

**CITY COUNCIL AGENDA ITEM**  
CITY OF SHORELINE, WASHINGTON

**AGENDA TITLE:** City's Performance Measurement Program  
**DEPARTMENT:** City Manager's Office & Finance  
**PRESENTED BY:** Robert Olander, Interim City Manager  
Julie Modrzejewski, Assistant City Manager  
Debbie Tarry, Finance Director

**PROBLEM/ISSUE STATEMENT:**

In 2001 the City initiated the implementation of a performance measurement pilot program and expanded this program citywide in 2003. The purpose of the program is to provide meaningful data to City staff, City Council and to the general public that can be used to improve and/or enhance services and customer satisfaction. During the last two years all program managers have developed measures that can be used to monitor progress towards achieving program goals. Additionally, the City has joined the International City Management Association (ICMA) Center for Performance Measurement and is participating in the ICMA Performance Measurement Puget Sound Consortium. The 2006 Budget included, for the first time, the City's Performance, Results, and Outcomes Card (PRO-Card) as a way to highlight and report the top tier performance measures from the City's strategic plan, which was adopted by the City Council on October 27, 2003.

Tonight will provide an opportunity for staff to brief the Council on the current status of the City's performance measurement program and for the Council to provide staff with further policy direction in regards to the performance measurement program.

**FINANCIAL IMPACT:**

The City has implemented this program without the allocation of additional budget dollars as existing staff assumed the responsibilities required to facilitate the City's performance measurement program.

**RECOMMENDATION**

No action is required by Council. This item is provided for informational purposes. Staff would like to have Council feedback on areas that they would like to see improvements or changes to the City's performance measurement program.

Approved By:            City Manager  \_\_\_\_\_ City Attorney \_\_\_\_\_

## **INTRODUCTION**

The purpose of the performance measurement program is to develop and implement a citywide program that provides meaningful data to be used by the City to improve its performance and enhance customer satisfaction. The program will provide meaningful data on a citywide basis to be used by stakeholders (Shoreline citizens, City Council, City Manager, City Leadership Team, and program managers) in the program and resource allocation decision-making process.

## **BACKGROUND**

### **Recommended Best Practice by the Government Finance Officers Association**

In 1994 the Government Finance Officers Association (GFOA) adopted a recommended best practice that financial, service, and program performance measures be developed and used as an important component of decision making and incorporated into governmental budgeting. GFOA recommended that performance measures should:

- Be based on program goals and objectives that tie to a statement of program mission or purpose;
- Measure program results or accomplishments;
- Provide for comparisons over time;
- Measure efficiency and effectiveness;
- Be reliable, verifiable, and understandable;
- Be reported internally and externally;
- Be monitored and used in decision-making processes; and
- Be limited to a number and degree of complexity that can provide an efficient and meaningful way to assess the effectiveness and efficiency of key programs.

GFOA encourages all governments to utilize performance measures. At a minimum, performance measures should be used to report on the outputs of each program and should be related to the objectives of each department. Governments in the early stages of incorporating performance measures into their budget process should strive to

:

- Identify meaningful and relevant goals and objectives for government and its service delivery units;
- Identify and track output measures that are useful and relevant to the goals and objectives of key services;
- Identify and track performance measures for a manageable number of meaningful financial objectives that are used in evaluation; and
- Develop and refine additional performance indicators to make them more meaningful and identify mechanisms to improve their interpretation and use in decision making and accountability.

GFOA recommends that as governments gain experience with these measures, that they use a variety of performance measures to report on the achievements, impacts, and outcomes of key programs. These measures should be aligned to the objectives of

the programs and the missions and priorities of the organization. GFOA recommends that governments should strive to:

- Develop a multiyear series of input, output, efficiency, and effectiveness (or quality) measures in major governmental areas;
- Develop a database of statistics of common measures;
- Analyze the implications of using particular measures for decision making and accountability;
- Use customer or resident satisfaction measures;
- Develop common definitions of key performance measures to allow intergovernmental comparison;
- Develop common or improved approaches to utilization of financial and service performance measures in making and evaluating decisions; and
- Use community condition measures to assess resident needs that may not be addressed by current programs.

Staff has used the GFOA recommendations as guidance in implementing the City's performance measurement program.

#### Why a Performance Measurement Program?

Performance measures should be an integral part in three of the City's major administrative functions: planning, management and budgeting.

The planning process provides an opportunity for staff and the Council to think strategically about what types, level, and mix of services should be provided. Such things as citizen surveys, statistical data on community and infrastructure conditions, and other indicators of service demand or need provide vital information that can be used to design programs, establish program goals, and identify specific, measurable objectives to be accomplished over time. During the planning processes staff can also evaluate how service delivery is made and how program execution can be improved. Performance indicators can be used to measure whether or not program objectives are being met and used to assess service delivery alternatives.

As programs are implemented the focus becomes on management of the program. Performance measurement can assist in evaluating whether program services can be improved, can be delivered more cost effectively, or identify if different results could be obtained through a different resource allocation. Providing the results of these measures can also be a valuable tool in providing data about the quality and cost-effectiveness of government services to the public.

One of the ultimate goals of the City's performance measurement program is to use the results in decision making. One of the City's major decision making processes is the budget process when council authorizes the allocation of resources for providing services to the community. Ultimately it would be the desire of staff to be able to use the results of performance measures as one tool to determine the best allocation of resources. The monitoring of the performance results can be evaluated to show how outcomes change with respect to either an increase or decrease in resource allocation.


This will allow the Council to evaluate the merits of allocating more or less resources to one program relative to another, both for the short-term and the long-term.

Ultimately when performance measurements can be used for planning, management, and budgeting, the information they provide can improve the ability of the City to achieve the results that are intended for programs and services.

### What Are We Trying to Measure?

Performance measures will be used to show the City's progress toward achieving the Strategic Plan Critical Success Factors (CSF) goals, City Council goals, City's mission, and program purposes and goals. Ultimately success in these areas should support our City vision of making Shoreline the best place to live, learn, work and play. A place to live your dream.

A comprehensive performance measurement program should have measures at the activity and program levels that help managers determine if they are meeting their program goals. Program goals should support the more comprehensive goals that are established in the City's strategic plan and the specific goals that the Council adopts on an annual basis. The following graphic depicts the linkage between City programs and activities and the Strategic Plan and City department's missions and goals.



### Types of Performance Measures

Different measures can be used to provide specific information about the programs and activities undertaken by the City. The most frequently used types of measures are input, output, outcome, and efficiency measures. Each of these types of measures is designed to answer different questions about a program or activity.

*Input Measures.* Input measures address the question of what amounts of resources are needed to provide a particular program or service. Examples of common input measures that are used by the City include:

- Number of full-time equivalent employees (FTEs)
- Total operating expenditures



- Total capital expenditures
- Number of vehicles or pieces of equipment used

Input measures are useful in showing the total cost of providing a program, the mix of resources used to provide the program, and the amount of resources used for one program in relation to other programs. Input measures are usually the most easily identifiable measures.

*Output or Workload Measures.* Output or workload measures report the quantity or volume of products and services provided by the program. Throughout the City's 2006 budget document the City Council saw a variety of examples of workload measures for different programs. Examples and the corresponding program/location include:

Program	Measure	2003	2004	2005	Target
PRO Card	Number of neighborhoods/blocks participating in National Night Out Against Crime	N/A	15.0	16.0	N/A
Human Services	Number of citizens receiving emergency food and shelter	2,707	1,974	2,116	2,403
Human Services	Number of major home repair projects completed	16.0	21.0	16.0	14.0
Public Records & City Council Meeting Management	Number of City Council packets and sets of minutes produced	N/A	37.0	42.0	42.0
Geographical Information Systems	Number of Service requests	N/A	154.0	126.0	N/A
24 Hour Customer Response Team	Number of customer requests for service	2,982	3,079	4,272	3,000
Code Enforcement Team	Number of Code Enforcement actions resolved (Strike 1)	507	438	1,900	N/A
Street Crime Investigations	Number of narcotic investigations	71.0	67.0	N/A	N/A
Police Patrol	Number of dispatched calls for service	13,548	13,842	N/A	N/A
Athletic Field Maintenance & Operations	Number of baseball/soccer game field preps provided	1,110	1,222	1,297	1,297
General Recreation Programs	Number of adult participants	17,306	17,059	20,390	20,500
Permit Services Team	Number of addition/remodel single-family residential permits submitted	211	189	190	200
Right-of-Way Permit and Inspection Program	Number of inspections performed	1,505	790	1,015	N/A

Workload measures are useful in defining the activities or units of service provided by the City, however, they provide no indication of whether the goals established for the program are being met, nor can they be used to assess the quality of a program or service. For example knowing the number of permits submitted may be helpful in assessing the incoming work impact to staff, but it does not provide information on staff's ability to provide timely permit issuance or inspections or whether the program is meeting its proposed goals.

*Effectiveness/Outcome Measures:* Effectiveness measures, also known as outcome measures, focus on the question of whether or not the program is meeting its mission and goals. They are used to evaluate the quality or effectiveness of programs. Again the 2006 budget document included a number of effectiveness measures for a variety of programs/services provided by the City. Examples and their corresponding programs/location include:

Program	Measure	2003	2004	2005	Target
PRO Card and various Programs	A variety of resident/citizen satisfaction measures – Example: Percent of residents who feel safe in their neighborhood during the day.	N/A	92.0%	92.0%	N/A
Internal support programs (City Clerk, Purchasing, Financial Planning, Information Technology, City Attorney, Human Resources)	Measures on customer rating of quality, timeliness, accuracy of information. Example: Percentage of customers rating the Finance Department services as good or excellent.	N/A	98.7%	98.7%	95.0%
PRO Card and Street Operation & Pavement Resurfacing Programs	Overall pavement condition rating for City streets	76.0	76.0	81.3	>76.0
PRO Card & Police Patrol	Part 1 crimes per 1,000 population	44.47	46.00	47.00	N/A
Public Records & City Council Meeting Management	Percentage of City Council packets available to the public on the City website the day after receipt by City Councilmembers	N/A	97.0%	97.0%	100.0%
Human Services	Percent of Shoreline residents served in "Educational and Job Skills" service area	N/A	N/A	0.8%	0.2%
Financial Planning and Accounting Services	Actual revenue collections compared to projected revenues	96.9%	101%		95 – 105%
Purchasing	Percentage of awards and solicitations made without protest	100.0%	100.0%	97.0%	100.0%
Information Technology Operations & Security	Help desk calls resolved within 8 hours	N/A	N/A	63.0%	65.0%
Grant Research & Development	Percentage of grant applications successfully awarded	75.0%	64.0%	60.0%	68.0%
24 Hour Customer Response Team	Percentage of customer requests responded to within 24 hours	100%	97%	95%	95%
Police Patrol	Response time to priority 1 calls (minutes)	6.57	6.81		N/A
Traffic Services & Neighborhood Traffic Safety	Percentage of service requests completed on time	92.0%	90.0%	95.0%	100.0%
PRO Card	Traffic accidents per 1,000 population	N/A	13.2	12.2	N/A
Parks Administration	Park acreage per 1,000 population	6.78	6.78	6.78	N/A
General Recreation Programs	Percentage of class sessions offered that were held	N/A	N/A	73%	75%
Code Enforcement Team	Percent of abandoned vehicles tagged within 24 hours of notification	N/A	N/A	99%	95%
Code Enforcement Team	Percentage of all code enforcement actions resolved by voluntary compliance (Strike 1)	84.4%	92.7%	92.0%	85.0%
Building and Inspections Team	Percent of building permits issued on or before the target dates identified in SMC 20.30.040	93.8%	92.3%		N/A
Economic Development	Retail sales tax collections per capita	\$103.68	\$109.28	\$113.69	N/A
Recycling Programs	Percentage of households participating in City recycling events	10.7%	12.9%	17.7%	25.0%
Surface Water Management	Percentage of catch basins cleaned annually	N/A	50.0%	50.0%	50.0%

**Efficiency Measures.** Efficiency measures measure the cost (either in terms of dollars or personnel hours) per unit of output or outcome. Efficiency measures are often measures of productivity. Examples of efficiency measures included within the 2006 budget document are:

Program	Measure	2003	2004	2005	Target
PRO Card and City Manager's Office	Operating expenditures per capita	\$469	\$468	\$489	N/A
City Manager's Office	Number of regular City employees per 1,000 population	2.5	2.6	2.6	2.6
City Manager's Office	Support service costs as a percentage of the City's general fund	15.6%	15.2%	13.7%	15.0%
Financial Planning and Accounting Services	Accounts payable checks processed per dedicated Full Time Equivalent Employee (FTE)	4,098	4,088	4,000	4,000

Program	Measure	2003	2004	2005	Target
Financial Planning and Accounting Services	Payroll checks processed per dedicated Full Time Equivalent Employee (FTE)	5,133	5,731	5,975	5,500
Information Technology	Central IT operating & maintenance expenditures per workstation	\$4,463	\$4,061	\$3,044	N/A
Aquatics	Revenue per hour of Shoreline Pool operation	\$55.39	\$65.66	\$67.51	\$69.45
Code Enforcement Team	Number of active cases per FTE	N/A	89	96	N/A
General Recreation Programs	Percent of general recreation program budget supported by fees	49.7%	42.4%	51.5%	50.0%
Jail	Average cost per jail day used	\$88.25	\$89.89	\$88.93	N/A
Police Patrol	Number of dispatched calls for service per Patrol Officer	410.50	407.10		N/A
Street Crime Investigations	Average number of cases per Detective	240.00	240.00	240.00	240.00
Street Operation & Pavement Resurfacing Programs	Cost per lane mile of street sweeping	\$32.64	\$22.67	\$18.92	N/A
Public Facility & Vehicle Maintenance & Operations	Number of square feet maintained (facilities) per FTE	37,370	32,370	47,953	47,953

In order to get a full picture of how a program may or may not be progressing on meeting its program purpose or goals, it is necessary to use input, output, effectiveness, and efficiency measures. Even when using measures from all of these categories, it can be difficult to fully assess a program. The important thing is to monitor the family of measures over time, evaluate if the information that is needed to assess the programs is being provided, and modify as needed to provide more pertinent information.

#### The City's Performance Measurement Program

A pilot City performance measurement program was initiated in 2001. Five City departments participated in the pilot program: City Manager's Office, Finance, Police, City Attorney and the Customer Response Team (CRT). Each of these departments developed performance measures that were included in the 2002 budget. During the development of the 2003 budget, each department in the pilot program reviewed their measures to determine if they were still appropriate to measure their progress toward department goals. Departments also began to collect data and report results in the 2003 proposed budget.

Since the pilot program was successful, a city-wide performance measurement team was created in January of 2003 with representatives from each City department. The team determined that performance measurement is a necessary tool to facilitate the City's commitment to continuous improvement and to measure if we are accomplishing the City's mission and objectives. The team also determined that the program should meet the following objectives:

- ◆ Provide relevant data that can be used for organizational and community decision making.
- ◆ Provide valid data that will assist the organization in its resource allocation decisions.
- ◆ Provide valid data that can be used in the City's efforts to proactively communicate its efforts and accomplishments.
- ◆ Provide data that can be used to evaluate program effectiveness and assist in program development and improvement.

- ◆ Develop the foundation for future benchmarking within the context of the City's policies and priorities.
- ◆ Provide data that can be used for policy formation and decision making.

Staff reviewed the proposed performance measurement program, including a review of all City programs, purpose statements, and relevant performance measures for each of the programs, with the City Council in September 2003. At that time, staff provided the following timetable to implement the City's performance measurement program.

	Year 1 (2003)	Year 2 (2004)	Year 3 (2005)	Year 4 (2006)
Identify Programs & Activities				
Align programs with Strategic Plan				
Develop outcome and customer service measures for each program				
Develop performance measures for Strategic Plan Critical Success Factors				
Develop measures for each program activity				
Collect data for ICMA program				
Report data to ICMA for inclusion in their annual Comparative Performance Measurement Report				

Staff has been working to implement the performance measurement program as based on the original goals and timelines. Staff has continued to review the measures applicable to their programs, collect data, and refine measures in order to become more meaningful. Currently staff has identified 520 performance measures for 52 programs. To date the primary reporting medium for the program performance measurements have been in the annual budget document.

Although the budget document does not contain all program performance measures, it does include those that staff believes would be more useful to the Council and the Community when evaluating the City's success in meeting program purposes and goals. A copy of the program pages from the 2006 proposed budget are included as Attachment A.

Strategic Plan

In 2003 the City developed its first operational strategic plan. The plan was based on the seven critical success factors (CSF) previously adopted by the City Council. The CSF are:

- **Healthy, vibrant neighborhoods**
- **Economic vitality and financial stability**
- **Quality services and facilities**
- **Innovative leadership and strategic planning**
- **Community alliances and partnerships**
- **Effective community relations and communications**
- **Professional and committed workforce**

The CSF are viewed as the key to achieving the City's vision. The strategic plan provides a "roadmap" to achieve the vision with goals and strategies that support each of the CSF. Performance measures were identified, of which the results could be used to assess the City's progress in achieving the strategic goals over time.

In 2004, data was collected for many of the Strategic Plan measures which provided baseline results. Data was again collected in 2005, and staff continued to look for a way to communicate the strategic plan and the City's progress toward achieving the plan's goals in a more meaningful way to the community. The result was the development of the Performance, Results & Outcomes Card (PRO Card). The PRO Card was first published with the 2006 proposed budget. The PRO Card attempted to communicate the strategic plan goals and measurements that were to be used to monitor the City's progress in meeting those goals. The PRO Card is included as Attachment B.

If Council believes that either the CSF need to be changed or that the goals or strategies to achieve the CSF need revised, then this should be a discussion at the annual planning retreat. As goals and strategies are changed, then the performance measures used to measure progress towards meeting those goals should be reviewed and modified as needed.

#### International City Management Association Center for Performance Measurement

In 2003 the City joined the International City Management Association Center for Performance Measurement (ICMA CPM). This program provides standardized templates for 15 different service areas for developing performance measures. The service areas include:

<i>Code Enforcement</i>	<i>Facilities Management</i>
<i>Fire and EMS</i>	<i>Fleet Management</i>
<i>Highway and Road Maintenance</i>	<i>Housing</i>
<i>Human Resources</i>	<i>Information Technology</i>
<i>Library Services</i>	<i>Parks and Recreation</i>
<i>Police Services</i>	<i>Purchasing</i>
<i>Refuse and Recycling</i>	<i>Risk Management</i>
<i>Youth Services</i>	

The City will be completing the templates, for the programs in italics, for a third year with 2005 data. It should be noted that although we provide information to ICMA for the police program, the City's results are not usually included in the overall ICMA CPM results since Shoreline contracts for police services. ICMA maintains the stance that they are developing a standardized template for city or county operated departments. Even though this is the case, staff is able to take the raw data and create comparisons of some of the key measures that ICMA tracks, as we see that the comparison is valid.

The main purpose of the ICMA CPM is to provide a forum in which participating agencies can collect data that is reported in a standard format and then can be used by the participating agencies to benchmark their results against either individual jurisdictions, the average value for all the reporting jurisdictions, and/or the median value for all the reporting jurisdictions. It is up to an individual agency to interpret the

comparison of their individual results to that of the other participants. Depending on a variety of factors, the results could be used to identify where a jurisdiction is doing well or where improvements could be made. This allows jurisdictions to evaluate if there are operational differences that can be changed to have better results or if there are differing values, differing physical conditions, differing operational services, or differing funding priorities that may result in differences between jurisdictions. The bottom line is that the collection of standardized data by ICMA CPM provides a forum for participating jurisdictions to ask these questions.

There are currently eighty-seven jurisdictions, nation wide, that have submitted at least one template for the 2004 reporting year. Fifty of these jurisdictions have populations of at least 100,000; thirty-seven are under 100,000. The average general fund budget of all participating jurisdictions is \$180 million, while the median is \$81 million. For those jurisdictions with a population of less than 100,000, the median residential population is 52,524, slightly greater than Shoreline's. The average general fund budget for jurisdictions with a population of less than 100,000 that participate in the ICMA CPM program, is \$41 million and the median is \$35 million, of which both are greater than Shoreline's (\$28.9 million).

City staff is currently in the process of completing the templates for the 2005 reporting year. The City must report its 2005 data to ICMA by mid March. Some of the major performance measure results from the ICMA CPM 2004 report for the City of Shoreline are included as Attachment C. Many of these were provided to the City Council in November 2005 as part of the City Manager's discussion of the 2006 proposed budget.

Attachment D provides additional information about the ICMA CPM program.

#### ICMA CPM Puget Sound Performance Consortium

The City, through its membership with ICMA, is partnering with the following cities to form the Puget Sound Performance Consortium:

- Bellevue
- Lynnwood
- Renton
- University Place
- Kirkland
- Mercer Island
- Sammamish
- Vancouver

The purpose of the Consortium is two-fold: first, identify similarities and differences in performance on specific operational programs/activities and second, identify the higher performers and ascertain why and how they are more effective. The value generated from such a review will be the opportunity for the participating cities to learn from each other and wherever possible improve organizational effectiveness.

The Puget Sound Consortium was established in 2004 and is just beginning the effort of sharing data and exchanging ideas and suggestions. The work that Shoreline will be doing within the Consortium will compliment our own performance measurement program and provide a strong tool to assist in our efforts of continuous improvement. Participating cities have agreed to collect data on a set of core measures, which are a sub-set of the ICMA CPM templates, for 2005. Participants are going through this

process at this time. It is anticipated that later in 2006 jurisdictions will be able to have comparable data in which to initiate a dialogue to evaluate the data and how it can provide assistance in improving services.

### How Have We Used the Data?

The performance measure results that have been accumulated, to date, have been used in a variety of ways which include:

- *Information for establishing baselines and future targets:* As departments have collected data about their programs for the past two to three years, they have been able to obtain baseline data to measure their progress towards meeting program goals. For example, in the Aquatics program one of the efficiency measures is revenue collected per hour of pool operation. Staff recognized a few years ago that this number seemed slightly low, along with recognizing that the pool could be utilized more effectively. As such additional programs have been implemented and pool programming has been streamlined resulting in a higher revenue per hour of operation in 2005 than in previous years. Based on three years of data, Aquatics has now set a target of generating \$69.45 of revenue per hour of pool operation in the future. Of course like any measure, a single measure can't be used to determine the success or failure of a program, but rather a combination of measures should be evaluated over time to determine if the goals of a program are being met.
- *Making service level decisions:* The City has continued to fund the pavement management program at a level to maintain the City's average pavement rating for City streets at 76.0 or better. By tracking the City's pavement rating in the Street Operation & Pavement Resurfacing Program, staff has been able to develop a program that maximizes the budget dollars by incorporating different methods of pavement preservation such as overlay and slurry seal. To date the City has been able to improve the overall pavement management rating from 76.0 in 2003 to 81.3 in 2005.
- *Identifying Areas Where We Are Successfully Meeting the Communities Needs and Areas Than Can Be Improved:* Feedback from the Shoreline Community is a very important component of the City's performance measurement program. The citizen survey provides feedback directly to staff and Council that can be used to identify areas where we are performing well and identifying areas where we can improve. Since the survey is done every other year, it will take a few years to get trend data, but by providing consistent questions that are aimed at getting the community's perspective on how the City is meeting their needs, the Council and staff can identify progress towards achieving our strategic plan goals.

Two specific examples of how the Council and staff has used the feedback from the community to assess where we are doing well and where we can improve are the use of *Currents* and increased information about City finances.

In 2004, residents identified that they used the *Currents* as the primary source for getting City information. *Currents* received a 71% satisfactory rating from residents. As such the Council authorized additional resources to increase the frequency of *Currents* to ten per year starting in 2005.

Another survey question asked residents how they think the City manages its finances. In 2004 only 22% of respondents rated the City's management of its resources as good or excellent, while 40% said they didn't know (an additional 26% rated the City's management of its resources as average). The large percentage of unknowns prompted City staff to enhance communication with the community regarding City finances. Those efforts have included:

- Program priority workshops, in which more than 150 community members have had an opportunity to learn more about the programs the City provides and City finances and provide priority information directly back to staff.
- A capital budget priority meeting held in 2005 where community members had a chance to learn about the City's capital budget and provide feedback on future priority areas
- A dedicated budget issue of the Currents and more frequent communication of financial information in other publication sources.

### Next Steps

Although much progress has been made on the City's performance measurement program, there are still many things that can be done to enhance our program. Specifically staff intends to continue to make improvements in the following areas:

*Targets:* With the accumulation of 2005 data many of the programs had three years of data to compare results. This allowed program managers to evaluate actual results and identify whether in the future they would like to improve in a performance area, maintain current ratings, or whether expectations should be lowered because of changing priorities or a change in resource allocation. As such, many program managers were able to establish targets for their performance measures to be used to compare against results in the future. Depending on the measure, the targets may represent short or long-term goals. If short-term, the target may be revised on a more frequent basis. As program managers continue to develop their programmatic performance measures and analyze the results, more emphasis will be placed on establishing targets. Many of the program performance measures included in the 2006 proposed budget included targets.

The same issues exist with the performance measures used on the PRO Card. Since the PRO Card has two years of data, it is important to evaluate the baseline data to help determine future targets. Staff will continue to review the PRO Card data in 2006 and seek feedback from the City Council in establishing targets for these high level measures.

*Decision Making:* The ultimate goal of the performance measurement program is to have information that can be used in resource allocation, planning, and service delivery decisions. In some cases the Council and staff have been able to use the data that has been collected to do this, but this has been some-what limited. As the measures are refined and multi-year data is collected, there is an expectation that staff will use the data to be more effective in providing services. It is also an expectation that if program goals are not being achieved that staff will look for either alternative ways to provide



service or that alternative services will be provided that may be more effective. Staff would also desire that as information from the performance measurement program is used for program and service delivery decisions that we can use the data to make resource allocation decisions. It is understood that this is a long-term process and that we will need to measure our progress in using the performance measurement program for this purpose.

*Trends:* As stated in the previous paragraph, by continuing to collect data over time and using consistent performance measures, staff is able to identify trends in the results. Since we are in the fourth year of the City's performance measurement program, we should be approaching a time when we can start to monitor trends and use that analysis to identify where we are achieving our program goals or where we may be missing the mark.

*Benchmarking:* The City's participation in the ICMA CPM and the in the Puget Sound Consortium will allow staff not only to set targets against our own performance, but compare our performance measurement results and trends against other cities both in our geographical region and nation-wide. This will allow staff the opportunity to identify areas in which we can seek information from other agencies in service areas that we may want to improve and where others have succeeded in implementing best business practices.

*Reporting Out:* One of the primary goals of the City's performance measurement program is to develop a communication tool between staff, City Council, and the community, on the City's progress in achieving its strategic plan and program goals. As previously mentioned, the budget document has been the primary reporting tool for performance measures to date. It is staff's goal to develop other means of communication that could be used to focus on performance outcomes. Some entities have published a performance outcome report that provides information on their high level program measures and discusses how the programs are using the information to monitor progress in achieving their goals. In 2006, staff hopes to initiate such a project in Shoreline. Other forms of communication can include the distribution of the PRO Card, continued community meetings, and the use of *Currents*.

One idea under consideration by staff is developing a citizen feedback committee that could work with staff to review City performance measures and their results. The committee could be useful as liaisons to the larger Shoreline community and to provide feedback to Council on areas that they think the City is succeeding in its efforts to achieve its goals and areas in which they would desire to see improvement.

Regardless of the methods that the City uses to communicate the performance results with the community, the important thing is that we find useful ways to communicate the information to the community and get their feedback on our progress.

*Initiative 900 (I-900):* As Council is aware, this initiative was approved by the Washington State voters in November 2005. This initiative directs the state auditor to conduct performance audits of every state and local government agency and entity, including executive, legislative, and judicial agencies and report annually. The audits

would include reviews of the economy, efficiency, and effectiveness of each agency's policies, management, fiscal affairs, and operations.

The State Auditor's Office is in the process of developing the programs that they will use to meet the requirements of the initiative. Shoreline's work on performance measures should be a valuable resource in responding to the needs of the auditor in implementing I-900.

### Summary

The City initiated a performance measurement program in 2001. Since that time all City program managers have identified a family of measures that can be used to help evaluate the achievement of program goals over time. In 2003 the City developed its first operational strategic plan. Goals and strategies were established to achieve the City's vision and critical success factors and performance measures have been identified that can be used to monitor the progress towards achieving those goals. In 2005 City staff developed the PRO Card as a way to communicate the City's strategic plan and the results of the measures associated with the strategic goals. The City has become a participant in the ICMA Center for Performance Measurement and the Puget Sound consortium as a way to have comparable data with other jurisdictions that can be used for benchmarking and/or identifying areas of success or desired improvement.

The development and implementation of a performance measurement program is a long-term commitment. As data collection and review of measure results becomes part of the City's operational culture and processes, the data will be used more frequently for communicating goal progress with our community and for decision making purposes. Staff is very committed to the continued improvement of the City's performance measurement program.

### **RECOMMENDATION**

No action is required by Council. This item is provided for informational purposes. Staff would like to have Council feedback on areas that they would like to see improvements or changes to the City's performance measurement program.

### **ATTACHMENTS**

- Attachment A – 2006 Proposed Budget Program Pages
- Attachment B – Performance, Results and Outcome Card (PRO Card)
- Attachment C – Excerpts from ICMA CPM 2004 Annual Report
- Attachment D – Information about the ICMA CPM Program

**AQUATICS**

**PROGRAM PURPOSE:**

Provide safe, healthy, accessible and affordable programs and services for the Shoreline community.  
 Provide diverse, life-long activities that meet evolving community needs in the areas of water safety, swimming skills, athletics, health, fitness, psychological well-being, certifications and recreational aquatics.

**CRITICAL SUCCESS FACTOR:**

Healthy, Vibrant Neighborhoods

Measurement: EFFICIENCY	2003	2004	2005	TARGET
Drop-in participants per hour of drop-in opportunity.	20.1	19.4	20.4	20.4
Net cost per hour of Shoreline Pool operation (net of revenues)	\$56.73	\$57.81	\$70.07	N/A
Program Revenue as a percentage of program costs (added utilities in 2005).	49.4%	53.1%	49.1%	45.4%
Revenue per hour of Shoreline Pool operation	\$55.39	\$65.66	\$67.51	\$69.45

Measurement: WORKLOAD	2003	2004	2005	TARGET
Number of drop-in participants	45,656	50,346	52,854	52,900
Number of hours of course instruction	3,876	4,488	4,313	4,375
Number of hours of drop-in opportunities (Lap & Rec Swim)	2,266	2,589	2,589	2,589
Number of swimming lesson participants	4,006	4,819	4,722	4,800
Resident Participants			81%	83%
Total Number of hours of pool operation	4,858	5,018	5,018	5,018


**2005 Budget**

Program Expenditures	\$690,381
Program Revenue	\$338,766
General Support	<u>\$351,615</u>


**2006 Budget**

Program Expenditures	\$766,934
Program Revenue	\$348,497
General Support	<u>\$418,437</u>

**Program Revenue vs General Support**



**Program Revenue vs General Support**



## ATHLETIC FIELD MAINTENANCE & OPERATIONS

### PROGRAM PURPOSE:

Provide stewardship for the City's athletic fields and to create safe recreational opportunities for the well-being and enjoyment of the public.

### CRITICAL SUCCESS FACTOR:

Healthy, Vibrant Neighborhoods

Measurement: EFFICIENCY	2003	2004	2005	TARGET
Cost per hour of field rental	N/A	N/A	\$7.62	\$4.85
Program Revenue as a percent of program expense	N/A	48%	47%	67%

Measurement: WORKLOAD	2003	2004	2005	TARGET
Number of baseball fields	15	15	15	15
Number of baseball/soccer game field preps provided	1,110	1,222	1,297	1,297
Number of baseball/soccer practice field preps provided	1,200	1,317	1,326	1,326
Number of hours of adult field rentals	9,097	9,721	4,281	4,000
Number of hours of youth field rentals	13,837	14,582	14,267	14,500
Number of soccer fields	10	10	10	10


### 2005 Budget

Program Expenditures	\$268,109
Program Revenue	\$126,764
General Support	\$141,345


### 2006 Budget

Program Expenditures	\$274,927
Program Revenue	\$185,165
General Support	\$89,762

**Program Revenue vs General Support**



**Program Revenue vs General Support**



## CODE ENFORCEMENT TEAM

### PROGRAM PURPOSE:

The Code Enforcement Team enforces the City's codes and regulations to implement community values and to sustain a safe and attractive City.

### CRITICAL SUCCESS FACTOR:

Healthy, Vibrant Neighborhoods

<b>Measurement:    EFFECTIVENESS</b>	2003	2004	2005	TARGET
Average number of calendar days from request initiation to voluntary compliance (Strike 1)			12	15
Percent of abandoned vehicles tagged within 24 hours of notification		N/A	99%	95%
Percentage of all cases issued a Notice and Order that are brought into compliance annually.		45%	31%	38%
Percentage of all code enforcement actions resolved by voluntary compliance (Strike 1)	84.4%	92.7%	92%	85%
Percentage of cases closed by induced compliance (Strike 2 & 3) annually		29%	30%	30%
Percentage of cases open beyond 365 days (Strike 2&3)	43%	70%	72%	70%

<b>Measurement:    EFFICIENCY</b>	2003	2004	2005	TARGET
Code Enforcement expenditures per capita		\$2.47	\$2.70	\$2.89
Number of Active Cases per FTE		89	96	N/A
Number of code enforcement actions (Strike 1) per FTE		219	976	N/A


<b>Measurement:    WORKLOAD</b>	2003	2004	2005	TARGET
Number of Code Enforcement requests for action	579	472	1997	N/A
Total Number of Code Enforcement actions resolved (Strike 1)	507	438	1900	N/A

## CODE ENFORCEMENT TEAM


	2005 Budget
Program Expenditures	\$242,051
Program Revenue	\$0
General Support	\$242,051

	2006 Budget
Program Expenditures	\$431,166
Program Revenue	\$0
General Support	\$431,166

**Program Revenue vs General Support**



**Program Revenue vs General Support**



## GENERAL RECREATION PROGRAMS

### PROGRAM PURPOSE:

Develop and implement comprehensive recreation programs, services, and events targeting all ages and abilities, and a variety of special interests throughout the year to meet the needs of the community.

### CRITICAL SUCCESS FACTOR:

Healthy, Vibrant Neighborhoods

<b>Measurement: EFFECTIVENESS</b>	2003	2004	2005	TARGET
Percentage of class sessions, ie pre-ballet has 10 sessions = 10 classes, that were held that were offered			73%	75%
Percentage of customers rating the quality of the programs as good or excellent	94%	94%	94%	95%
Percentage of residents who participated in recreational programming offered by the City	40%	67%	73%	73%

<b>Measurement: EFFICIENCY</b>	2003	2004	2005	TARGET
Average Number of Participants per Day	N/A	N/A	382	400
Percent of general recreation program budget supported by fees.	49.7%	42.4%	51.5%	50%


<b>Measurement: WORKLOAD</b>	2003	2004	2005	TARGET
Number of adult participants	17,306	17,059	20,390	20,500
Number of adult recreational classes held	222	307	244	250
Number of Drop-ins at the Spartan Gym	N/A	N/A	10,264	10,000
Number of preschool participants	7,624	7,070	8,770	8,700
Number of preschool recreational classes held	84	81	116	100
Number of special needs participants	1,154	1,712	1,312	1,300
Number of special needs recreational classes held	57	64	61	65
Number of youth participants	2,535	2,743	3,485	3,500
Number of youth recreational classes held	170	163	273	250

## GENERAL RECREATION PROGRAMS


2005	Budget
Program Expenditures	\$602,995
Program Revenue	\$310,700
General Support	\$292,295

2006	Budget
Program Expenditures	\$763,993
Program Revenue	\$363,700
General Support	\$400,293

**Program Revenue vs General Support**



**Program Revenue vs General Support**





# JAIL

**PROGRAM PURPOSE:**

The Jail program accounts for the costs of screening, booking and imprisonment of misdemeanor offenders. This service is provided through interlocal agreements with the King County and Yakima County jails.

**CRITICAL SUCCESS FACTOR:**

Healthy, Vibrant Neighborhoods

Measurement: EFFICIENCY	2003	2004	2005	TARGET
Average cost per jail day used	\$88.25	\$89.89		N/A
Percentage of days held at Yakima County Jail Facility	34%	47%		75%

Measurement: WORKLOAD	2003	2004	2005	TARGET
Total Jail Days Used	8,204	7,294		N/A


**2005 Budget**

Program Expenditures	<b>\$865,000</b>
Program Revenue	<b>\$0</b>
General Support	<b>\$865,000</b>


**2006 Budget**

Program Expenditures	<b>\$839,000</b>
Program Revenue	<b>\$0</b>
General Support	<b>\$839,000</b>

**Program Revenue vs General Support**



**Program Revenue vs General Support**



## NEIGHBORHOODS

### PROGRAM PURPOSE:

The Council of Neighborhoods was created in 1996 by City Council Resolution No. 54 to provide a vehicle for two-way communication between the City and its residents. The Neighborhoods program provides support, advice and assistance to the Council of Neighborhoods to build healthy, vibrant neighborhoods.

The Mini-Grant program was created in 1996 by City Council Resolution No. 54 to provide funding for neighborhood groups to make improvements that enhance the Shoreline community.

### CRITICAL SUCCESS FACTOR:

Healthy, Vibrant Neighborhoods

<b>Measurement:</b> EFFECTIVENESS	2003	2004	2005	TARGET
Percentage of residents rating the condition of their neighborhoods as excellent or good		59%	59%	N/A
Percentage of residents who think Shoreline is an excellent or good place to live		87%	87%	N/A
Percentage of residents who think that the overall quality of life in the City is excellent or good		93%	93%	N/A

<b>Measurement:</b> OTHER	2003	2004	2005	TARGET
Dollar value of improvements funded through the Mini-Grant program	\$13,100	\$8,797		\$12,000
Number of City Neighborhoods participating in the Mini-Grant program	4	3		3


### 2005 Budget

Program Expenditures	<b>\$181,942</b>
Program Revenue	<b>\$0</b>
General Support	<b>\$181,942</b>


### 2006 Budget

Program Expenditures	<b>\$166,735</b>
Program Revenue	<b>\$0</b>
General Support	<b>\$166,735</b>

Program Revenue vs General Support



Program Revenue vs General Support



## PARKS ADMINISTRATION

### PROGRAM PURPOSE:

Administer a full service Parks, Recreation and Cultural Services Department and provide long term planning and capital project oversight of park projects to support community use and meet public recreation needs of the community and provides support to the Shoreline Library Board.

### CRITICAL SUCCESS FACTOR:

Healthy, Vibrant Neighborhoods

Measurement: EFFECTIVENESS	2003	2004	2005	TARGET
Park acreage per thousand population	6.78	6.78	6.78	N/A
Percentage of citizens satisfied with Parks, Recreation and Cultural Services	88%	88%	88%	N/A
Percentage of Community that has visited a park in the past year	70%	70%	70%	N/A
Percentage of Community that has visited a park more than five times in the past year	66%	66%	66%	N/A

Measurement: EFFICIENCY	2003	2004	2005	TARGET
Net Parks and Recreation revenue per capita	37.2	40.65	48.82	N/A
Parks Administration as a percent of the total Parks budget	11.6%	8.4%	9%	<10%
Parks and Recreation FTE per 1,000 population	.46	.44	.44	.49
Recreation and athletic programming cost recovery percentage		40%	42%	48%


  

Measurement: OTHER	2003	2004	2005	TARGET
Number of volunteer hours	1,047	2,718.9	1,979	


2005 Budget	
Program Expenditures	\$294,769
Program Revenue	\$0
General Support	\$294,769

2006 Budget	
Program Expenditures	\$387,781
Program Revenue	\$0
General Support	\$387,781

**Program Revenue vs General Support**



**Program Revenue vs General Support**



## **PARKS ADMINISTRATION**

## POLICE COMMUNITY STOREFRONTS

### PROGRAM PURPOSE:

Community Storefronts work collaboratively with local residents, businesses, and schools in order to address issues that affect the community.

### CRITICAL SUCCESS FACTOR:

Healthy, Vibrant Neighborhoods

Measurement: WORKLOAD	2003	2004	2005	TARGET
Court reminder program contacts	2,829	2,631		2,800
Number of active block watch groups	126	125	125	130
Number of Citizen Contacts		3,572		N/A
Number of crime prevention vacation house checks performed		335		N/A
Storefront Volunteer Hours	11,862	12,300	12,000	N/A
Victim Call Back Calls made.		180		N/A


### 2005 Budget

Program Expenditures	\$250,700
Program Revenue	\$0
General Support	\$250,700


### 2006 Budget

Program Expenditures	\$261,306
Program Revenue	\$0
General Support	\$261,306

Program Revenue vs General Support



Program Revenue vs General Support



## POLICE INVESTIGATIONS CRIME ANALYSIS

### PROGRAM PURPOSE:

To investigate crime and solve cases in order to keep the community safe.

### CRITICAL SUCCESS FACTOR:

Healthy, Vibrant Neighborhoods

<b>Measurement: EFFECTIVENESS</b>	2003	2004	2005	TARGET
Juvenile Arrests for Part II Drug Abuse Offenses as a Percentage of Total Arrests for UCR Part II Drug Offenses	29%	10.1%		N/A
Total Arrests for Part I Crimes per 1,000 population	8.39	7.2		N/A
Total Arrests for UCR Part II Drug Offenses per 1,000 population	1.8	1.8		N/A
Total arrests per 1,000 population		27		N/A
Total DUI arrests per 1,000 population		30		N/A

<b>Measurement: EFFICIENCY</b>	2003	2004	2005	TARGET
Number of UCR Part I Crimes Cleared per Sworn FTE	5.78	5.2		N/A
Total Arrests for UCR Part I Crimes per Sworn FTE	9.85	8.4		N/A


<b>Measurement: WORKLOAD</b>	2003	2004	2005	TARGET
Juvenile Arrests for UCR Part 1 Crimes as a percentage of Total Arrests for UCR Part 1 Crimes	19%	23.7%		N/A
Number of Adult Charges & Arrest	1,550	1266		N/A
Number of cases closed and cleared by arrest (Part I and Part II Crimes)	1,128	1150		N/A
Number of Juvenile Charges & Arrest	238	191		N/A
Number of Victim Call Back Program contacts made	85	180		N/A
Percentage of UCR Part I Crimes Assigned to Major Investigation Units	3.4%	4.8%		N/A

## POLICE INVESTIGATIONS CRIME ANALYSIS


	2005 Budget
Program Expenditures	\$500,604
Program Revenue	\$0
General Support	\$500,604

	2006 Budget
Program Expenditures	\$516,421
Program Revenue	\$0
General Support	\$516,421

**Program Revenue vs General Support**



**Program Revenue vs General Support**



## POLICE PATROL

### PROGRAM PURPOSE:

Patrol responds to calls for service, enforces criminal laws and performs self-initiating activity to keep citizens safe.

### CRITICAL SUCCESS FACTOR:

Healthy, Vibrant Neighborhoods

<b>Measurement: EFFECTIVENESS</b>	2003	2004	2005	TARGET
Crime rate (Part 1) per 1,000 population	44.47	46.0		N/A
Crime rate (Part 2) per 1,000 population	2101	2160		N/A
Number of Dispatched Calls for Service per Patrol Officer	410.5	407.1		N/A
Percentage of citizens feeling safe in their neighborhood at night	69%	73.0%		N/A
Percentage of citizens feeling safe in their neighborhood during the day	91%	95.0%		N/A
Response Time to Priority 1 Calls	6.57	6.81		N/A
Response Time to Priority 2 Calls	11.54	11.37		N/A
Response time to Priority X Calls	4.06	3.62		N/A

<b>Measurement: EFFICIENCY</b>	2003	2004	2005	TARGET
Number of dispatched calls for service per Patrol Officer.	410.5	407.1		N/A

<b>Measurement: WORKLOAD</b>	2003	2004	2005	TARGET
Number of Alternative Calls Handled	1,071	1,051		N/A
Number of dispatched calls for service.	13548	13842		N/A
Number of Self-initiated Police Activities	15,456	13,037		N/A




# POLICE PATROL


	<b>2005 Budget</b>
Program Expenditures	\$3,786,606
Program Revenue	\$1,129,338
General Support	\$2,657,268

	<b>2006 Budget</b>
Program Expenditures	\$3,732,299
Program Revenue	\$1,198,756
General Support	\$2,533,543

**Program Revenue vs General Support**



**Program Revenue vs General Support**



# PROSECUTING ATTORNEY

**PROGRAM PURPOSE:**

The Prosecuting Attorney prosecutes violations of the Shoreline Municipal Code.

**CRITICAL SUCCESS FACTOR:**

Healthy, Vibrant Neighborhoods

Measurement: WORKLOAD	2003	2004	2005	TARGET
Total Number of Criminal Cases	1,287	906		N/A


**2005 Budget**

Program Expenditures	<b>\$118,000</b>
Program Revenue	<b>\$0</b>
General Support	<b>\$118,000</b>


**2006 Budget**

Program Expenditures	<b>\$153,000</b>
Program Revenue	<b>\$0</b>
General Support	<b>\$153,000</b>

**Program Revenue vs General Support**



**Program Revenue vs General Support**



## PUBLIC DEFENDER

**PROGRAM PURPOSE:**

The Public Defender provides legal representation for indigent criminal defendants

**CRITICAL SUCCESS FACTOR:**

Healthy, Vibrant Neighborhoods

Measurement: WORKLOAD	2003	2004	2005	TARGET
Number of cases represented	929	774	600	650


**2005 Budget**

Program Expenditures	\$137,000
Program Revenue	\$5,000
General Support	\$132,000


**2006 Budget**

Program Expenditures	\$134,104
Program Revenue	\$1,000
General Support	\$133,104

**Program Revenue vs General Support**



**Program Revenue vs General Support**



## POLICE SUPPORT SERVICES (911 CENTER, MAJOR CRIME INVESTIGATION, CANINE SERVICES, ETC.)

**PROGRAM PURPOSE:**

Support Services provides emergency communications and special investigation on major crimes in order to solve cases committed in Shoreline and apprehend offenders.

**CRITICAL SUCCESS FACTOR:**

Healthy, Vibrant Neighborhoods

<b>Measurement: EFFECTIVENESS</b>	2003	2004	2005	TARGET
Number dispatched calls for service per 1,000 population	256.8	262.5		N/A

<b>Measurement: WORKLOAD</b>	2003	2004	2005	TARGET
Dispatched calls for service	13,548	13,842		N/A
Number of Air Support (Helicopter) Flight Hours	6	6.15		N/A
Number of Bomb Disposal Unit responses	7	6		N/A
Number of canine calls for service	154	182		N/A
Number of Hostage & Barricade Incidents	1	0		N/A
Number of major accidents reconstruction incidents (3 year average)		13		N/A
Total number of canine hours of service	207.25	257.75		N/A


**2005 Budget**

Program Expenditures	<b>\$1,309,464</b>
Program Revenue	<b>\$0</b>
General Support	<b>\$1,309,464</b>


**2006 Budget**

Program Expenditures	<b>\$1,481,593</b>
Program Revenue	<b>\$0</b>
General Support	<b>\$1,481,593</b>

**Program Revenue vs General Support**



**Program Revenue vs General Support**



## RECYCLING PROGRAMS

**PROGRAM PURPOSE:**

Provide waste reduction and recycling education programs to the community. Coordinate recycling events, provide resource materials (compost bins, etc.), and manage the City's single solid waste service contract.

**CRITICAL SUCCESS FACTOR:**

Healthy, Vibrant Neighborhoods

<b>Measurement: EFFECTIVENESS</b>	2003	2004	2005	TARGET
Percentage of households participating in City recycling events	10.7%	12.9%	17.7%	25%

<b>Measurement: OTHER</b>	2003	2004	2005	TARGET
Number of households participating in annual recycling opportunities	2,221	2,681	3,717	5,000


**2005 Budget**

Program Expenditures	\$224,722
Program Revenue	\$198,039
General Support	\$26,683


**2006 Budget**

Program Expenditures	\$181,652
Program Revenue	\$155,710
General Support	\$25,942

**Program Revenue vs General Support**



**Program Revenue vs General Support**



## RIGHT-OF-WAY PERMIT AND INSPECTION PROGRAM

### PROGRAM PURPOSE:

Review planned work and inspect construction/work taking place in the public right-of-way, manage City franchises in the right-of-way, and provide plan review services on planning and development project applications submitted to the City's Planning and Development Services Department.

### CRITICAL SUCCESS FACTOR:

Healthy, Vibrant Neighborhoods

<b>Measurement:</b> EFFICIENCY	2003	2004	2005	TARGET
Number of ROW inspections completed per FTE	N/A	608	781	N/A

<b>Measurement:</b> WORKLOAD	2003	2004	2005	TARGET
Number of inspections performed	1,505	790	1,015	N/A
Number of right-of-way permits issued	522	462	523	N/A


### 2005 Budget

Program Expenditures	<b>\$100,968</b>
Program Revenue	<b>\$100,000</b>
General Support	<b>\$968</b>


### 2006 Budget

Program Expenditures	<b>\$103,444</b>
Program Revenue	<b>\$111,469</b>
General Support	<b>\$(8,025)</b>

**Program Revenue vs General Support**



**Program Revenue vs General Support**



## STREET CRIME INVESTIGATIONS

### PROGRAM PURPOSE:

The Street Crimes Unit proactively responds to crimes such as narcotics activities, code violations in the adult entertainment industry and vice activities in the City; to investigate these crimes and solve cases in order to keep the community safe and improve the quality of life for residents.

### CRITICAL SUCCESS FACTOR:

Healthy, Vibrant Neighborhoods

Measurement: EFFICIENCY	2003	2004	2005	TARGET
Average number of cases per Detective	240	240	240	240

Measurement: WORKLOAD	2003	2004	2005	TARGET
Felony cases closed "Cleared by Arrest"	69	78		N/A
Misdemeanor cases closed "Cleared by Arrest"	112	89		N/A
Number of Assigned Narcotic Activity Reports (neighborhood drug complaints)	31	26		N/A
Number of Miscellaneous Felony Investigations	26	75		N/A
Number of Narcotics Investigations	71	67		N/A
Number of Vice Arrests	61	54		N/A


### 2005 Budget

Program Expenditures	\$393,332
Program Revenue	\$0
General Support	\$393,332


### 2006 Budget

Program Expenditures	\$405,760
Program Revenue	\$0
General Support	\$405,760

Program Revenue vs General Support



Program Revenue vs General Support



## STREET OPERATION & PAVEMENT RESURFACING PROGRAMS

### PROGRAM PURPOSE:

Vegetation & Tree Maintenance in Right-of-Way: Maintains public rights-of-way by tree trimming, controlling vegetation, grading and other methods.

Street Maintenance & Operations: Manages the city's road overlay, curb ramp, and sidewalk programs. Provides maintenance and upkeep of city streets and roads. This service includes pothole patching, crack sealing, street sweeping, and snow and ice removal. Provides general maintenance support for the City including signing, striping, fence/barricade repair, parking lot maintenance, and other odd jobs.

Pavement Resurfacing: Provide long-term maintenance and upkeep of City streets and roads. This service includes asphalt overlay, slurry sealing, crack sealing, pot hole patching, and emulsion application

Street Lighting: Provides funding for street lights on arterial streets and traffic signalization. Maintains inventory data on all streetlights, through a GPS network mapping system.

### CRITICAL SUCCESS FACTOR:

Healthy, Vibrant Neighborhoods

<b>Measurement: EFFECTIVENESS</b>	2003	2004	2005	TARGET
Average pavement rating for arterials/collectors.	71.9	71.9	72.0	>76.0
Average pavement rating for residential streets.	75	75	80.8	>76.0
Percentage of citizens surveyed that are satisfied with the adequacy of city street lighting on arterial streets		60%	60%	N/A
Weighted average pavement rating for all City streets.	76.0	76.0	81.3	>76.0

<b>Measurement: EFFICIENCY</b>	2003	2004	2005	TARGET
Annual operating and maintenance costs per City traffic signal		\$3,364	\$4,250	N/A
Annual street operation expenditures per paved lane mile in the City	\$4,364	\$3,651	\$3,612	N/A
Cost per lane mile for asphalt overlay	\$36,126	\$54,335	\$47,260	N/A
Cost per lane mile for slurry seal	\$9,741	\$9,629	\$8,542	N/A
Cost per lane mile of street sweeping	\$32.64	\$22.67	\$18.92	N/A

<b>Measurement: WORKLOAD</b>	2003	2004	2005	TARGET
Collector Arterials total lane miles	32.81	32.81	32.81	N/A
Contract hours spent sanding & plowing roads	20	101	N/A	N/A
In-house hours spent sanding & plowing roads	73	99	N/A	N/A
Number of lane miles rehabilitated with slurry seal	11.1	14.8	13.6	13.0
Number of lane miles resurfaced with asphalt overlay	15.1	9.1	7.2	>9.0



## STREET OPERATION & PAVEMENT RESURFACING PROGRAMS

	2003	2004	2005	TARGET
Number of lane miles swept	1,756	2,405	2,520	2,520
Number of traffic signs maintained	571	273	300	N/A
Principle Arterials Total Lane Miles	22.22	22.22	22.22	N/A
Residential Streets total lane miles	295.59	295.59	295.59	N/A


### 2005 Budget

Program Expenditures	<b>\$2,804,896</b>
Program Revenue	<b>\$863,143</b>
General Support	<b>\$1,941,753</b>


### 2006 Budget

Program Expenditures	<b>\$2,881,290</b>
Program Revenue	<b>\$793,277</b>
General Support	<b>\$2,088,013</b>

Program Revenue vs General Support



Program Revenue vs General Support



## SURFACE WATER MANAGEMENT

### PROGRAM PURPOSE:

The Surface Water Management program provides for the maintenance and operations of the City's surface and subsurface water infrastructure, public education and outreach, water quality monitoring and code enforcement to protect water quality, enhance natural habitat, and prevent flooding.

### CRITICAL SUCCESS FACTOR:

Healthy, Vibrant Neighborhoods

<b>Measurement: EFFECTIVENESS</b>	2003	2004	2005	TARGET
Percentage of catch basins cleaned annually		50%	50%	50%
Percentage of citizens who are very satisfied or satisfied with the adequacy of storm drainage services in their neighborhood		55%	55%	100%
Percentage of citizens who are very satisfied or satisfied with the overall quality of the City's stormwater system		55%	55%	100%

<b>Measurement: EFFICIENCY</b>	2003	2004	2005	TARGET
Cost per lane mile swept.	\$21.67	\$15.12	\$18.92	N/A


<b>Measurement: WORKLOAD</b>	2003	2004	2005	TARGET
Approximate linear feet of stormwater pipes maintained		640,000	640,000	N/A
Approximate total linear feet of ditches maintained		150,000	150,000	N/A
City owned Storm Water Facilities inspected and maintained by the City		30	30	N/A
Number of catch basins cleaned	3,000	3,653	3,800	3,800
Number of dams inspected and maintained		6	6	6
Number of drainage ponds		9	9	9
Number of linear feet of open drainage channels cleared	200	1,114	977	N/A
Number of private retention/detention facility inspections	364	318	320	350
Number of pump stations maintained		4	4	4
Total number of catch basins maintained		7,117	7,200	7,300

## SURFACE WATER MANAGEMENT


	2005 Budget
Program Expenditures	\$2,898,600
Program Revenue	\$3,071,187
General Support	\$(172,587)

	2006 Budget
Program Expenditures	\$1,557,254
Program Revenue	\$5,179,067
General Support	\$(3,621,813)

**Program Revenue vs General Support**



**Program Revenue vs General Support**



## TEEN RECREATION PROGRAMS

### PROGRAM PURPOSE:

The Teen Recreation program help youth in the community, ages 12-19 years old, make successful life choices by being positive role models and offering diverse, challenging, safe and innovative programs. As a means of gauging progress toward this goal, the program uses 9 of the 40 Search Institute's Development Assets for success as guiding factors. The assets chosen focus on the following: giving teens useful roles, valuing their opinions, giving clear expectations, doing their homework, volunteerism, increasing their sense of personal responsibility, non-violent conflict resolution, adding more caring adults in their lives and helping them feel more in control over their life.

### CRITICAL SUCCESS FACTOR:

Healthy, Vibrant Neighborhoods

Measurement: EFFECTIVENESS	2003	2004	2005	TARGET
Percentage of surveyed participants that always or sometimes feel that the Teen Program provides all 9 of the development assets surveyed	83%	82%	82%	85%


Measurement: EFFICIENCY	2003	2004	2005	TARGET
Net cost per hour of teen recreation programs (net of revenue)	\$97.28	\$99.56	\$130.09	N/A
Net Cost per Visit (net of revenues)	\$11.53	\$8.51	\$11.76	\$11.10

Measurement: WORKLOAD	2003	2004	2005	TARGET
Number of teen recreation program hours	3,328	3,197	2,723	2,995
Number of visits in the Teen Late Night Programs	10,844	11,507	8,588	9,447
Number of visits to all Teen Programs excluding Late Night	14,228	22,213	21,546	22,623
Total number of all visits.	25,072	33,720	30,134	32,070

2005 Budget	
Program Expenditures	\$399,793
Program Revenue	\$45,555
General Support	\$354,238

2006 Budget	
Program Expenditures	\$403,125
Program Revenue	\$48,407
General Support	\$354,718

Program Revenue vs General Support



Program Revenue vs General Support



## TEEN RECREATION PROGRAMS

## TRAFFIC SERVICES & NEIGHBORHOOD TRAFFIC SAFETY

### PROGRAM PURPOSE:

Responsible for plan review, design and approval of all traffic control devices including streetlights, crosswalks, signals, signs, striping, etc; maintenance of traffic-related records including accident reports and signage/crosswalk inventories; preparation and documentation of city traffic standards; traffic counts and investigations and community education.

Provide traffic counts and investigations, community education, and management of the City's Neighborhood Traffic Safety Program (NTSP). Design traffic calming solutions that enhance the quality of life for Shoreline residents. Provide funding for special emphasis police traffic enforcement.

### CRITICAL SUCCESS FACTOR:

Healthy, Vibrant Neighborhoods


Measurement: EFFECTIVENESS	2003	2004	2005	TARGET
Percentage of citizens surveyed who are very satisfied or somewhat satisfied with the flow of traffic and congestion.		41%	41%	N/A
Percentage of services requests completed on time.	92%	90%	95%	100%

Measurement: WORKLOAD	2003	2004	2005	TARGET
Number of active residential areas involved in the NTSP Program	42	45	45	45
Number of residential area traffic projects completed per year	2	7	25	30
Number of service requests received	75	104	136	N/A
Number of targeted law enforcement hours in a NTSP residential area.		946	950	950
Number of traffic counts completed each year	182	382	350	350
Number of work orders issued	157	350	360	N/A


2005 Budget	Budget
Program Expenditures	\$588,273
Program Revenue	\$0
General Support	\$588,273

2006 Budget	Budget
Program Expenditures	\$452,506
Program Revenue	\$0
General Support	\$452,506

Program Revenue vs General Support



Program Revenue vs General Support



# ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT: BUSINESS ATTRACTION AND RETENTION

## PROGRAM PURPOSE:

To bring together public and private resources necessary to enhance the existing business environment in Shoreline and ensure the long-term viability of the City's economic base.

## CRITICAL SUCCESS FACTOR:


Economic Vitality and Financial Stability

Measurement: EFFECTIVENESS	2003	2004	2005	TARGET
Percentage of City assessed valuation that is classified commercial	9.5%	9.2%	9.1%	N/A
Sales Tax Per Capita	\$103.68	\$109.28	\$108.07	N/A


2005 Budget	
Program Expenditures	\$168,581
Program Revenue	\$0
General Support	<u>\$168,581</u>

2006 Budget	
Program Expenditures	\$274,150
Program Revenue	\$95,000
General Support	<u>\$179,150</u>

Program Revenue vs General Support



Program Revenue vs General Support



## FINANCIAL PLANNING AND ACCOUNTING SERVICES

### PROGRAM PURPOSE:

This program provides financial analysis, financial reporting, accounting services, and financial planning to support City departments making fiscal and organizational decisions resulting in the optimization of city resources.

### CRITICAL SUCCESS FACTOR:

Economic Vitality and Financial Stability

Measurement: EFFECTIVENESS	2003	2004	2005	TARGET
Actual revenue collections compared to projected revenues.	96.9%	101%		95-105%
Basis points in which investment returns exceed the City's benchmark	4	9	75	50
Percentage of customers rating the Budget Division services as good or excellent		100%	100%	95%
Percentage of customers rating the Finance Department services as good or excellent		98.7%	98.7%	95%
Percentage of customers rating the Financial Operations Division services as good or excellent		97.8%	97.8%	95%
Percentage of time month-end close process completed within 10 working days of the end of the month	92%	58%	50%	92%

Measurement: EFFICIENCY	2003	2004	2005	TARGET
Financial planning and accounting services as a % of the City's operating budget.	2.7%	2.5%	2.6%	N/A
Number of accounts payable checks processed per dedicated FTES.	4098	4088	4,000	4,000
Number of payroll checks processed per dedicated FTES.	5133	5731	5975	5500


### 2005 Budget

Program Expenditures	\$711,004
Program Revenue	\$1,800
General Support	\$709,204


### 2006 Budget

Program Expenditures	\$730,017
Program Revenue	\$1,800
General Support	\$728,217

Program Revenue vs General Support



Program Revenue vs General Support





## 24 HOUR CUSTOMER RESPONSE TEAM

### PROGRAM PURPOSE:

Responds to internal and external inquiries, concerns, suggestions and complaints and provide reliable resolution and follow up to guarantee customer satisfaction. Provide telephone and in-person problem resolution and follow-up.

### CRITICAL SUCCESS FACTOR:

Quality Services and Facilities

<b>Measurement: EFFECTIVENESS</b>	2003	2004	2005	TARGET
Percentage of customer requests responded to within 24 hours	100%	97%	95%	95%
Percentage of customers giving CRT services a good or excellent rating	98%	94%	98%	95%
Percentage of requests inspected within 5 days.	98%	97%	99%	95%

<b>Measurement: EFFICIENCY</b>	2003	2004	2005	TARGET
Average Cost per Service Request	N/A	N/A	\$69	N/A
Average Number of Service Requests per FTE	840	867	854	N/A


<b>Measurement: WORKLOAD</b>	2003	2004	2005	TARGET
Number of customer requests for service	2,982	3,079	4,272	3,000
Number of Service Requests for Litter/Garbage.			209	N/A
Number of Service Requests for Parking/Abandoned Vehicles.			1,626	NA
Number of Service Requests for Signs.			328	N/A
Number of Service Requests for Vegetation.			228	N/A
Number of Service Requests for Zoning Code Violations.			321	N/A

## 24 HOUR CUSTOMER RESPONSE TEAM


	2005 Budget
Program Expenditures	\$295,566
Program Revenue	\$0
General Support	\$295,566

	2006 Budget
Program Expenditures	\$137,410
Program Revenue	\$0
General Support	\$137,410

**Program Revenue vs General Support**



**Program Revenue vs General Support**



## BUILDING AND INSPECTIONS TEAM

### PROGRAM PURPOSE:

The Building & Inspections Team perform reviews and make decisions on more complex building permits; to provide comprehensive inspections and approval of conditions for all permitted work; and to provide enforcement and education of the adopted codes and ordinances.

### CRITICAL SUCCESS FACTOR:

Quality Services and Facilities

<b>Measurement: EFFECTIVENESS</b>	2003	2004	2005	TARGET
Percent of customers who rated services as good or excellent.			93%	95%
Percent of customers who said they were treated courteously by employees.			98%	100%
Percent of customers who were satisfied with the clarity of inspection correction forms.			91%	93%
Percent of customers who were satisfied with the timeliness of building inspections.			94%	96%
Percent of customers who were satisfied with the updates they received regarding their project's status.			94%	96%
Percent of customers who were satisfied with the usefulness of the pre-application process.			87%	89%
Percentage of building permits issued on or before the target dates identified in SMC 20.30.040 (data includes days waiting for information)	93.8%	92.3%	N/A	

<b>Measurement: EFFICIENCY</b>	2003	2004	2005	TARGET
Average number of Inspections Completed Per Inspector per day		8	8	8
Average number of plan checks completed per plans examiner annually			N/A	


<b>Measurement: WORKLOAD</b>	2003	2004	2005	TARGET
Number of Addition/Remodel Commercial Permits submitted	66	55	72	75
Number of Demolition Permits submitted	34	36	55	42
Number of Fire Systems Permits submitted	271	105	119	119
Number of inspections completed annually	4,014	3,969	4,049	4,149
Number of Mechanical Permits submitted	200	208	237	215
Number of Miscellaneous Structures - Complex Permits submitted (retaining walls/rockeries, wireless facilities)	18	14	12	15
Number of New Construction Commercial Permits submitted	23	15	23	25
Number of Plumbing Permits submitted		227	270	250

## BUILDING AND INSPECTIONS TEAM


2005	Budget
Program Expenditures	\$584,711
Program Revenue	\$559,050
General Support	\$25,661

2006	Budget
Program Expenditures	\$625,714
Program Revenue	\$611,985
General Support	\$13,729

**Program Revenue vs General Support**



**Program Revenue vs General Support**



## GEOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION SYSTEMS

**PROGRAM PURPOSE:**

Geographical Information Systems manages enterprise wide data so that it is readily available to City departments to support their decision-making and planning processes.

**CRITICAL SUCCESS FACTOR:**

Quality Services and Facilities

Measurement: EFFICIENCY	2003	2004	2005	TARGET
Number of Service Requests completed per FTE	N/A	154	126	N/A

Measurement: WORKLOAD	2003	2004	2005	TARGET
Number of Service Requests	N/A	154	126	N/A


**2005 Budget**

Program Expenditures	\$206,476
Program Revenue	\$0
General Support	\$206,476


**2006 Budget**

Program Expenditures	\$183,242
Program Revenue	\$0
General Support	\$183,242

**Program Revenue vs General Support**



**Program Revenue vs General Support**



## INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY OPERATIONS AND SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

**PROGRAM PURPOSE:**

IT Operations and Security Administration provides technology infrastructure that supports the daily operations of City departments in achieving their goals and objectives.

**CRITICAL SUCCESS FACTOR:**

Quality Services and Facilities

Measurement: <b>EFFECTIVENESS</b>	2003	2004	2005	TARGET
Help Desk calls resolved within 8 hours			63%	65%
Percentage of customers rating the Information Technology Division services as good or excellent	92%	93%	93%	95%
Percentage of help desk calls resolved and/or repaired within 24 hours	93%	92%	97%	95%
Percentage of Help Desk calls resolved at time of call			32%	33%
Percentage of Help Desk calls resolved within 4 hours			54%	55%
Percentage of telephone system problems resolved within 24 hours			73%	70%

Measurement: <b>EFFICIENCY</b>	2003	2004	2005	TARGET
Central information technology operating maintenance and capital expenditures per workstation.	7551	6383	6065	N/A
Central IT operating & maintenance expenditures per workstation (excluding telephone service)	4463	4061	3044	N/A
Information technology operating and maintenance expenditures as a percentage of the City's operating budget	3.8%	3.5%	3.6%	N/A
Number of workstations per Central IT FTE		36.42	36.42	33


**2005 Budget**

Program Expenditures	<b>\$788,998</b>
Program Revenue	<b>\$0</b>
General Support	<b>\$788,998</b>


**2006 Budget**

Program Expenditures	<b>\$808,830</b>
Program Revenue	<b>\$0</b>
General Support	<b>\$808,830</b>

**Program Revenue vs General Support**



**Program Revenue vs General Support**



## LEGAL SERVICES

**PROGRAM PURPOSE:**

The City Attorney provides accurate and timely legal advice to the Council, City departments and advisory boards and commissions to improve effectiveness and minimize risk of City operations

**CRITICAL SUCCESS FACTOR:**

Quality Services and Facilities

<b>Measurement: EFFECTIVENESS</b>	2003	2004	2005	TARGET
Percentage of customers rating timeliness of legal services as good or excellent	N/A	79.2%	79.2%	N/A
Percentage of internal customers rating legal Services overall as good or excellent	N/A	94.5%	94.5%	N/A

<b>Measurement: EFFICIENCY</b>	2003	2004	2005	TARGET
Program budget as a percent of the City's operating budget	1.0%	1.1%	1.2%	N/A


**2005 Budget**

Program Expenditures	<b>\$329,867</b>
Program Revenue	<b>\$0</b>
General Support	<b>\$329,867</b>


**2006 Budget**

Program Expenditures	<b>\$362,549</b>
Program Revenue	<b>\$0</b>
General Support	<b>\$362,549</b>

**Program Revenue vs General Support**



**Program Revenue vs General Support**



## PARK AND OPEN SPACE MAINTENANCE PROGRAM

### PROGRAM PURPOSE:

Provide stewardship for the City's parks and open space system, including the preservation of important natural areas, the enhancement of quality parks, and to create safe recreational and educational opportunities for the well-being and enjoyment of the public.

### CRITICAL SUCCESS FACTOR:

Quality Services and Facilities

Measurement: EFFECTIVENESS	2003	2004	2005	TARGET
Percentage of citizens that rate the condition of the City park as good or excellent	87%	87%	87%	95%

Measurement: EFFICIENCY	2003	2004	2005	TARGET
Average Annual cost per acre of park property maintained	\$2,550	\$2,840	\$4,300	N/A

Measurement: WORKLOAD	2003	2004	2005	TARGET
Number of acres of park and open space maintained	350	353	353	366


### 2005 Budget

Program Expenditures	\$1,079,996
Program Revenue	\$9,882
General Support	\$1,070,114


### 2006 Budget

Program Expenditures	\$1,089,283
Program Revenue	\$7,618
General Support	\$1,081,666

Program Revenue vs General Support



Program Revenue vs General Support





## PARKS CULTURAL SERVICES PROGRAMS

### PROGRAM PURPOSE:

The Parks Cultural Services Program provides a variety of community services and events: Celebrate Shoreline, Summer Lunchtime Music Series, Swingin' Summer Eve, Hamlin Haunt, Fall Library programs, and financial contributions to the Arts Council and Shoreline Museum.

### CRITICAL SUCCESS FACTOR:

Quality Services and Facilities

<b>Measurement: EFFICIENCY</b>	2003	2004	2005	TARGET
Shoreline Historical Museum contribution per capita	\$1.02	\$1.17	\$1.18	N/A
Shoreline/Lake Forest Park Arts Council contribution per capita	\$1.19	\$1.17	\$1.18	N/A

<b>Measurement: OTHER</b>	2003	2004	2005	TARGET
Amount of sponsorship dollars for Celebrate Shoreline		\$6,200	\$6,350	\$6,350
Total Cost for Swingin' Summer Eve Events		\$400	\$400	\$400
Total Cost of Fall Library Program		\$1,200	\$1,200	\$1,200
Total Cost of Hamlin Haunt		\$800	\$800	\$800
Total Cost of Summer Lunchtime Events		\$3,000	\$3,000	\$3,000


<b>Measurement: WORKLOAD</b>	2003	2004	2005	TARGET
Fall library program participants	105	145	150	150
Hamlin Haunt attendance	800	800	1,000	1,000
Number of Events Held During Celebrate Shoreline, Teen Event, Parade, Festival and Sand Castle Contest			4	4
Number of fall library programs	6	6	6	6
Number of Sponsors of Celebrate Shoreline Events		20	18	18
Number of summer lunchtime events	5	6	6	6
Summer lunchtime event attendance	2,500	2,000	2,000	2,000
Swingin' Summer Eve attendance	800	1,000	1,000	1,000

## PARKS CULTURAL SERVICES PROGRAMS


	<b>2005 Budget</b>
Program Expenditures	\$234,805
Program Revenue	\$8,745
General Support	\$226,060

	<b>2006 Budget</b>
Program Expenditures	\$219,319
Program Revenue	\$15,000
General Support	\$204,319

**Program Revenue vs General Support**



**Program Revenue vs General Support**



## PERMIT SERVICES TEAM

### PROGRAM PURPOSE:

The Permit Services Team provides accurate information and referral services; intake and issuance of all building and land use related permits; including expedited review for less complex projects.

### CRITICAL SUCCESS FACTOR:

Quality Services and Facilities

<b>Measurement: EFFECTIVENESS</b>	2003	2004	2005	TARGET
Percent of customers who rated services as good or excellent			93%	95%
Percent of customers who said they were treated courteously by employees			98%	100%
Percent of customers who were satisfied with the updates they received regarding their project's status			94%	96%
Percent of customers who were satisfied with the usefulness of the pre-application process			87%	89%
Percentage of permits issued on or before the target dates identified in SMC 20.30.040 (data includes days waiting for information)	95.4%	94.4%	N/A	

<b>Measurement: EFFICIENCY</b>	2003	2004	2005	TARGET
Average number of permit applications submitted per Technical Assistant		517	577	577
Average number of permits issued per Technical Assistant		501	528	528


<b>Measurement: WORKLOAD</b>	2003	2004	2005	TARGET
Number of Accessory Dwelling Units (ADU) or Adult Family Home Applications submitted	14	21	9	10
Number of Addition/Remodel Single-family Residential Permits submitted	211	189	190	200
Number of Home Occupation, B&B, or Boarding House Permits submitted	8	5	2	2
Number of New Construction Single-family Residential Permits submitted	49	71	75	80
Number of Sign and Miscellaneous Structure Permits submitted	45	37	45	45
Number of walk-in customers served		N/A	10,400	10,400
Number Right-of-Way Permits submitted	530	469	463	480
Total Number of Applications submitted		1,551	1,730	1,950

## PERMIT SERVICES TEAM


2005	Budget
Program Expenditures	\$522,098
Program Revenue	\$277,950
General Support	\$244,148

2006	Budget
Program Expenditures	\$615,641
Program Revenue	\$291,650
General Support	\$323,991

**Program Revenue vs General Support**



**Program Revenue vs General Support**



## PLANNING - LONG RANGE TEAM

### PROGRAM PURPOSE:

The Planning - Long Range Team provide opportunities for public input and develop staff reports and recommendations for all quasi-judicial and legislative permits and proposals

### CRITICAL SUCCESS FACTOR:

Quality Services and Facilities

<b>Measurement: EFFECTIVENESS</b>	2003	2004	2005	TARGET
Percent of customers who rated services as good or excellent.			93%	95%
Percent of customers who said they were treated courteously by employees.			98%	100%
Percent of customers who were satisfied with the updates they received regarding their project's status.			94%	96%
Percent of customers who were satisfied with the usefulness of the pre-application process.			87%	89%
Percentage of permits issued on or before target dates identified in SMC 20.30.060 (data includes days waiting for information)	100%	88.9%	N/A	


<b>Measurement: WORKLOAD</b>	2003	2004	2005	TARGET
Number of Comprehensive Plan amendments processed annually	1	0	621	1
Number of Development Code amendments processed annually	6	27	24	19
Number of Planning Commission meetings staffed	19	23	25	25
Number of Preliminary Subdivisions submitted	1	2	0	1
Number of public disclosure requests processed		N/A	57	50
Number of Rezones submitted	1	3	0	1
Number of Special Use Permits (SUP) submitted	2	2	0	1

## PLANNING - LONG RANGE TEAM


2005	Budget
Program Expenditures	\$374,611
Program Revenue	\$50,000
General Support	\$324,611

2006	Budget
Program Expenditures	\$272,219
Program Revenue	\$49,250
General Support	\$222,969

**Program Revenue vs General Support**



**Program Revenue vs General Support**



## PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT OPERATIONS SUPPORT TEAM

### PROGRAM PURPOSE:

The Planning & Development Support Team provides support to enhance the Planning & Development Services Department's operations and systems through administrative and technical support, technology enhancements; managing fiscal and human resources, and implementation of a performance measurement system.

### CRITICAL SUCCESS FACTOR:

Quality Services and Facilities

Measurement: EFFECTIVENESS	2003	2004	2005	TARGET
Percent of customers who rated services as good or excellent.			93%	95%
Percent of customers who said they were treated courteously by employees.			98%	100%

Measurement: EFFICIENCY	2003	2004	2005	TARGET
Operations Support Team budget as a percent of the Planning and Development Services budget.	N/A	N/A	11.5%	N/A

Measurement: WORKLOAD	2003	2004	2005	TARGET
Number of archival requests retrieved annually		N/A	275	N/A


### 2005 Budget

Program Expenditures	\$275,518
Program Revenue	\$0
General Support	\$275,518


### 2006 Budget

Program Expenditures	\$235,590
Program Revenue	\$0
General Support	\$235,590

Program Revenue vs General Support



Program Revenue vs General Support



# POLICE ADMINISTRATION

**PROGRAM PURPOSE:**

Administration establishes policy and priorities in order to deliver police services in Shoreline based upon Council direction and community input

**CRITICAL SUCCESS FACTOR:**

Quality Services and Facilities

<b>Measurement:</b> EFFECTIVENESS	2003	2004	2005	TARGET
Percentage of surveyed citizens who indicated that Police were customer service oriented	70%	61%		N/A

<b>Measurement:</b> EFFICIENCY	2003	2004	2005	TARGET
Civilian FTEs per 1,000 population	.02	.04	.04	N/A
Police Department operating and maintenance expenditures per capita	\$125.82	\$138.57	\$147.36	N/A
Sworn FTEs per 1,000 population	.089	0.87	0.90	N/A

**2005 Budget**

Program Expenditures	<b>\$620,997</b>
Program Revenue	<b>\$0</b>
General Support	<b>\$620,997</b>


**2006 Budget**

Program Expenditures	<b>\$776,360</b>
Program Revenue	<b>\$0</b>
General Support	<b>\$776,360</b>

**Program Revenue vs General Support**



**Program Revenue vs General Support**





## POLICE TRAFFIC ENFORCEMENT

### PROGRAM PURPOSE:

The Traffic Unit provides motorist education and enforces traffic laws, with the City of Shoreline in order to keep motorists and citizens safe.

### CRITICAL SUCCESS FACTOR:

Quality Services and Facilities

Measurement: EFFECTIVENESS	2003	2004	2005	TARGET
Percentage of citizens who are satisfied or very satisfied with the enforcement of local traffic laws.		64%		N/A
Percentage of surveyed citizens who indicated they were concerned or very concerned about speeding traffic	49.5%	66.0%		N/A

Measurement: EFFICIENCY	2003	2004	2005	TARGET
Average number of traffic citations issued per FTE		105		N/A
Traffic accidents investigations per FTE		19		N/A


  

Measurement: WORKLOAD	2003	2004	2005	TARGET
Number of citizen traffic complaints referred to Police Department	57	292		N/A
Number of collisions	607	614		N/A
Number of traffic accident investigations	843	1346		N/A
Number of Traffic Citations & Notices of Infractions	7,719	4847		N/A


2005 Budget	
Program Expenditures	\$502,967
Program Revenue	\$105,160
General Support	\$397,807

2006 Budget	
Program Expenditures	\$539,535
Program Revenue	\$31,660
General Support	\$507,875

**Program Revenue vs General Support**



**Program Revenue vs General Support**



## PUBLIC FACILITY & VEHICLE MAINTENANCE & OPERATIONS

### PROGRAM PURPOSE:

The Facilities Program manages and maintains the City's owned and leased buildings and vehicles keeping them in good working order to provide services to citizens and to promote good stewardship of City of Shoreline's assets

### CRITICAL SUCCESS FACTOR:

Quality Services and Facilities

Measurement: EFFECTIVENESS	2003	2004	2005	TARGET
Percentage of internal customers satisfied or very satisfied with the quality of fleet maintenance services				

Measurement: EFFICIENCY	2003	2004	2005	TARGET
Cost per square foot to maintain	\$8.47	\$10.21	\$5.33	N/A
Fleet maintenance cost per mile - vehicles and light trucks	\$0.27	N/A	\$1.07	N/A
Fleet maintenance cost per mile -heavy-duty trucks and equipment	\$0.49	N/A	\$1.65	N/A
Number of square feet maintained (facilities) per FTE	37,370	32,370	47,953	47,953


### 2005 Budget

Program Expenditures	<b>\$1,126,062</b>
Program Revenue	<b>\$72,074</b>
General Support	<b>\$1,053,988</b>


### 2006 Budget

Program Expenditures	<b>\$1,141,726</b>
Program Revenue	<b>\$88,717</b>
General Support	<b>\$1,053,009</b>

Program Revenue vs General Support



Program Revenue vs General Support



# PUBLIC RECORDS & CITY COUNCIL MEETING MANAGEMENT

## PROGRAM PURPOSE:

The City Clerk's Office oversees the legal and efficient operation of City Council meetings and Hearing Examiner appeal hearings and manages the availability, protection and retention of City records to facilitate the democratic process for the citizens of Shoreline.

## CRITICAL SUCCESS FACTOR:

Quality Services and Facilities

Measurement: <b>EFFECTIVENESS</b>	2003	2004	2005	TARGET
Percentage of City Council packets available to the public on the City website the day after receipt by City Councilmembers		97%	97%	100%
Percentage of external customers who rate the City Clerk's public disclosure process as very good or excellent		94%	95%	100%
Percentage of internal customers rating the City Clerk's Office services very good or excellent		99%	99%	100%

Measurement: <b>WORKLOAD</b>	2003	2004	2005	TARGET
Number of boxes of records accessioned into the Records Center		290	200	200
Number of City Council packets and sets of minutes produced		37	42	42
Number of contracts and property records, agreements processed, recorded, and/or filed		500	400	400
Number of items uploaded to the web site or network		946	1,300	1,200
Number of pages of public records provided		13,773	7,500	7,000
Number of public records requests processed		192	165	150
Number of specialty business licenses issued		202	193	200


### 2005 Budget

Program Expenditures	<b>\$354,482</b>
Program Revenue	<b>\$26,030</b>
General Support	<b>\$328,452</b>


### 2006 Budget

Program Expenditures	<b>\$379,841</b>
Program Revenue	<b>\$26,050</b>
General Support	<b>\$353,791</b>

Program Revenue vs General Support



Program Revenue vs General Support



# PUBLIC WORKS ADMINISTRATION

**PROGRAM PURPOSE:**

Public Works Administration provides the department with overall management, leadership, grants and contract administration, process and policy development.

**CRITICAL SUCCESS FACTOR:**

Quality Services and Facilities

Measurement: EFFICIENCY	2003	2004	2005	TARGET
Public Works Administration as a percent of the total Public Works Budget	3.0%	3.0%	4.0%	<5.0%

Measurement: WORKLOAD	2003	2004	2005	TARGET
Number of grant reimbursements processed	15	23	23	N/A
Number of vendor invoices processed	4,402	5,322	3,500	N/A
Total number of contracts processed		134	130	N/A
Total number of easements processed		157	40	N/A
Total number of interlocals processed		3	3	N/A


**2005 Budget**

Program Expenditures	\$274,161
Program Revenue	\$0
General Support	\$274,161


**2006 Budget**

Program Expenditures	\$269,026
Program Revenue	\$0
General Support	\$269,026

**Program Revenue vs General Support**



**Program Revenue vs General Support**



## PURCHASING SERVICES

### PROGRAM PURPOSE:

Purchasing provides City departments with knowledge and resources to obtain goods and services for the best value, while complying with applicable Federal, State, and City procurement regulations

### CRITICAL SUCCESS FACTOR:

Quality Services and Facilities

Measurement: EFFECTIVENESS	2003	2004	2005	TARGET
Number of protests filed per \$25 million purchased	0	0	1	0
Percentage of awards and solicitations made without protest	100%	100%	97%	100%
Percentage of customers rating the Purchasing Division services as good or excellent	91%	89%	89%	95%
Percentage of internal customers rating the Purchasing Division timeliness of services as good or excellent		89%	89%	95%

Measurement: EFFICIENCY	2003	2004	2005	TARGET
Dollar Amount of Central Purchasing Office Purchases per Central Purchasing Office FTE		\$9.041 Mill	\$9 Mill.	\$9 Mill.
Number of Purchasing transactions per FTE.	549	456	385	N/A
Percentage of purchasing transactions conducted using procurement and credit cards	1.78%	1.18%	1.69%	2.0%

Measurement: OTHER	2003	2004	2005	TARGET
Number of protests filed and sustained	0	0	0	0


### 2005 Budget

Program Expenditures	\$185,215
Program Revenue	\$0
General Support	\$185,215


### 2006 Budget

Program Expenditures	\$190,085
Program Revenue	\$0
General Support	\$190,085

Program Revenue vs General Support



Program Revenue vs General Support



## RECREATION FACILITY RENTAL PROGRAM

### PROGRAM PURPOSE:

Provide opportunities for Shoreline residents to use recreational facilities and picnic shelters for special events.

### CRITICAL SUCCESS FACTOR:

Quality Services and Facilities

Measurement: WORKLOAD	2003	2004	2005	TARGET
Hours of Baseball/Softball Field Rentals			9,743	N/A
Hours of Football Field Rentals			668	N/A
Hours of Picnic Shelter Rentals			1,348	N/A
Hours of Rentals of Richmond Highlands Recreation Center			475	N/A
Hours of Rentals of Spartan Recreation Center			2,888	N/A
Hours of Soccer Field Rentals			7,251	N/A
Total Hours of facility rentals	7,810	8,093	22,373	N/A


### 2005 Budget

Program Expenditures	\$25,840
Program Revenue	\$41,769
General Support	\$(15,928)


### 2006 Budget

Program Expenditures	\$27,567
Program Revenue	\$53,369
General Support	\$(25,802)

Program Revenue vs General Support



Program Revenue vs General Support



## CITY COUNCIL

### PROGRAM PURPOSE:

The City Council is a representative body, comprised of seven citizens elected by the community to provide leadership to the organization and community. The Council seeks to maintain a healthy, vibrant and attractive place to live and work by adopting policies that create and support the values and vision of our community.

### CRITICAL SUCCESS FACTOR:

Innovative Leadership and Strategic Planning

Measurement: <b>EFFECTIVENESS</b>	2003	2004	2005	TARGET
Percentage of residents that are satisfied with the overall quality of leadership provided by the City's elected officials	N/A	47%	47%	N/A
Percentage of residents who believe the City is moving in the right direction	N/A	58%	58%	N/A
Percentage of residents who rate the quality of life in Shoreline as the same or better than other cities	N/A	69%	69%	N/A


### 2005 Budget

Program Expenditures	\$162,969
Program Revenue	\$0
General Support	\$162,969


### 2006 Budget

Program Expenditures	\$167,738
Program Revenue	\$0
General Support	\$167,738

**Program Revenue vs General Support**



**Program Revenue vs General Support**



## CURRENT PLANNING TEAM

### PROGRAM PURPOSE:

The Current Planning Team performs reviews and make decisions on administrative land use actions.

### CRITICAL SUCCESS FACTOR:

Innovative Leadership and Strategic Planning

<b>Measurement: EFFECTIVENESS</b>	2003	2004	2005	TARGET
Percent of customers who rated services as good or excellent.			93%	95%
Percent of customers who said they were treated courteously by employees.			98%	100%
Percent of customers who were satisfied with the updates they received regarding their project's status.			94%	96%
Percent of customers who were satisfied with the usefulness of the pre-application process.			87%	89%
Percentage of permits issued on or before target dates identified in SMC 20.30.040 and SMC 20.30.050 (data includes days waiting for information)	67%	76%	N/A	

<b>Measurement: WORKLOAD</b>	2003	2004	2005	TARGET
Number of Building Permits that require SEPA submitted (new commercial exceeding 4,000 square feet)	6	4	7	7
Number of Clearing & Grading Permits submitted	15	20	20	20
Number of Conditional Use Permits submitted	3	3	1	1
Number of Development Code interpretations submitted	17	13	11	11
Number of Final Short Plats submitted	10	10	15	18
Number of Lot Line Adjustments submitted	15	9	12	12
Number of Preliminary Short Plats submitted	11	17	23	25
Number of SEPA Threshold Determinations	13	10	13	13
Number of Site Development/Construction Permits submitted	5	14	13	16
Number of Temporary Use Permits submitted	3	2	3	3
Number of Variance from Engineering Standards submitted	6	1	1	1
Number of Zoning Variances submitted	2	2	2	2




## CURRENT PLANNING TEAM


	2005 Budget
Program Expenditures	\$399,382
Program Revenue	\$190,000
General Support	\$209,382

	2006 Budget
Program Expenditures	\$369,893
Program Revenue	\$190,750
General Support	\$179,143

**Program Revenue vs General Support**



**Program Revenue vs General Support**



## GRANT RESEARCH & DEVELOPMENT

**PROGRAM PURPOSE:**

The Grant Development program coordinates and supports all City Departmental grant seeking efforts designed to increase resources available for General Fund and Capital Improvement Program Budgets

**CRITICAL SUCCESS FACTOR:**

Innovative Leadership and Strategic Planning

Measurement: EFFECTIVENESS	2003	2004	2005	TARGET
Percentage of customers rating the Grant Development services as good or excellent		100%	100%	100%
Percentage of grant applications successfully awarded	75%	64%	60%	68%


**2005 Budget**

Program Expenditures	<b>\$16,942</b>
Program Revenue	<b>\$0</b>
General Support	<b>\$16,942</b>


**2006 Budget**

Program Expenditures	<b>\$17,378</b>
Program Revenue	<b>\$0</b>
General Support	<b>\$17,378</b>

**Program Revenue vs General Support**



**Program Revenue vs General Support**



# INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY STRATEGIC PLAN IMPLEMENTATION

## PROGRAM PURPOSE:

Information Technology Strategic Plan Implementation provides needs assessment, justification, alternatives analysis, oversight, project management, and on-site consultation advisory services to City departments/staff to successfully deliver projects in the City's IT Strategic Plan, aimed at enhancing service levels and streamlining business processes through the utilization of technology.

## CRITICAL SUCCESS FACTOR:

Innovative Leadership and Strategic Planning

Measurement: EFFICIENCY	2003	2004	2005	TARGET
Information Technology Strategic Plan expenditures as a percentage of the City's operating budget	1.39%	2.3%	1.8%	N/A

Measurement: OTHER	2003	2004	2005	TARGET
Total capital expenditures for IT activities and equipment	\$586,802	\$441,210	\$479,039	N/A


### 2005 Budget

Program Expenditures	\$506,484
Program Revenue	\$0
General Support	\$506,484


### 2006 Budget

Program Expenditures	\$326,678
Program Revenue	\$0
General Support	\$326,678

**Program Revenue vs General Support**



**Program Revenue vs General Support**



## ORGANIZATION STRATEGIC PLANNING AND COUNCIL POLICY SUPPORT & IMPLEMENTATION

### PROGRAM PURPOSE:

The City Manager's Office is accountable to the City Council for operational and financial results and organizational leadership.

### CRITICAL SUCCESS FACTOR:

Innovative Leadership and Strategic Planning

<b>Measurement: EFFECTIVENESS</b>	2003	2004	2005	TARGET
Percentage of citizens that rate the quality of services provided by the City of Shoreline as better or about the same as compared to other cities in the state	N/A	69%	69%	75%
Percentage of citizens that rate the value of services received for their city taxes paid as Average, Good or Excellent.	N/A	75%	75%	80%
Percentage of Employees who Have a Clear Understanding of City's Mission, Goals, and Organizational Values	90%	90%	94%	95%
Percentage of employees who rate the City of Shoreline as "one of the best" or "above average" as an organization to work for compared with other organizations	64%	64%	73%	75%
Percentage of residents who are neutral, satisfied or very satisfied with the effectiveness of the City Manager and appointed staff	N/A	49%	49%	50%
Percentage of residents who rate City employees as excellent or good providers of customer service	N/A	53%	53%	65%


<b>Measurement: EFFICIENCY</b>	2003	2004	2005	TARGET
City operating reserves as a percentage of operating revenues	43%	49.4%	36.7%	25%
Number of regular City employees per 1,000 population	2.5	2.6	2.6	2.6
Operating expenditures per capita (real dollars)	469	467	506	N/A
Program budget as a percent of the City's operating budget	2.5%	2.5%	2.5%	2.5%
Support service costs as a percentage of the City's general fund	15.6%	15.2%	13.7%	15%

## ORGANIZATION STRATEGIC PLANNING AND COUNCIL POLICY SUPPORT & IMPLEMENTATION


	2005 Budget
Program Expenditures	\$709,279
Program Revenue	\$0
General Support	\$709,279

	2006 Budget
Program Expenditures	\$728,545
Program Revenue	\$0
General Support	\$728,545

**Program Revenue vs General Support**



**Program Revenue vs General Support**



## EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT PLANNING

### PROGRAM PURPOSE:

The purpose of emergency preparedness in the City of Shoreline is to provide an emergency management organization and resources to minimize the loss of life; protect property and natural resources; and restore the proper operations of the City in the event of a major disaster.

### CRITICAL SUCCESS FACTOR:

Community Alliances and Partnerships

Measurement: WORKLOAD	2003	2004	2005	TARGET
Number of Community Emergency Response volunteers trained	56	31	50	50


### 2005 Budget

Program Expenditures	\$178,512
Program Revenue	\$81,986
General Support	\$96,526


### 2006 Budget

Program Expenditures	\$113,474
Program Revenue	\$0
General Support	\$113,474

Program Revenue vs General Support



Program Revenue vs General Support



## HUMAN SERVICES: SUPPORT FOR SOCIAL AGENCIES

### PROGRAM PURPOSE:

Human Services fosters the development of an effective and accessible system of human services to meet the needs of Shoreline residents.

### CRITICAL SUCCESS FACTOR:

Community Alliances and Partnerships

<b>Measurement: EFFECTIVENESS</b>	2003	2004	2005	TARGET
Percent of Shoreline residents served in "A Safe Haven From All Forms of Violence and Abuse" service area.	0.2%	0.2%	0.3%	0.2%
Percent of Shoreline residents served in "Educational and Job Skills" service area.	N/A	N/A	0.8%	0.2%
Percent of Shoreline residents served in "Food to Eat and a Roof Overhead" service area.	14.6%	15.3%	13.6%	8.6%
Percent of Shoreline residents served in "Health Care" service area.	N/A	N/A	0.5%	.03%
Percent of Shoreline residents served in "Supportive Relationships" service area.	16.0%	15.2%	14.8%	3.1%
Percentage of service goals met by human service contractors	77%	85%	84%	80%

<b>Measurement: EFFICIENCY</b>	2003	2004	2005	TARGET
Program cost per capita	\$8.60	\$8.60	\$11.43	\$10.80
Program expenditures as a percentage of City's operating budget	1.8%	1.8%	2.3%	2.1%


<b>Measurement: WORKLOAD</b>	2003	2004	2005	TARGET
Number of citizens receiving emergency food and shelter	2,707	1,974	2,116	2,403
Number of major home repair projects completed	16	21	16	14
Number of older adults receiving congregate meals and home delivered meals	365	413	350	342
Number of Shoreline Residents served in "A Safe Haven from all Forms of Violence and Abuse" service area.	104	127	170	105
Number of Shoreline Residents served in "Educational and Job Skills" service area.	N/A	N/A	416	116
Number of Shoreline Residents served in "Food to Eat and a Roof Overhead" service area.	7,678	8,092	7,146	9,068
Number of Shoreline Residents served in "Health Care" service area.	N/A	N/A	280	16
Number of Shoreline Residents served in "Supportive Relationships" service area.	8453	8038	5610	1610
Number of Shoreline residents served through contracts	16,235	16,257	15,790	12,762

## HUMAN SERVICES: SUPPORT FOR SOCIAL AGENCIES


2005	Budget
Program Expenditures	\$599,980
Program Revenue	\$191,066
General Support	\$408,914

2006	Budget
Program Expenditures	\$567,024
Program Revenue	\$151,859
General Support	\$415,165

**Program Revenue vs General Support**



**Program Revenue vs General Support**





## INTERGOVERNMENTAL PARTICIPATION

**PROGRAM PURPOSE:**

City participation in organizations that provide a forum for city staff and/or council members to address federal, state, and regional issues and that provide financial or legislative support to the City. Includes the following organizations: Seashore Transportation Forum, Suburban Cities, Association of Washington Cities, Economic Development Council of Seattle & King County, National League of Cities, Puget Sound Regional Council, Puget Sound Clean Air Agency, and the Shoreline Chamber of Commerce.

**CRITICAL SUCCESS FACTOR:**

Community Alliances and Partnerships

Measurement: EFFICIENCY	2003	2004	2005	TARGET
Program expenditures as a percentage of the City's total operating budget	0.34%	0.37%	0.36%	N/A


**2005 Budget**

Program Expenditures	\$99,991
Program Revenue	\$0
General Support	\$99,991


**2006 Budget**

Program Expenditures	\$105,380
Program Revenue	\$0
General Support	\$105,380

**Program Revenue vs General Support**



**Program Revenue vs General Support**



## INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS

### PROGRAM PURPOSE:

The Intergovernmental Relations program provides staff support for legislative objectives and intergovernmental alliances and partnerships that further the City's goals and priorities.

### CRITICAL SUCCESS FACTOR:

Community Alliances and Partnerships

Measurement: EFFICIENCY	2003	2004	2005	TARGET
Intergovernmental Relations as a percentage of the City's operating budget	.4%	.4%	.4%	N/A


### 2005 Budget

Program Expenditures	\$102,876
Program Revenue	\$0
General Support	\$102,876


### 2006 Budget

Program Expenditures	\$104,170
Program Revenue	\$0
General Support	\$104,170

Program Revenue vs General Support



Program Revenue vs General Support



# SCHOOL RESOURCE OFFICER PROGRAM

**PROGRAM PURPOSE:**

The School Resource Officer (SRO) program facilitates a safe learning environment for students and staff, SRO's provide security, mentoring, and teach a variety of classes to students and staff in the Shoreline School District and some private schools in Shoreline.

**CRITICAL SUCCESS FACTOR:**

Community Alliances and Partnerships

Measurement: WORKLOAD	2003	2004	2005	TARGET
Number of Anti-Bullying Classes Taught	74	N/A	N/A	----
Number of Classes Taught through the SRO program	171	43	N/A	----
Number of School Resource Officer Hours	935	1,052	N/A	----
Number of students taught	1,815	1,583	N/A	----


**2005 Budget**

Program Expenditures	<b>\$175,583</b>
Program Revenue	<b>\$89,432</b>
General Support	<b>\$86,151</b>


**2006 Budget**

Program Expenditures	<b>\$170,435</b>
Program Revenue	<b>\$91,011</b>
General Support	<b>\$79,424</b>

**Program Revenue vs General Support**



**Program Revenue vs General Support**



## SISTER CITY RELATIONS

**PROGRAM PURPOSE:**

To seek international relationships which will enhance Shoreline citizens' understanding of other cultures, and/or which will allow the City to engage in productive and mutually beneficial exchanges of new technology, techniques, and solutions to problems with cities of comparable development.

**CRITICAL SUCCESS FACTOR:**

Community Alliances and Partnerships

Measurement: WORKLOAD	2003	2004	2005	TARGET
Number of Sister Cities Association meetings and events supported during sister city visit		27		


**2005 Budget**

Program Expenditures	\$7,000
Program Revenue	\$0
General Support	\$7,000


**2006 Budget**

Program Expenditures	\$7,000
Program Revenue	\$0
General Support	\$7,000

**Program Revenue vs General Support**



**Program Revenue vs General Support**



## COMMUNICATIONS

### PROGRAM PURPOSE:

The Communications program develops and uses two-way communication resources to deliver and elicit useful information to and from our residents and other key stakeholders.

### CRITICAL SUCCESS FACTOR:

Effective Community Relations and Communications

Measurement: EFFECTIVENESS	2003	2004	2005	TARGET
Percentage of residents who are satisfied with public involvement in local decision-making		53%	53%	N/A
Percentage of residents who are satisfied with quality of programming on City's Government Access Channel		44%	44%	N/A
Percentage of residents who are satisfied with the quality of the City's newsletter, "Currents"		71%	71%	N/A
Percentage of residents who are satisfied with the quality of the City's web site		47%	47%	N/A

Measurement: OTHER	2003	2004	2005	TARGET
Number of Website visits	166,258	151,618		152,000


### 2005 Budget

Program Expenditures	\$283,358
Program Revenue	\$0
General Support	\$283,358


### 2006 Budget

Program Expenditures	\$289,074
Program Revenue	\$0
General Support	\$289,074

Program Revenue vs General Support



Program Revenue vs General Support



## EMPLOYEE RECRUITMENT, COMPENSATION ADMINISTRATION & ORGANIZATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

### PROGRAM PURPOSE:

This program creates an environment which attracts, retains and develops a professional and committed workforce to support delivery of the highest quality public services to Shoreline residents.

### CRITICAL SUCCESS FACTOR:

Professional and Committed Workforce

<b>Measurement: EFFECTIVENESS</b>	2003	2004	2005	TARGET
Benefits as a percentage of Salaries & Benefits	20.5%	20.7%	21.2%	N/A
Number of sick leave hours used per 1,000 hours worked for non-public safety employees	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Percentage of customers rating Human Resources services as good or excellent	N/A	92%	92%	95%
Percentage of employees who rate the City of Shoreline as one of the best organizations to work for compared to other organizations	64%	64%	73.2%	75%
Percentage of regular staff who terminated employment during the year	7.9%	7.7%	11%	N/A
Salary and Benefits as a Percent of the Operating Budget	27.9%	30%	35.9%	N/A

<b>Measurement: EFFICIENCY</b>	2003	2004	2005	TARGET
Average number of working days for external recruitment	N/A	N/A	58	50
Human resource budget as a percent of the operating budget	1.4%	1.4%	1.4%	N/A
Ratio of human resources FTE's to total benefitted FTE's	1:44.4	1:45.8	1:46.6	N/A


### 2005 Budget

Program Expenditures	<b>\$368,462</b>
Program Revenue	<b>\$0</b>
General Support	<b>\$368,462</b>


### 2006 Budget

Program Expenditures	<b>\$365,041</b>
Program Revenue	<b>\$1,000</b>
General Support	<b>\$364,041</b>

**Program Revenue vs General Support**



**Program Revenue vs General Support**





# City of Shoreline Performance, Results, Outcomes (PRO) Card

**Vision**  
Shoreline! A Great Place to Live, Learn, Work and Play. A Place to Live Your Dream.

**Mission**  
We, the employees of the City of Shoreline, are dedicated to providing exceptional public services in fulfilling the community vision and council goals with integrity and integrity.

## Critical Success Factors



- Safe, secure, attractive neighborhoods
- Park and open space within safe walking distance
- Excellent public utilities and infrastructure

- Sufficient fiscal capacity to fund priority services, facilities, and infrastructure
- Quality investments in commercial areas
- Diversified and balanced economic base

- Services and programs delivered at an excellent value
- Personalized, responsive customer service
- Quality facilities and infrastructure

- Programs aligned with community values and critical success factors
- Problems and issues effectively anticipated and solved
- Work environment that fosters innovation

- Public resources and quality services maximized through alliances and partnerships

- Open, accessible two-way communication with the community
- Responsive government

- Customer/results-driven culture
- Highly Skilled, team-oriented workforce
- Effective organizational leadership

## Strategies

- Enhance safe, friendly streets program (Council Goal No. 3)
- Improve code enforcement program (Council Goal No. 6)
- Develop plan for acquiring/preserving open space and critical areas (Council Goal No. 7)
- Implement Comprehensive Plan, PROS Plan, and Transportation and Surface Water Master Plans

- Develop a long-term financial plan
- Complete the Aurora Corridor Project (Council Goal No. 1)
- Complete the North City Project
- Create public and private partnerships to improve business areas
- Develop an economic development plan (Council Goal No. 4)
- Create joint economic development partnerships

- Complete City Hall Project (Council Goal No. 5)
- Complete the Interurban Trail (Council Goal No. 2)
- Improve processes and seek efficiencies
- Conduct citizen satisfaction surveys
- Work with Bond Advisory Committee to create a priority capital projects list

- Develop PRO Cards by departments/program areas
- Develop a "problem solving" model to improve service delivery

- Coordinate with outside agencies to pursue joint programs and projects
- Promptly address mutual issues and concerns with partners
- Effectively work with boards, commissions, neighborhoods, and volunteers

- Provide timely, accurate information using the City's newsletter, web site, cable channel, events, and through the local media
- Effectively work with the Council of Neighborhoods
- Improve strategies to increase citizen awareness, participation, and involvement

- Align systems and practices with organizational values
- Create competitive compensation and recognition programs
- Implement citywide training program that align with organizational values and needs
- Provide leadership and management training
- Conduct employee satisfaction/customer surveys

- Percent of residents who feel safe in their neighborhood during the day
- Percent of residents who rate the overall quality of life as excellent/good
- Percent of residents who rate their neighborhood condition as excellent/good
- Percent of households located within 1/2 mile of an active recreational facility
- Number of pedestrian pathway linear feet
- Percent of residents very/somewhat satisfied with overall maintenance of streets
- Percent of households that rate the condition of parks as good/excellent
- Traffic accidents per 1,000 population
- Part 1 crimes per 1,000 population

- Percent of residents who rate the value of services received for City taxes as excellent/good
- Percent of residents who think the city manages finances excellent/good
- Sales tax revenue per capita
- Total assessed value per capita
- General obligation debt per capita

- Percent of residents who are very satisfied/satisfied with the overall quality of services
- Percent of residents rating quality of customer service as excellent/good
- Percent of residents who contacted City staff and who believe staff were courteous/polite
- Operating expenditures per capita
- Overall pavement condition rating for City streets (0-100)

- Percent of residents who feel the City is moving in the right direction
- Percent of employees who have a clear understanding of how their job fits with the mission of the City
- Employees per 1,000 population

- Number of neighborhoods/blocks participating in National Night Out Against Crime
- Number of citizen/volunteer hours
- Percent of 6-year CIP funded by state and federal funding

- Percent of residents satisfied with the City's efforts to keep residents informed
- Percent of residents satisfied with the level of public involvement in local decision making
- Percent of residents who feel satisfactory satisfied with the overall image of the City

- Percent of employees who believe customer service is a high priority in our organization
- Percent of employees who rate service of support departments as excellent/good
- Percent of employees who would recommend the City to a friend
- Percent of operating budget spent on professional development and training
- Retention rate
- Percent of employees who believe they have resources/training to do their job

## Performance Measures

**Above all else, our focus is customer service through: Continuous Improvement-Raising the Bar! Professionalism-Making the Difference! Results-Getting it Done!**

## Organizational Values



# City of Shoreline Performance, Results, Outcomes (PRO) Card

## Critical Success Factors



Healthy, Vibrant Neighborhoods

- Safe, secure, attractive neighborhoods
- Park and open space within safe walking distance
- Excellent public utilities and infrastructure



Economic Vitality and Financial Stability

- Sufficient fiscal capacity to fund priority services, facilities, and infrastructure
- Quality investments in commercial areas
- Diversified and balanced economic base



Quality Services and Facilities

- Services and programs delivered at an excellent value
- Personalized, responsive customer service
- Quality facilities and infrastructure

## 84



Innovative Leadership and Strategic Planning

- Programs aligned with community values and critical success factors
- Problems and issues effectively anticipated and solved
- Work environment that fosters innovation



Community Alliances and Partnerships

- Public resources and quality services maximized through alliances and partnerships



Effective Community Relations and Communications

- Open, accessible two-way communication with the community
- Responsive government



Professional and Committed Workforce

- Customer/results-driven culture
- Highly Skilled, team-oriented workforce
- Effective organizational leadership

## Strategies

- Enhance safe, friendly streets program (Council Goal No. 3)
- Improve code enforcement program (Council Goal No. 6)
- Develop plan for acquiring/preserving open space and critical areas (Council Goal No. 7)
- Implement Comprehensive Plan, PROS Plan, and Transportation and Surface Water Master Plans
- Develop a long-term financial plan
- Complete the Aurora Corridor Project (Council Goal No. 1)
- Complete the North City Project
- Create partnerships for marketing/promoting Shoreline, supporting businesses and major projects and for attracting investment
- Develop an economic development plan (Council Goal No. 4)

- Complete City Hall Project (Council Goal No. 5)
- Complete the Interurban Trail (Council Goal No. 2)
- Improve processes and seek efficiencies
- Conduct citizen satisfaction surveys
- Work with Bond Advisory Committee to create a priority capital projects list

- Develop PRO Cards by departments/program areas
- Develop a "problem solving" model to improve service delivery

- Coordinate with outside agencies/partners to pursue joint programs/projects and to address mutual concerns
- Pursue federal and state funding for projects/programs
- Effectively work with boards, commissions, neighborhoods, and volunteers

- Provide timely, accurate information using the City's newsletter, web site, cable channel, events, and through the local media
- Effectively work with the Council of Neighborhoods
- Improve strategies to increase citizen awareness, participation, and involvement

- Align systems and practices with organizational values
- Create competitive compensation and recognition programs
- Implement citywide training program that align with organizational values and needs
- Provide leadership and management training
- Conduct employee satisfaction/customer surveys

## Performance Measures

- Percent of residents who feel safe in their neighborhood during the day<sup>1</sup>
- Percent of residents who rate the overall quality of life as excellent/good<sup>2</sup>
- Percent of residents who rate their neighborhood condition as excellent/good<sup>3</sup>
- Percent of households located within 1/2 mile of an active recreational facility
- Number of pedestrian pathway linear feet
- Percent of residents very/somewhat satisfied with overall maintenance of streets
- Percent of households that rate the condition of parks as good/excellent
- Traffic accidents per 1,000 population
- Part 1 crimes per 1,000 population

- Percent of residents who rate the value of services received for City taxes as excellent/good<sup>3</sup>
- Percent of residents who think the city manages its finances excellent/good<sup>3</sup>
- Sales tax revenue per capita
- Total assessed value per capita
- General obligation debt per capita

- Percent of residents who are very satisfied/satisfied with the overall quality of services<sup>3</sup>
- Percent of residents rating quality of customer service as excellent/good<sup>3</sup>
- Percent of residents who contacted City staff and who believe staff were courteous/polite<sup>3</sup>
- Operating expenditures per capita
- Overall pavement condition rating for City streets (0-100)

- Percent of residents who feel the City is moving in the right direction<sup>3</sup>
- Percent of employees who have a clear understanding of how their job fits with the mission of the City<sup>3</sup>
- Employees per 1,000 population

- Number of neighborhoods/blocks participating in National Night Out Against Crime
- Number of citizen volunteer hours
- Percent of 6-year CIP funded by state and federal funding

- Percent of residents satisfied with the City's efforts to keep residents informed<sup>3</sup>
- Percent of residents satisfied with the level of public involvement in local decision making<sup>3</sup>
- Percent of residents who feel satisfied/very satisfied with the overall image of the City<sup>3</sup>

- Percent of employees who believe customer service is a high priority in our organization<sup>4</sup>
- Percent of employees who rate service of support departments as excellent/good<sup>4</sup>
- Percent of employees who would recommend the City to a friend<sup>4</sup>
- Percent of operating budget spent on professional development and training
- Retention rate
- Percent of employees who believe they have resources/training to do their job<sup>4</sup>

	2004 Actual	2005 Actual/Estimated
Percent of residents who feel safe in their neighborhood during the day <sup>1</sup>	82%	92%
Percent of residents who rate the overall quality of life as excellent/good <sup>2</sup>	82%	82%
Percent of residents who rate their neighborhood condition as excellent/good <sup>3</sup>	60%	60%
Percent of households located within 1/2 mile of an active recreational facility	NA	NA
Number of pedestrian pathway linear feet	442,528	453,873
Percent of residents very/somewhat satisfied with overall maintenance of streets	55%	55%
Percent of households that rate the condition of parks as good/excellent	87%	87%
Traffic accidents per 1,000 population	13.2	12.2
Part 1 crimes per 1,000 population	46	47
Percent of residents who rate the value of services received for City taxes as excellent/good <sup>3</sup>	35%	35%
Percent of residents who think the city manages its finances excellent/good <sup>3</sup>	22%	22%
Sales tax revenue per capita	\$108	\$111
Total assessed value per capita	\$100,311	\$105,407
General obligation debt per capita	\$0	\$0

Percent of residents who are very satisfied/satisfied with the overall quality of services <sup>3</sup>	69%	69%
Percent of residents rating quality of customer service as excellent/good <sup>3</sup>	70%	70%
Percent of residents who contacted City staff and who believe staff were courteous/polite <sup>3</sup>	92%	92%
Operating expenditures per capita	\$468	\$500
Overall pavement condition rating for City streets (0-100)	81	81

Percent of residents who feel the City is moving in the right direction <sup>3</sup>	77%	77%
Percent of employees who have a clear understanding of how their job fits with the mission of the City <sup>3</sup>	86%	86%
Employees per 1,000 population	2.6	2.6

Number of neighborhoods/blocks participating in National Night Out Against Crime	15	16
Number of citizen volunteer hours	10,184	10,185
Percent of 6-year CIP funded by state and federal funding	57%	47%

Percent of residents satisfied with the City's efforts to keep residents informed <sup>3</sup>	66%	66%
Percent of residents satisfied with the level of public involvement in local decision making <sup>3</sup>	53%	53%
Percent of residents who feel satisfied/very satisfied with the overall image of the City <sup>3</sup>	68%	69%

Percent of employees who believe customer service is a high priority in our organization <sup>4</sup>	96%	97%
Percent of employees who rate service of support departments as excellent/good <sup>4</sup>	94%	94%
Percent of employees who would recommend the City to a friend <sup>4</sup>	77%	94%
Percent of operating budget spent on professional development and training	1.0%	1.0%
Retention rate	92.3%	92.0%
Percent of employees who believe they have resources/training to do their job <sup>4</sup>	88%/80%	94%/90%

<sup>1</sup> NA is defined as data is currently not available.

<sup>2</sup> The PRO Card does not capture all of the City's department or program area's goals, strategies and performance measures.

<sup>3</sup> The citizen satisfaction survey is conducted every other year (2002, 2004), and the previous year's results are carried over.


<sup>4</sup> The employee satisfaction survey (2003, 2005) and internal customer survey (2004) is conducted every other year, and the previous year's results are carried over.




# **APPENDIX C**

## **2004 ICMA CPM PERFORMANCE MEASURES**


2004 ICMA Performance Measures  
 Risk Management - Number of Worker Days Lost Per Claim




2004 ICMA Performance Measures  
 Risk Management - Number of Workers' Comp Claims per 100 FTEs




**2004 ICMA Performance Measures**  
**Risk Management - General Liability Claims per 10,000 Population Served**




2004 ICMA Performance Measures  
Risk Management - Expenditures for Liability Claims per Capita




2004 ICMA Performance Measures  
Purchasing - Number of Protest Filed per \$25 Million Purchased



2004 ICMA Performance Measures  
 Police - Citizens' Ratings of Safety in their Neighborhoods after Dark




2004 ICMA Performance Measures  
Police - Part One Crimes Per 1,000 Population






# 2004 ICMA Performance Measures


## Police - Costs Per Capita




**2004 ICMA Performance Measures**  
**Police - Sworn And Civilian FTEs Per 1,000 Population**




2004 ICMA Performance Measures  
Parks Revenue Per Capita




2004 ICMA Performance Measures  
IT - Expenditures Per Workstation




2004 ICMA Performance Measures  
 IT - Internal Customer Satisfaction, General IT Services




Appendix C



2004 ICMA Performance Measures  
 Roads - Paved Lane Miles Assessed in Satisfactory or Better Condition




2004 ICMA Performance Measures  
Roads - Street Sweeping Expenditures Per Capita







2004 ICMA Performance Measures  
 Roads - Rehabilitation Expenditures Per Capita




2004 ICMA Performance Measures  
Roads - Rehabilitation Expenditures Per Mile




**2004 ICMA Performance Measures  
Fleet Management - Medium Vehicle Expenditures Per Vehicle**




2004 ICMA Performance Measures  
 Fleet Management - Light Vehicle Expenditures Per Vehicle



2004 ICMA Performance Measures  
Code Enforcement - Rates Of Voluntary Compliance



2004 ICMA Performance Measures  
Code Enforcement - Expenditures Per Capita



# Join the ICMA Center for Performance Measurement

**We've got something that will work for you!**




ICMA's Center for Performance Measurement (CPM) is inviting local governments in the U.S. and Canada to join one of its comparative performance measurement programs, host a workshop for employees, and/or learn more about performance measurement through one of its publications. CPM assists counties, cities, villages, and towns of all sizes with the collection, analysis, and application of performance information. In accordance with the Center's mission of helping local governments measure, compare, and continuously improve the effectiveness and efficiency of local public services, CPM has various options for participation. Striving to get everyone involved in performance measurement, these options allow jurisdictions to choose their level of participation.



## CPM Comprehensive Program

The CPM Comprehensive Program is a complete comparative performance measurement program. This option allows jurisdictions to participate in every aspect of CPM with a comprehensive set of performance measurement services in 15 service areas. The CPM Comprehensive Program includes:

- Full access to all 15 service area templates (online, paper, and PDFs)
- Web-based data collection and cleaning
- Introductory on-site training
- Access to CPM's private Web site-cleaned data sets from 1996 to present; query and graphing tool; CPM publications; reference materials such as the ICMA e-library, uses of performance information, sample citizen surveys and internal services surveys, and more; CPM staff and participants contact lists; and automated password lookup and changes.
- Bound and unbound copies of the Annual Data Report
- Copy of *What Works* case studies with best practices of high performing jurisdictions
- Core Measures (10-20 measures for each of 15 service areas)
- CPM Certificate Program



### **CPM Small Communities**

CPM Small Communities is an option of participation for all local governments with a population less than 10,000. CPM recognizes that small jurisdictions often have limited resources. Among other things there are budget and staffing constraints that may make it a challenge to participate in such an in-depth program as the CPM Comprehensive Program. Thus, CPM offers these jurisdictions all the services provided to participants in the CPM Comprehensive Program (see above) with the following special features:

- Annual fee reduced by 50%
- No fee for remote training (a savings of \$3,900 compared to on-site training)
- Focus on 10 or fewer service areas
- Emphasis on core measures (10-20 measures per service area)

### **CPM a la Carte**

Additionally, a third option of participation in CPM allows jurisdictions to sign up for one to two service areas only. A jurisdiction can choose one to two of the 15 service areas CPM measures for which to collect and submit data.

### **Metropolitan-area or Statewide Performance Consortia**


ICMA-CPM will waive the \$3,900 one-time training fee for clusters of 10 or more jurisdictions that agree to be trained at a single location.

Participation in a regional consortium affords communities all of the benefits and services provided in the comprehensive program. In addition, an area-wide consortium provides more opportunities for comparisons within a region as well as facilitates the sharing of effective practices. Each service area in each regional consortium can select its own set of core measures. Contact ICMA-CPM for additional information.


### **Workshops and Other Services**

Understanding that performance measurement is such an essential element of professional local government management and leadership, ICMA-CPM offers the following services in addition to the programs described above.

**The Essentials of Performance Measurement.** In this highly interactive full-day workshop, employees in your jurisdiction will learn the basics of performance measurement, develop a small set of measures for their departments or service areas, and learn how to develop additional measures in the future. Several communities—especially small communities—may choose to participate in the same workshop and split the workshop fee.







**The “Performance Dividend” of Professional Management: How You Can Demonstrate It Using Performance Measurement.** This highly interactive half-day workshop provides the essentials of performance measurement as well as provides numerous examples of uses of performance measurement by elected officials, managers and department heads, sample action plans to reach performance targets, and describes the role of citizen outreach and citizen surveys in performance measurement. This CPM/ICMA University workshop is designed for managers and assistants and is intended primarily for state or metropolitan-area association meetings.

**Performance Governance: A Workshop for Elected Officials.** This highly-interactive half-day workshop provides the basics of performance measurement in the context of elected leadership. A special emphasis is given to outcome-based policy-making and governance. Elected officials (and


managers) from several communities may choose to participate in the same workshop and split the workshop fee.

**The National Citizen Survey™ (The NCS™).** Developed by ICMA and National Research Center, Inc., The NCS™ is a low-cost citizen survey service for local governments. Tested, flexible, affordable, and efficient, The NCS™ lets you survey citizen opinion for performance measurement, goal setting, budgeting, and program planning. Staff can use the results of The NCS™ to improve service delivery. Elected officials can use the results to set spending priorities. The manager can use the results to measure progress and chart future steps. You select from a set of standard questions to assess citizen opinion about basic services and community life. Additional customized questions

let you tailor the survey to your unique needs. For more information, visit [icma.org/ncs](http://icma.org/ncs).

**Technical assistance, peer-to-peer assistance, customized services and training.** Please contact ICMA-CPM for more information.

The ICMA-CPM staff is extremely excited about the work we do to help local governments better manage their jurisdictions while improving service delivery. It is our hope that you will avail yourself of at least one of our programs, workshops and/or publications.



**ICMA Center for Performance Measurement Information/Enrollment Form**

**Yes, my jurisdiction would like to participate in the following ICMA comparative performance measurement program:**

- CPM Comprehensive Program**  
\$5,000 annual fee (plus \$3,900 one-time fee for two days of on-site training)
- CPM-SC (small communities)**  
\$2,500 annual fee\* (remote training included)  
\* I understand that this option is for communities with a population of 10,000 or less.

- CPM-ALC (a la carte)**  
\$1,250 annual fee (1 service area; remote training incl.)  
\$2,500 annual fee (2 service areas; remote training incl.)

For CPM-ALC, please indicate the one or two service area(s) in which your jurisdiction will participate.

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Code Enforcement           | <input type="checkbox"/> Facilities Management |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Fire & EMS                 | <input type="checkbox"/> Fleet Management      |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Highway & Road Maintenance | <input type="checkbox"/> Housing               |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Information Technology     | <input type="checkbox"/> Human Resources       |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Parks & Recreation         | <input type="checkbox"/> Library Services      |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Purchasing                 | <input type="checkbox"/> Police                |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Risk Management            | <input type="checkbox"/> Refuse & Recycling    |
|   | <input type="checkbox"/> Youth Services        |

**WORKSHOPS & OTHER SERVICES**

- The Essentials of Performance Measurement (full-day workshop for local government employees; \$3,900)
- The "Performance Dividend" of Professional Management: How You Can Demonstrate It Using Performance Measurement (half-day workshop, intended primarily for managers & assistants at state association meetings; \$3,200; \$125 per person at the ICMA conference—to register visit icma.org)
- Performance Governance: A Workshop for Elected Officials (half-day workshop for elected officials; \$3,200)
- National Citizen Survey™ (\$8,200 for the standard service)
- Technical assistance, peer-to-peer assistance, customized services and training (call for details)

Name \_\_\_\_\_

Title \_\_\_\_\_

Jurisdiction \_\_\_\_\_

FY close (month) \_\_\_\_\_

Address \_\_\_\_\_

City/State/Zip \_\_\_\_\_

Phone \_\_\_\_\_ Fax \_\_\_\_\_

E-mail \_\_\_\_\_

**No, my jurisdiction is not ready to enroll. But I would like an ICMA representative to contact me to discuss the performance measurement program.**

**Please mail or fax this form to:**

ICMA Center for Performance Measurement  
777 North Capitol St., N.E., Suite 500  
Washington, DC 20002-4201  
Fax: 202/962-3603  
For vendor purposes: ICMA's Federal ID number is: 362-16-7755.

**You may also contact CPM by**

Email: [cpmmail@icma.org](mailto:cpmmail@icma.org)  
Phone: 202/962-3562  
[icma.org/performance](http://icma.org/performance)

**PUBLICATIONS**

- *Comparative Performance Measurement: Annual Data Report* (\$70 local governments; \$350 private sector)
- *What Works: Management Applications of Performance Measurement in Local Government* (\$35)
- *Does Your Government Measure Up? Basic Tools for Local Officials and Citizens* (\$20)
- *Fleet Management IQ Report* (\$16.95)
- *Performance Measures and Benchmarks in Local Government Facilities Maintenance* (\$40)
- *Citizen Surveys: How to Do Them, How to Use Them, What They Mean, second edition* (\$45)

Please visit the ICMA online bookstore ([bookstore.icma.org](http://bookstore.icma.org)) to order publications.

The leader in comparative  
performance measurement for  
local governments

# ICMA Center for Performance Measurement



## Message from the ICMA Executive Director

Greetings from the ICMA Center for Performance Measurement!



In today's accountability-driven environment, performance measurement is more important than ever. In good times or challenging ones, an effective system of performance measurement is an essential decision-making tool for local governments. No longer a fad or a buzz phrase, performance measurement systems are in high demand at all levels of government.

Toward that end, the ICMA Center for Performance Measurement (CPM) provides the necessary tools for local governments to collect and report performance information and also to use it to improve local services.

CPM offers data collection, analysis, and reporting services to a broad assortment of towns, cities, and counties from across the United States and Canada. The Center for Performance Measurement:

- Assists in year-to-year internal and cross-jurisdictional comparisons by collecting, verifying, and reporting comparative performance information
- Provides a low-cost, high-tech approach to performance measurement
- Offers reliable data comparisons, made possible by uniform questions and definitions developed and refined over the years by city managers, department heads, and other local government staff
- Promotes continuous learning among participating jurisdictions
- Moves beyond the simple collecting and reporting of performance information by encouraging participating jurisdictions to incorporate it into budgets, link it to strategic plans and goal setting, and use it to communicate to stakeholders
- Saves jurisdictions from unnecessarily replicating the performance measurement process.

Since 1994, CPM has grown from a small consortium of jurisdictions engaged in measuring performance to a permanent and growing Center at ICMA. I invite you to join your peers in this important endeavor. Consider participating in the ICMA Center for Performance Measurement... the leader in comparative performance measurement for local governments.

Sincerely,

Robert J. O'Neill, Jr.  
Executive Director  
International City/County  
Management Association



## MISSION

*ICMA's Center for Performance*

*Measurement is dedicated to*

*helping local governments*

*improve the effectiveness and*

*efficiency of public services*


*through the collection, analysis,*

*and application of performance*

*information.*

## Data Collection Templates

Performance information is gathered annually from CPM participants through data collection instruments called templates. Each service area has its own template with its own definitions and measures. Under the general direction of city/county managers, department heads and other service area specialists have developed CPM's templates during the past decade; the templates are updated and revised annually to keep them current and relevant. Participants submit data once a year via the user-friendly online templates or on paper (downloadable in pdf format).



Web-based data collection is one of the most convenient services CPM offers. Participants can complete the online templates at any time, grant access to multiple users to fill out portions of the templates, and see calculations performed in real time.

## On-Site Training

Shortly after enrolling in CPM, jurisdictions receive two days of on-site training. Staff members in the new jurisdiction are provided a brief overview of CPM and performance measurement in general. After this opening session, small group meetings are held for each service area. During these in-depth sessions, the templates are reviewed page by page to allow service area personnel to become familiar with the types of questions the templates ask. CPM staff members clarify any definitions or questions that seem unclear and discuss exceptions that may apply to the jurisdiction.


Also during the two-day training, CPM staff members facilitate a separate meeting with the city/county managers (or CAO) and department heads to discuss how performance measurement will make a positive difference in their community. Among the issues discussed during this meeting are communicating performance results to the general public and linking performance measures to strategic plans, annual council goals, budget priorities, and process improvements.

This two-day training is an excellent way not only to acquaint jurisdiction and CPM staff with each other and with their respective operations, but also to motivate and energize participants who are about to engage in a thorough, relevant, and useful comparative performance measurement program.

## Rigorous Data Cleaning

CPM staff examine key data points in every template submitted. Instead of accepting thousands of data points without critical review, CPM carries the data collection process further than most local government surveys; CPM uses stringent data cleaning techniques designed to minimize errors in data reporting. This process includes thousands of statistical outlier checks, computer-programmed logic checks (to test data points against other data points in the same survey), as well as review of participants' explanatory comments. This intermediate step between data collection and data reporting helps to ensure that CPM participants have access to data sets that have been scrutinized for error and are valid for comparison and analysis.

### TIMELINE





## Interactive Web Resources

CPM offers its participants access to information at all times through an easy-to-use, password-protected Web site. This Web site includes:

- Full, cleaned data sets from FY 1996 to the present that are downloadable in Excel and Access formats
- Ready-made charts and graphs that jurisdictions can customize for their specific needs using the online query tool
- An electronic discussion group for participants to seek advice and share effective practices with each other
- News and events area where participants learn the latest activities of CPM
- Participant rosters searchable in several ways
- Access to ICMA's electronic library of over 5,000 forms, citizen brochures, plans, and guides used by local governments
- Additional reference materials with downloadable articles, uses of performance measurement information, sample presentations from CPM and its participants, and more
- Access to online templates.

## CPM Forum


To foster idea exchange and information sharing, CPM invites all participants to the CPM Forum each year. This is a unique opportunity for local government employees

to come together in a relaxed atmosphere to delve into what performance measurement means to them and how best to make use of performance measurement in general and the offerings of CPM in particular. Several participating jurisdictions are asked to kick off the Forum with presentations about how performance measurement has benefited their communities and how they use performance measurement to improve service delivery and communicate with stakeholders. There are also numerous how-to workshops covering topics like motivating employees and conducting your own benchmarking studies.

The Forum is yet another way that staff from participating jurisdictions stay in touch with each other and with CPM staff. It affords participants the opportunity to suggest program improvements and to learn from each other.

## Certificate Program

CPM highlights excellence in performance measurement by recognizing jurisdictions that have made an exceptional commitment to integrating performance measurement into their management practices. Initiated in 2002, the CPM Certificates of Achievement and Distinction reward jurisdictions that demonstrate that they use performance information jurisdiction-wide on a regular basis. The certificates are a way for CPM to showcase their success in using performance measurement to drive organizational improvement.



\*CPM offers on-site training for new participants at any time during the year. \*\*Jurisdictions can submit data in either October or March.



**Measure, compare, and improve these services:**

**Code Enforcement**

**Facilities Management**

**Fire and EMS**

**Fleet Management**

**Highway and Road  
Maintenance**

**Housing**

**Human Resources**

**Information Technology**

**Library Services**

**Parks and Recreation**

**Police**

**Purchasing**

**Refuse and Recycling**


**Risk Management**

**Youth Services**

## **Additional Services: CPM has something that will work for you!**

To better serve local governments, CPM has developed optional services aside from the standard program. Our wide variety of additional services allows everyone to become involved in performance measurement in their own way. These services include:

- Small communities;
- Regional/metropolitan/statewide consortia;
- Half-day and full-day workshops for local government employees as well as elected officials;
- Customized training;
- Customized technical assistance;
- Citizen surveys and internal services surveys;
- And more!



## **Want to join the Center for Performance Measurement? Need more information?**

CPM invites jurisdictions to join the program at any time during the year. When you become a CPM participant, you gain access to the most comprehensive and relevant comparative performance data available. Furthermore, you save valuable time and money by using a time-tested set of measures and definitions with data cleaning, graphing, and reporting done for you.

CPM staff are available to answer questions and to provide supplemental information about the program. To learn more, please call us at 202/962-3562, e-mail [cpmmail@icma.org](mailto:cpmmail@icma.org), or visit our Web site at <http://icma.org/performance>.





# PUBLICATIONS




## Data Report

Each year, CPM publishes *Comparative Performance Measurement: Annual Data Report*. This book is the result of one year of data collection, cleaning, and analysis. Within the report are more than 200 graphs and charts in the 15 service areas that CPM examines. Participants receive complimentary copies of the *Data Report* each year. CPM also provides each *Data Report* chapter in pdf format on the private Web site.





Refuse and Recycling: Tons of Recycling Materials Collected as a Percentage of All Refuse and Recycle Materials



## What Works

In an effort to move beyond just the collection and reporting of performance data, CPM published a set of case studies, collectively called *What Works: Management Applications of Performance Measurement in Local Government*. This book is a collection of methods for encouraging high performance, sharing performance data, and other performance measurement-related practices proven effective by CPM participants. The second edition of this book includes 45 additional case studies in 14 service areas, plus cases studies on the effective uses of performance data in local governments.

All CPM and ICMA publications can be purchased online at <http://bookstore.icma.org>





---

# ***Overview of the City's Performance Measurement Program***

***February 21, 2006***

---

# **Purpose of Tonight's Review**

- *Provide Council with an update on the City's performance measurement program*
  - New Councilmembers
- *Provide an opportunity for Councilmembers to ask questions*
- *Not asking for any decisions – information sharing*

---

# ***What is Performance Measurement?***

“A method of measuring the progress of a public program or activity in achieving the results or outcomes that clients, customers or stakeholders expect”

American Society for Public Administration  
Performance Measurement concepts and  
Techniques Workbook



---

# **Who Provides Professional Guidance on Performance Measurement?**

- ***Government Finance Officers Association (GFOA)***
  - 1994 adopted a recommended best practice policy statement
  - *Base performance measures on program goals and objectives that tie to a statement of program mission or purpose*
  - *Measure results or accomplishments*
  - *Progressive process*
  - *Develop a multiyear series of input, output, efficiency, and effectiveness measures*
  - *Use customer or resident satisfaction measures*
  - *Use community condition measures to assess resident needs that may not be addressed by current programs.*

---

# **Who Provides Professional Guidance on Performance Measurement?**

- ***ICMA Center for Performance Measurement***

- Data Collection Templates, Training, Data Cleaning, Web Resources, Certificate Program

- ***ICMA CPM Puget Sound Consortium***


- Bellevue      Kirkland      Lynnwood
- Renton      Sammamish      Vancouver
- Mercer Island      University Place

---

# Why Performance Measurement?

- *Strategy for Continuous Improvement*
- *Means to evaluate whether we are accomplishing the City's strategic plan and program goals to achieve the City's vision*
- *Provide data for operational decision making in the areas of planning and program evaluation*
- *A tool to provide for decision making in resource allocation*
- *Provide data for benchmarking*

# Where Does Performance Measurement Fit In?




---

# **Elements of a Successful Performance Measurement System**

- *Show a direct link to the mission/purpose*
- *Measures results of programs or accomplishments and provide for comparisons over time*
- *Reliable, verifiable, and understandable measures*
- *Clearly communicates the benefit or value of the program's work*
- *Used in decision-making process*
- *Relevant few measures that people care about*
- *Balanced to avoid unintended consequences*



# ***Alignment and Linkage***



---

# ***City's Vision***

***Shoreline! The best place to live, learn,  
work and play.***

***A place to live your dream.***

---

# **City's Strategic Plan**

## **Critical Success Factors**

- *Healthy, vibrant neighborhoods*
- *Economic vitality and financial stability*
- *Quality services and facilities*
- *Innovative leadership and strategic planning*
- *Community alliances and partnerships*
- *Effective community relations and communications*
- *Professional and committed workforce*

# Develop Goals and Strategies to Support the Critical Success Factors

## Critical Success Factors

Healthy, Vibrant Neighborhoods



- Safe, secure, attractive neighborhoods
- Park and open space within safe walking distance
- Excellent public utilities and infrastructure

Economic Vitality and Financial Stability



- Sufficient fiscal capacity to fund priority services, facilities, and infrastructure
- Quality investments in commercial areas
- Diversified and balanced economic base

## Goals

- Enhance safe, friendly streets program (Council Goal No. 3)
- Improve code enforcement program (Council Goal No. 6)
- Develop plan for acquiring/preserving open space and critical areas (Council Goal No. 7)
- Implement Comprehensive Plan, PROS Plan, and Transportation and Surface Water Master Plans

- Develop a long-term financial plan
- Complete the Aurora Corridor Project (Council Goal No. 1)
- Complete the North City Project
- Create partnerships for marketing/promoting Shoreline, supporting businesses and major projects and for attracting investment
- Develop an economic development plan (Council Goal No. 4)

## Strategies



---

# **Programs and Program Goals**

## **Support Critical Success Factor Goals**

- *Healthy Vibrant Neighborhoods*

Goal: Safe, secure, attractive neighborhoods

Programs:

- *Code Enforcement Team - Enforces the City's codes and regulations to implement community values and to sustain a safe and attractive City*
- *Traffic Services & Neighborhood Traffic Safety – Design, review and approve traffic control devices and traffic calming solutions that enhance the quality of life for Shoreline residents.*
- *Police Patrol – Respond to calls for service, enforce criminal laws and perform self-initiating activity to keep citizens safe*



# Measure Progress Towards Achieving Goals

## Critical Success Factor: Healthy, Vibrant Neighborhoods

### Goal: Safe, secure, attractive neighborhoods

Program/ Level	Measure	2003	2004	2005	Target
Code Enforcement	Percentage of all cases issued a Notice and Order that are brought into compliance annually (Strike 3)		45%	31%	38%
Traffic Services & Neighborhood Traffic Safety	Percentage of citizens surveyed who are very satisfied or somewhat satisfied with the flow of traffic and congestion		41%	41%	N/A
Police Patrol	Part 1 Crimes Per 1,000 Population	44.47	46.00		N/A
	Part 2 Crimes Per 1,000 Population	39.84	40.96		N/A
PRO Card	Percent of residents who feel safe in their neighborhood during the day		92%	92%	
	Percent of residents who rate their neighborhood condition as excellent/good		82%	82%	

---

## ***Types of Measures - Input***

- ***Input – Level of resources needed to provide a program or service***

Examples:

- Number of full-time equivalents
- Budget Allocation
- Number of Pieces of Equipment

- ***Doesn't show what is being delivered, how effective or how efficient a program is***

# **Types of Measures – Output/Workload**

- *Output or Workload Measures – Report the quantity or volume of products and services provided by the program*

<i>Program</i>	<i>Measure</i>	<i>2003</i>	<i>2004</i>	<i>2005</i>	<i>Target</i>
<i>24 Hour Customer Response Team</i>	<i>Number of customer requests for service</i>	<i>2,982</i>	<i>3,079</i>	<i>4,272</i>	<i>3,000</i>
<i>Police Patrol</i>	<i>Number of dispatched calls for service</i>	<i>13,548</i>	<i>13,842</i>	<i>N/A</i>	<i>N/A</i>
<i>Right-of-Way Permit and Inspection Program</i>	<i>Number of inspections performed</i>	<i>1,505</i>	<i>790</i>	<i>1,015</i>	<i>N/A</i>

- *No indication of whether the goals established for the program are being met*
- *Can't be used to assess the quality of a program or service*



# Types of Measures – Effectiveness/Outcome

- *Effectiveness/Outcome Measures – Focus on the question of whether or not the program is meeting its mission and goals*

<i>Program</i>	<i>Measure</i>	<i>2003</i>	<i>2004</i>	<i>2005</i>	<i>Target</i>
<i>24 Hour Customer Response Team</i>	<i>Percentage of customer requests responded to within 24 hours</i>	<i>100%</i>	<i>97%</i>	<i>95%</i>	<i>95%</i>
<i>Police Patrol</i>	<i>Part 1 crimes per 1,000 population</i>	<i>44.47</i>	<i>46.00</i>		<i>N/A</i>
<i>Street Operation &amp; Pavement Resurfacing</i>	<i>Overall pavement condition rating for City streets</i>	<i>76.0</i>	<i>76.0</i>	<i>81.3</i>	<i>&gt;76.0</i>
<i>Code Enforcement Team</i>	<i>Percentage of all code enforcement actions resolved by voluntary compliance (Strike 1)</i>	<i>84.4%</i>	<i>92.7%</i>	<i>92.0%</i>	<i>85.0%</i>

- *Can't be used to assess the efficiency of the program*

# Types of Measures - Efficiency

- *Efficiency Measures – Measures productivity. Measure the cost in terms of dollars or personnel per unit of output or outcome.*

<i>Program</i>	<i>Measure</i>	<i>2003</i>	<i>2004</i>	<i>2005</i>	<i>Target</i>
<i>24 Hour Customer Response Team</i>	<i>Average Number of Service Requests per FTE</i>	<i>840</i>	<i>867</i>	<i>1,203</i>	<i>N/A</i>
<i>Police Patrol</i>	<i>Number of dispatched calls for service per patrol officer</i>	<i>410.5</i>	<i>407.1</i>		<i>N/A</i>
<i>Street Operation &amp; Pavement Resurfacing</i>	<i>Annual street operation expenditures per paved lane mile in the City</i>	<i>\$4,364</i>	<i>\$3,651</i>	<i>\$3,612</i>	<i>N/A</i>
<i>Code Enforcement Team</i>	<i>Number of code enforcement actions (Strike 1) per FTE</i>		<i>219</i>	<i>976</i>	<i>N/A</i>

- *Can't be used to assess the quality or effectiveness of the program*

# Need a Family of Measures to Get the Whole Story

## 24 Hour Customer Response Team

*Respond to internal and external inquires, concerns, suggestions and complaints and provide reliable resolution and follow up to guarantee customer satisfaction.*

<i>Measure Type</i>	<i>Measure</i>	2003	2004	2005	<i>Target</i>
<i>Input</i>	<i>Annual Expenditures</i>	\$276,527	\$281,077	\$274,659	N/A
	<i>FTE Allocation</i>		3.55	3.55	N/A
<i>Output/ Workload</i>	<i>Number of customer requests for service</i>	2,982	3,079	4,272	3,000
	<i>Percentage of customer requests responded to within 24 hours</i>	100%	97%	95%	95%
<i>Effectiveness/ Outcome</i>	<i>Percentage of customers giving CRT services a good or excellent rating</i>	98%	94%	98%	95%
	<i>Average Cost per Service Request</i>	\$92.73	\$91.28	\$64.29	N/A
<i>Efficiency</i>	<i>Average Number of Service Requests per FTE</i>	N/A	867	1,203	N/A



# Need a Family of Measures to Get the Whole Story

## Police Patrol

*Patrol responds to calls for service, enforces criminal laws and performs self-initiating activity to keep citizens safe*

<i>Measure Type</i>	<i>Measure</i>	<i>2003</i>	<i>2004</i>	<i>2005</i>	<i>Target</i>
<i>Input</i>	<i>Annual Expenditures</i>	\$3,162,820	\$3,486,440	\$3,619,988	N/A
	<i>FTE Allocation</i>	29.0	29.0	28.0	N/A
<i>Output/ Workload</i>	<i>Number of dispatched calls for service</i>	13,548	13,842		N/A
	<i>Number of self-initiated police activities</i>	15,456	13,037		N/A
<i>Effectiveness/ Outcome</i>	<i>Crime Rate (Part 1) per 1,000 population</i>	44.47	46.00		N/A
	<i>Crime Rate (Part 2) per 1,000 population</i>	39.84	40.96		N/A
	<i>Percentage of citizens feeling safe in their neighborhood during the day</i>	91.0%	95.0%		N/A
	<i>Percentage of citizens feeling safe in their neighborhood at night</i>	69.0%	73.0%		N/A
<i>Efficiency</i>	<i>Number of dispatched calls for service per patrol officer</i>	467.17	477.31		N/A

# ***City of Shoreline Program***

## ***City-Wide Program Initiated in 2003***

	Year 1 (2003)	Year 2 (2004)	Year 3 (2005)	Year 4 (2006)
Identify Programs & Activities				
Align programs with Strategic Plan				
Develop outcome and customer service measures for each program				
Develop performance measures for Strategic Plan Critical Success Factors				
Develop measures for each program activity				
Collect data for ICMA program				
Report data to ICMA for inclusion in their annual Comparative Performance Measurement Report				

---


# **International City Management Association**

## **Center for Performance Measurement**

### **(ICMA PM)**


- *Provide comparative performance measurement for local governments*
  - Code Enforcement
  - Fleet Management
  - Information Technology
  - Parks & Recreation
  - Risk Management
  - Highway & Road Maintenance
  - Facilities Management
  - Human Resources
  - Police Services
  - Purchasing

2004 ICMA Performance Measures  
 Risk Management - General Liability Claims per 10,000 Population Served




2004 ICMA Performance Measures

Police - Citizens' Ratings of Safety in their Neighborhoods after Dark





2004 ICMA Performance Measures  
Roads - Paved Lane Miles Assessed in Satisfactory or Better Condition



---

## **ICMA PM**

### **Puget Sound Consortium**

- *Bellevue*
- *Kirkland*
- *Lynnwood*
- *Mercer Island*
- *Renton*
- *Sammamish*
- *University Place*
- *Vancouver*
- *Shoreline*

---

# **Where Have We Found Success?**

- *Started Establishing Targets and Baselines*
- *Making Service Level Decisions*
  - Pavement Rating Data
- *Identifying Areas Where We Are Successfully Meeting the Communities Needs and Areas That Can Be Improved*
  - Currents
  - Information on How the City Manages Its Finances

---

# Next Steps

- ***Targets***
  - Making Sure Strategic Goals Still Valid
  - Use Baseline Information to Establish Goals
    - *Programs and PRO Card*
- ***Decision Making***
  - What Is the Data Telling Us?
  - Long-Term Process
- ***Identify Trends***
  - Need for multi-year data

---

## ***Next Steps***

- ***Benchmarking***
  - Use of the ICMA PM Puget Sound Consortium
- ***Reporting Out***
  - Monitor Progress on Strategic Plan and Program Goals
  - Targets, Trends, Benchmarking
- ***Initiative 900***

---

# Summary

- *City's Performance Measurement Program*
  - Starting Our 4<sup>th</sup> Year
  - Long-Term Commitment
    - *Program will continue to evolve*
    - *Use as decision making tool*
- *Validate with Council and Community*
  - Areas to improve or change