks. The
10 quote simply is, "Respondents who rated parks
11 acceptable for overall conditions."

12 311: Customer Satisfaction Index only
13 provided data for three of those six.

14 HRA: Customer satisfaction rating for
15 public health insurance program services good or
16 excellent.

17 DOE: Customer's rating service good or
18 better.

19 NYCHA: Customers rating service good or
20 better.

21 DOIT: Rate of overall customer
22 satisfaction.

23 Now, I try to track down the following
24 data: The universe sample; sampling method; dates of
25

1 contact; method of contact; number of respondents and
2 contacted and interviewed. The question asked; the
3 question wording and order; and frequency of contact.
4 It may be public accessible, but I couldn't find it,
5 and I have my doubts that it is really publicly
6 accessible in any really meaningful sense.

7
8 The second major problem, which again the
9 Chairs dealt with, and so has testimony, is the lack
10 of linkage of performance in budget. This is a
11 mandated charter responsibility, and like customer
12 satisfaction, no administration from the beginning
13 administration to the current administration had
14 provided that. It's going to be extremely difficult
15 to do. Operations attempted to do it during their
16 Roundtable, and we're only very partially successful
17 in doing so.

18 My recommendation simply to the Council
19 is that you pass legislation similar to Intro 370,
20 which was introduced in 2005, which call for
21 mandating that the Mayor's Management Report include
22 citizen satisfaction responses. I looked at the
23 sponsors of that legislation. They are no longer
24 part of the body. I would hope that either one of
25 you two or any other Council Member proposes the

legislation and gets a lot of co-sponsors. Thank
you.

CHAIRPERSON GENTILE: Thank you,
Professor Muzzio for that spirited presentation, and
we've been joined by a member of the Oversight and
Investigations Committee, Rory Lancman. Rory, thank
you. Our next speaker will be Paul Epstein.

PAUL EPSTEIN: Thank you. I passed out
already. You should have my written testimony. I
will be trying to edit it as I speak so I don't read
it all to you, but my qualifications are on the back.
I'll just summarize it really quickly that I have
worked since the 1970s. I go back to not just the
early Mayor's Management Reports, but the Lindsay,
Mayor Lindsay's Productivity Improvement Reports,
which were really the predecessor for the Mayor's
Reports. The Council, the Charter Revision
Commission actually spoke to us about those reports,
and that inspired putting the MMR in the City
Charter. But at any rate, that may just mean I'm old
but I have also worked for two different City
administrations and for-- And as a consultant to
many other governments actually around the world, and
communities and non-profits on performance reporting,

performance measurement reporting and improvement and
community governments. I've been recognized with a
Lifetime Achievement Award.

There are four things I want to bring to
your attention, and I'll try to spend most of my time
on the first one, which I think perhaps is the most
unusual both beyond the MMR. And a little bit of
time on each of the other three. The first is that I
recommend that the Council look outward from
government performance indicators of the MMR to
higher level community conditions of concern to
residents, which are often called community
indicators. That could include the kinds of resident
satisfaction surveys that Professor Muzzio and others
have talked about. I can also go beyond that.

Second, that the Council should at least-
- The second one really speaks to some of the
questions some of the council members already raised.
The Council should look inward to how City
performance information is being used as part of a
systemic cycle of improvement generally referred to
as a performance management system. Not just
performance management, but it's a circular
performance management system.

1
2 Third, the Council should ask the Mayor's
3 Office to provide one-click access from the MMR to
4 what I would call strategy pages for each agency and
5 each of those multi-agency collaborative initiatives.
6 So you don't have to pore through an agency website
7 to see what are they doing about these things. But
8 you go right to what are the strategies for the
9 things reported in the MMR.

10 And the fourth idea would add credibility
11 to the first three. Several council members were
12 asking about the accuracy of the data. Well, there
13 are ways to audit. They are established and other
14 cities do it. So I would say the Council should ask
15 the Controller and the Mayor to put in place regular
16 audit and assessment processes to ensure the
17 relevance and reliability of performance information.

18 So those are my four big points. I'll
19 kind of skip the next paragraph and just summarize by
20 saying actually I think the MMR and City Performance
21 Reporting overall despite the deficiencies that
22 people point out has gotten much better over the
23 years, but there is still room for improvement. Now
24 I'm suggesting the bigger room for improvement is
25 beyond the MMR. That making that report better will

1
2 get some minimal gains, but the bigger room for
3 improvement in public accountability and public
4 benefit, things actually changing for the better
5 really go by looking both outward to connecting the
6 city performance reporting to what I'm calling a
7 system of community indicators.

8 So my first point would be connect the
9 city performance measurements through a system of
10 community indicators. And one improvement to the MMR
11 from the days when I worked on it in the '80s until
12 there is there are a lot more outcome measures. They
13 didn't used to be too many outcome measures in there.
14 The problem is, and it's not necessarily a problem,
15 it's just the structure of things. This is the
16 Mayor's Report, so those outcome measures, those
17 outcome indicators like every indicator in the MMR
18 are chosen by the Mayor and the agencies. That's
19 what it's supposed to be. So what we really need is
20 an independent look from the outside, what are the
21 outcomes that the citizens and the residents of the
22 city actually feel and see in their communities?
23 Those aren't always the outcomes that are reported.
24 Maybe in cases, they are. Maybe in other cases,
25 though, they certainly aren't.

1
2 Now, to really make that work properly in
3 addition to MMR indicators and other city data you
4 can find online, the city needs an independent system
5 of reporting through the indicators chosen through a
6 representative and deliberative public engagement
7 process. That will get at some comments, some
8 questions asked by some council members before about
9 is there a way for the public to engage in what
10 should be reported? Here's a way to do it, but it
11 wouldn't necessarily be reported by the Mayor. The
12 City government can be a partner in the process, but
13 the reporting should be an independent organization
14 such as a non-profit civic organization or perhaps a
15 collaboration between civic groups and universities.
16 They have the capabilities to do it.

17 I just give one example of why this kind
18 of sort of independent community indicators reporting
19 can be very important. Well, an issue on everyone's
20 mind right now, police community relations. The MMR
21 has basically reports on police community relations
22 in two kinds of measures. The total civilian
23 complaints, and the results of the anonymous courtesy
24 professionalism and respect tests randomly conducted
25 of police personnel. In the MMR it's interesting.

1 In the narrative before those indicators it says in
2 the MMR the Police Department is looking into
3 additional metrics to evaluate police community
4 relations. So I ask you, do you think those
5 additional metrics will be credible if they came
6 entirely from within the NYPD? Or, would they be
7 more credible if people from communities across the
8 city were engaged to determine what those metrics
9 should be, and the data were collected and reported
10 by an independent party?

12 Now, I don't mean to single out the
13 police. The public and the city government I think
14 will benefit greatly with measures on a wide range of
15 community conditions important to city residents, or
16 reported by an independent impartial source trusted
17 by communities and trusted by the city government.
18 It shouldn't be an us against them kind of thing. It
19 should be more a partnerships. The conditions
20 reported should be based on major issues selected
21 through a representative of a deliberative process.
22 And indicators selected should be tested with
23 residents to be sure they represent how they really
24 see and feel those issues in the community. Now,
25 luckily-- Oh, now one reason you're not going to get

1 all those in the Mayor's Report is there are a lot of
2 conditions about quality of life in the community
3 that are really important to people that city
4 agencies just don't do everything, don't do that much
5 about. The city government can't do everything to
6 improve the quality of life. So there have been
7 issues that just don't get reported in the Mayor's
8 Report because that's mainly about how we produce the
9 services. So you could have additional issues that
10 are reported on, and the City might say, Well, how
11 can we change policy or do something to influence it?

12
13 Luckily, New York does not have to
14 reinvent the wheel to conduct the Community
15 Indicators Project. In my book, *Results That Matter*,
16 and in one chapter of that book I reported on
17 longstanding community indicator projects in
18 Jacksonville, Florida and also the Reno, Nevada
19 region. But there are literally hundreds more that
20 we can learn from. A note in my testimony gives you
21 a website where you can find those hundred more, the
22 Community Indicators Consortium. But what does this
23 have to do with the MMR? A number of things. One is
24 that once there is a community indicator system, the
25 MMR should really be framed to tell the stories in

words, numbers, and graphics about what the city government and its partners are doing to improve results as measured by the community indicators.

Think of community indicators as telling the story of the quality of life as the residents define it. Think of the MMR as telling the story of performance of city government and its agencies. So shouldn't the two relate to each other? So right now we just got the story of the city agencies. We don't have the story of the quality of life as the residents define it. I'm not saying the MMR should necessarily be radically changed once you have community indicator system. Instead, the changes should be made more in presentation emphasis and as needed in a few indicators here and there to show the relationship between city performance and priority outcomes. And there are a lot of benefits I think would come from... I believe that would come from that. The first would be to not ratchet it up, ratchet it up in accountability to another level. Because right now the MMR establishes accountability for performance on indicators selected by the Mayor and his agencies. But tying the MMR to community indicators would add accountability for demonstrating

1 what the city is doing to improve outcomes that are
2 the highest priority to residents. And I think what
3 would inevitably come with that, some agencies,
4 preferably all, but there would be some agencies that
5 would start doing things differently to be more
6 responsive to resident priorities. And as a result,
7 our quality of life will improve not just as defined
8 by the city, but as defined by the residents. I
9 think there's a good opportunity. I think this
10 current MMR actually has an opening for that. The
11 emphasis on equity in every agency is just beginning.
12 It needs to get better, but the emphasis on equity in
13 every agency's section I think provides an
14 opportunity for convergence between what the city
15 does and what residents feel and see in their
16 communities. But it would need-- You would really
17 need to build that other piece of it, the community
18 indicator system. And the equity piece I think would
19 be a natural point of convergence for the two. So I
20 think it's a good opportunity for that.

22 CHAIRPERSON GENTILE: Mr. Epstein, we're
23 running a little late. So are you done? Can we
24 conclude with that part?

25 PAUL EPSTEIN: I'll be very brief--

CHAIRPERSON GENTILE: [interposing] Okay.

PAUL EPSTEIN: -- on my three other points because I-- These now look more inward, and you've already asked some very good questions, Chair Gentile, and some of the other council members on how is the data being used. And I would commend you on that and say to keep probing on that. But I would go further, and ask the Mayor and the agencies to demonstrate how they use performance data to improve performance on a regular basis as a systemic cycle of performance improvement, not just one time, one indicator or another. And ask the Controller to audit that. That is auditable. There are occasions around-- Across North America, state and local agencies where auditors have audited performance management systems against best practice standards. So you can ask the controller to do that, and give him good rationale to do it.

And the third point is ask for one-click access to the strategy pages. The narrative in the MMR has gotten much, much less than it used to be. Probably a good thing as a document, but since things are online now, you don't need to keep everything. You don't need to restrict everything in that one

1 document. So the links now go from the agency
2 sections to the agency websites, which are
3 voluminous, and you really can't-- It's really hard
4 to find what relations in the agency website to those
5 indicators in the MMR. So what you really need to do
6 is have like a strategy page. What are the major
7 changes that are going to affect performance? And a
8 one-click link from every agency section, and from
9 all of those multi-agency initiatives in the front of
10 the MMR to a strategy page on each of those. So we
11 can see what are the major changes in your plan, and
12 how are you going to-- and how is that going to
13 affect performance.
14

15 CHAIRPERSON GENTILE: Let me ask you, Mr.
16 Epstein--

17 PAUL EPSTEIN: Sure.

18 CHAIRPERSON GENTILE: Would the citizen
19 satisfaction surveys that Professor Muzzio has been
20 talking about, if implemented would that lead to the
21 system of community indicators that you're talking
22 about?

23 PAUL EPSTEIN: I think it should be a
24 part of it. In some of the other community indicator
25 systems, that's one set of data. And then they also

1 have other data on-- from a whole variety of sources
2 depending on the community, and what they see is
3 important on housing, on education, on things that
4 may or may not be reported by the government.
5

6 CHAIRPERSON GENTILE: Yes, go ahead, sir>

7 DOUG MUZZIO: [off mic] The--

8 CHAIRPERSON GENTILE: Just use the mic.

9 Use the mic.

10 DOUG MUZZIO: Okay. Absolutely. I mean
11 these indicators have to be multi-barrier. They
12 can't be single-barrier if they're going to be bulk.
13 The data coming out of surveys are more objectively
14 bureaucratic driven data. There are all kinds of
15 sources for doing it. By the way, the CUNY Institute
16 and State and local governance is putting together a
17 series of indicators revolved around the issue of
18 equity and equality that I think Council Member
19 Lander and you folks you would be interested in.

20 CHAIRPERSON GENTILE: Okay. Let me ask
21 you about the citizens satisfaction surveys. Should
22 there be an event. You know, it varies I guess if
23 there's an event in the city, whether it be a major
24 snowstorm or a garbage strike or something like that
25

1 that the citizens satisfaction surveys are going to
2 reflect that kind of event. Wouldn't it?

3
4 DOUG MUZZIO: Yes, and it's certainly
5 possible that a highly salient event could affect the
6 responses to questions. It's one of the things that
7 you have to deal with and recognize. But clearly, a
8 regularly conducted probably on an annuals basis, but
9 it doesn't only have to be on an annual basis. You
10 could do a large baseline survey at the beginning of
11 a particular period. And then rotate various
12 agencies throughout the year. Maybe do it quarterly
13 and have fewer agencies being the focus of those
14 questions. So, yes. The answer to your question is
15 yes it can have an affect. There are always to
16 mitigate.

17 CHAIRPERSON GENTILE: Okay, interesting.
18 I have a question for Ms. Katze from Reinvent Albany.
19 Have you had the opportunity to share some of your
20 thoughts with the new administration and the Mayor's
21 Office of Operations?

22 PRUDENCE KATZE: I know that the
23 Executive Director of Reinvent Albany, John Kaehny,
24 has met with Mindy Tarlow a few times. What
25 particularly are you speaking on?

CHAIRPERSON GENTILE: Well, the fact that you said that some of this information, and you give the Parks Department as an example, was not downloadable, and you could not have it in a readable format. Am I correct in what I'm reading here?

PRUDENCE KATZE: Yes, yes.

[background comment]

PRUDENCE KATZE: It might be a little confusing. I'm kind of toggling back and forth, but I'm mostly just focusing on how we want as much data as possible to be linked to on the Open Data Portal. And while I'm at Open Data Portal, they have various statistics from 2003 to 2012. And it hasn't really been updated. I don't really see much in 2013 or anything from 2014. And if there is the CPR data that's regularly updated, that's great. But if you go to the CPR page, it's locked into this-- It's just not very usable. You can't download it. You can't play around with the data. So you can't look at it in a spreadsheet. And so, it's great, but there is some data on the Open Data Portal, but in terms of how it's presented in the MMR and if you're looking at each-- I'm talking now about the interactive MMR, which I found is interesting that

1 it's actually hosted by the same domain that hosts
2 the Open Data Portal.
3

4 And it looks like there is-- I mean this
5 is--I don't know. There seems to be some similarity
6 in the way that the Open Data Portal is designed by
7 Secrata. There seems to be some kind of similarity
8 of what some of the icons and such that are used with
9 the MMR report and with the Open Data Portal. Yet,
10 you can't download any of those spreadsheets. For
11 example, having the target indicators and some things
12 like that. That's not on the Open Data Portal. And
13 we would be happy to talk about this more with the
14 administration.

15 CHAIRPERSON GENTILE: Thanks. That's
16 great to hear. And just I agree with Citizens Union
17 about the blanks in the performance targets. They
18 really need to be completed. It really leaves a
19 whole in the whole MMR as you look at the history of
20 it.

21 PRUDENCE KATZE: Yeah, and actually one
22 thing that came to mind in terms of the customer
23 satisfaction reviewing the MMR before coming here,
24 we're looking at the CCRBs, the Civilian Complaint
25 Review Board. There's a neutral-- The goal is

1 neutral in a number of complaints received. That
2 might be true from the perspective of the CCRB, but
3 they don't see it as germane to their mission to
4 decrease the number of complaints because that's
5 something that's related to the Police Department.
6 But the goal of the city as a whole obviously is to
7 decrease complaints against police officers. So I
8 thing it's an interesting idea of taking it back to
9 the public and saying, What are you goals for the
10 city as a whole. Not necessarily the individual
11 silos of agencies. So I think that's something--
12 That might be one reason why there are a lot of
13 blanks is that the agency might not see its mission
14 as relevant to other agencies. But obviously there
15 should be linkages.

17 CHAIRPERSON GENTILE: Agreed, agreed.
18 Council Member Kallos.

19 CHAIRPERSON KALLOS: Sure. I just want
20 to disclose publicly that my questioning on opening
21 was not coordinated with the great government groups
22 this time. We just happened to have a substantial
23 overlap. I just wanted to echo what the government
24 groups have shared, and I think that the additions
25 for webcasting and recording and FOIL, which we

(laughs) brought up, and other items are incredibly important. In terms of performance targets, one piece I would bring up is that there is a trend of under-reporting. So when I'd go to my precinct before I was a Council Member, while I was running and tried to report a crime, they wouldn't take the crime report. And so, the thought is if we can actually change the measures from being measures of reports to a measure of what the job actually does. And so, if the job of a police officer is to investigate crimes that are reported, the measure of success shouldn't be the number crimes. But actually the number of reported crimes that are successfully investigated and prosecuted or resolved. So measuring what success actually should be. In terms of Professor Muzzio, I've worked very closely with Professor Dunchman [sp?], and been a huge fan of yours. In terms of satisfaction surveys in the private sector, any time I call anybody nowadays, they always say, Can we call you back? And would that be something we should be adding into 311 so that people can actually have satisfaction.

DOUG MUZZIO: I think you need,
particularly with 311, you need to know how satisfied

1 the customer was with the service that was provided.
2 Did they get the relevant information? You could ask
3 questions about the receipt of the information. Was
4 the person knowledgeable, respectful, et cetera. You
5 can do a whole batter of questions there. And then
6 you could ask questions were you--? Was it resolved
7 to your satisfaction? If not, how so? There are so
8 many ways that one could address this through a
9 survey type methodology.
10

11 CHAIRPERSON KALLOS: And so with the 311
12 call, they ask you after the 311 call and then follow
13 up in two weeks or in a month?

14 DOUG MUZZIO: Or what you would do is if
15 you have a complaint, I presume the data includes
16 names and some kind of communication.

17 CHAIRPERSON KALLOS: [interposing] If you
18 choose-- If you chose to share it.

19 DOUG MUZZIO: You could then do a
20 randomized sample of those people who were contacted,
21 and find out their satisfaction. So you could really
22 get that list, give it to someone else to do, and
23 then have a survey outfit or Operations do it.
24
25

CHAIRPERSON KALLOS: And I just want to echo that I agree with anything one click, and appreciated it in your testimony. So I'm wrapped up.

PAUL EPSTEIN: I'd like to comment, though, Council Member Kallos, on your comment about sometimes the data is not always representing everything that it should be representing. And, my last point I made very briefly, but I have a little bit more to say about it. Was that to really put in place processes to regulate, assess, and audit the relevance and reliability of the performance information. It's done in other cities. Auditors do it. I've done it in other states and in local governments. We could recommend. You could ask the Controller to have his audit bureau on a sample basis. Too many indicators to do them all every years. So every agency would know at any given time that the Controller's auditors might show up to look at any given indicator. And, they could be measuring both the relevance and if it is the right indicator, and the reliability, which gets at some of the things that Council Member Kallos and some of the other council members have raised. So that would be the last point I would make.

COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND INVESTIGATIONS JOINTLY
WITH COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENTAL OPERATIONS

129

CHAIRPERSON GENTILE: Thank you, Mr.
Epstein, and thank you to the panel for a very
informative session. Thank you so much, and not
seeing any other panelists, we will close this
hearing, and thank everyone for attending. [gavel]
And thank you to my Co-Chair also, Ben Kallos.

C E R T I F I C A T E

World Wide Dictation certifies that the foregoing transcript is a true and accurate record of the proceedings. We further certify that there is no relation to any of the parties to this action by blood or marriage, and that there is interest in the outcome of this matter.



Date December 13, 2014