



## NOTICE OF PUBLIC MEETING

CITY OF ALBANY  
CITY COUNCIL  
Council Chambers  
333 Broadalbin Street SW  
Wednesday, November 2, 2011  
7:15 p.m.

### OUR MISSION IS

*"Providing quality public services  
for a better Albany community."*

### OUR VISION IS

*"A vital and diversified community  
that promotes a high quality of life,  
great neighborhoods, balanced  
economic growth, and quality public  
services."*

## AGENDA

### Rules of Conduct for Public Meetings

1. CALL TO ORDER
2. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE TO THE FLAG
3. ROLL CALL
4. SCHEDULED BUSINESS
  - a. Business from the Public
  - b. Reports
    - 1) Annual Performance Benchmarking Report/Citizen Survey. [Pages 1-10]  
Action: \_\_\_\_\_
    - 2) Budget options. [Pages 11-12]  
Action: \_\_\_\_\_
5. BUSINESS FROM THE COUNCIL
6. NEXT MEETING DATE: Work Session November 7, 2011  
Regular Session November 9, 2011
7. ADJOURNMENT

City of Albany Web site: [www.cityofalbany.net](http://www.cityofalbany.net)

*The location of the meeting/hearing is accessible to the disabled. If you have a disability that requires accommodation, please notify the Human Resources Department in advance by calling (541) 917-7500.*



TO: Albany City Council  
 VIA: Wes Hare, City Manager  
 FROM: Bob Woods, Management Systems Director *BW*  
 DATE: October 28, 2011, for the November 2, 2011, City Council Meeting  
 SUBJECT: Annual Performance Benchmarking Report/Citizen Survey

RELATES TO STRATEGIC PLAN THEME: • An Effective Government

RELATES TO: • Objective 10.43 Participation in National Performance Benchmarking.

Action Requested:

None required. This is an informational report to Council.

Discussion:

Since 2005, the City has participated in national benchmark reporting with other jurisdictions, beginning with the annual International City/County Management Association (ICMA) national benchmarking program. FY2010-2011 is the seventh year that the City has submitted information in support of this program. In September 2011, the City received the ICMA Certificate for Excellence in Performance Measurement, the highest award granted by the Center for Performance Measurement.

The ICMA program has changed over the years with adjustments and improvements in the reporting items and breakdowns, and the extent of City participation has grown over that time.

For FY2011, ICMA has performance measurement efforts in the following 19 areas.

Reporting Area	FY10	FY11	Reporting Area	FY10	FY11
Code Enforcement	X	X	Facilities Management	-	-
Fire and EMS	X	X	Fleet Management	-	X
General Demographics	X	X	Highway and Road Maintenance	X	X
Housing	X	X	Human Resources	X	X
Information Technology	X	X	Library Services	X	X
Obesity Prevention	X	X	Parks & Recreation	X	X
Permits, Land Use, and Plan Review	X	X	Police Services	X	X
Purchasing Services	-	-	Refuse and Recycling	n/a	n/a
Risk Management	X	X	Sustainability	X	X
Youth Services	n/a	n/a			

Albany has reported for FY2011 in 15 areas with the addition of Fleet Management, an increase of 1 from FY2010. The implementation of fleet systems tracking was the primary effort of our performance and process improvement activities in FY2011.

The addition of reporting on Fleet Management has been accomplished as the result of a Fleet Management System, developed in-house. Unlike many organizations, in Albany all fleet activities are decentralized to the various departments where fueling and maintenance services are secured from outside sources. With the new system, the City has comprehensive and detailed information on equipment and vehicles owned by the City. All departments enter data using the same format, and the City can now comprehensively track fuel, repairs, inspections, and operating costs by individual units and by vehicle/equipment classes across the entire organization. Beyond cost and utilization measurement, the implementation of this fleet system has resulted

in the establishment of process performance tracking across all organizational units that have associated equipment and vehicles. A brief demonstration of the fleet system will be given to Council at its meeting.

There are two areas where we have not yet been able to submit data.

*Facilities Management:*

A lack of appropriate data and the ability to effectively collect it have been the major problem. Facilities Management operations lack an appropriate tracking system and financial pressures have prevented securing an off-the-shelf system. The City will attempt to develop a system in house.

*Purchasing Services:*

This reporting module was substantially revised by ICMA in FY2010. We were unable to implement tracking in FY2011 as planned, due primarily to focusing on the implementation of the fleet system.

ICMA does not currently have performance indicators for Sewer Service, Water Service, or Customer Service/Utility Billing operations, but efforts are now underway by the Colorado Consortium to begin a system. Albany is committed to working with ICMA and the member cities to develop tracking systems for what are often the largest service areas provided by city government.

A hallmark of these performance benchmarking efforts is the requirement that data be based on actual, verifiable measurement. Estimates are not acceptable; the data must be real.

***Current Reporting Status***

In each area of reporting, ICMA has worked with jurisdictions to develop a broad range of measures that can be used for comparison, regardless of jurisdiction size. Within that range of measures are subsets referred to as core measures. These core measures are considered fundamental to each area, and jurisdictions are expected to work first on implementing them.

Core measures are developed nationally and are adjusted regionally by member jurisdictions. Albany’s goal is to meet all regional measures and to eventually report on all national measures. The measures below were adopted by the Oregon Consortium, but also include other national measures on which Albany currently reports. The breakdowns show the FY2011 status in each selected reporting area.

**Code Enforcement**

CORE MEASURE	FY2010 REPORTING	FY2011 REPORTING
Rates of Voluntary Compliance	√	√
Rates of Forced Compliance Capita	√	√
Average Number of Calendar Days from Case Inspection to Voluntary Compliance	√	√
Average Number of Calendar Days from Case Inspection to Forced Compliance	√	√
Code Enforcement Expenditures Per Capita		
Average Number of Calendar Days from First Complaint to Investigation	√	√
Percentage of Cases Resolved through Voluntary Compliance	√	√
Percentage of Cases Resolved through Forced Compliance	√	√

## Fire and EMS

CORE MEASURE	FY 10 REPORTING	FY11 REPORTING
Paid Fire and EMS Staffing per 1,000 Population		√*
Total Fire Operating Expenditures per Capita		√*
Residential Structure Fire Incidents per 1,000 Residential Structures		**
Residential Structure Fires per 1,000 Population	√	√
One- and Two-Family Residential Structure Fire Incidents: Fire out on Arrival, Confined to Room of Origin, or Confined to Structure of Origin		
Total Combined Commercial and Industrial Structure Fire Incidents per 1,000 Commercial and Industrial Structures		
Fire Incidents Involving Non-structures per 1,000 Population	√	√
Total Non-fire Incidents per 1,000 Population		
Total Fire Incidents per 1,000 Population	√	√
False Alarms and Good Intent Calls as Percentage of Total Fire Incidents	√	√
Residential Arson Incidents per 10,000 Residents Served		
Total Arson Incidents per 10,000 Population		√
Arson Clearance Rate		√
Rescues and Recoveries Performed per 10,000 Population Served		√
Fire Personnel Injuries with Time Lost per 1,000 Incidents		
Percentage of Total Fire Calls with a Response Time of Five Minutes and Under from Dispatch to Arrival on the Scene		√
EMS Responses per 1,000 Population Served: Total, BLS, and ALS Responses	√	
EMS Response Time: Average Time from Dispatch to Arrival on Scene for Calls Requiring an ALS Response (Lights and Sirens)		
Patients with Full Cardiac Arrest from Medical Causes and Patients who Received Early Defibrillation		
Percentage of Patients in Full Cardiac Arrest who Have Specified Rhythms upon Delivery to a Medical Facility		
Hazmat Incidents per 10,000 Population	√	√

\*Albany only reports combined Fire and EMS staffing and costs but because Fire and EMS serve different populations, ICMA cannot report a consistent “per 1,000 population” calculation.

\*\*Albany does not have structure counts for areas served outside of the city limits.

### Fleet Management

CORE MEASURE	FY10 REPORTING	FY11 REPORTING
Hours Billed per Vehicle or Piece of Equipment Maintained by the Central Fleet Management Operation <i>(Note: Albany has no central fleet operation.)</i>		N/A
Hours Billed as a Percentage of Hours Available <i>(Note: Albany has no central fleet operation.)</i>		N/A
Percentage of Fleet Maintenance Expenditures that are Contracted Out		√
Percentage of Vehicles Exceeding Replacement Criteria (After Pending Orders Fulfilled)		√
Average Fleet Maintenance Expenditures per Vehicle: All Vehicles and Heavy Equipment		√
Police Vehicles: Total Maintenance and Preventive Maintenance Expenditures per Vehicle	√	√
Police Vehicles: Total Maintenance Expenditures per Mile Driven	√	√
Fire Apparatus: Total Maintenance and Preventive Maintenance Expenditures per Vehicle		√
Fire Apparatus: Total Maintenance Expenditures per Mile Driven		√
EMS Vehicles: Total Maintenance Expenditures per Mile Driven		√
EMS Vehicles: Total Maintenance and Preventive Maintenance Expenditures per Vehicle		√
Light Vehicles I: Total Maintenance and Preventive Maintenance Expenditures per Vehicle		√
Light Vehicles II: Total Maintenance and Preventive Maintenance Expenditures per Vehicle		√
Light Vehicles: Total Maintenance Expenditures per Mile Driven		√
Buses: Total Maintenance Expenditures per Mile Driven		√
Medium Vehicles: Total Maintenance and Preventive Maintenance Expenditures per Vehicle		√
Heavy Vehicles: Total Maintenance and Preventive Maintenance Expenditures per Vehicle		√
Heavy Equipment: Total Maintenance		√

and Preventive Maintenance Expenditures per Piece of Equipment		
Percentage of Vehicles and Heavy Equipment using Alternative Fuel		√
Internal Customer Satisfaction: Quality of Fleet Maintenance Services		N/A
Internal Customer Satisfaction: Timeliness of Fleet Maintenance Services		N/A

### General Demographics

The General Demographics section does not have any core measures. It is an overall compilation of community statistics covering population, area, form of government, housing units, unemployment rate, household income, operating expenditures, capital expenditures, and citywide citizen surveys.

Albany does not collect or report annual measured data on:

- Estimates on daily/annual incoming commuters and tourists
- Numbers of occupied housing units/vacancy rates
- Foreclosures
- Median/average household and per-capita income
- Poverty statistics

### Highway and Road Maintenance

CORE MEASURE	FY10 REPORTING	FY11 REPORTING
Road Rehabilitation Expenditures per Paved Lane Mile	√	√
Road Rehabilitation Expenditures per Capita	√	√
Paved Lane Miles Assessed in Satisfactory or Better Condition as Percentage of Total Paved Lane Miles Assessed		
Street Sweeping Expenditures per Capita	√	√
Snow and Ice Control Expenditures per Capita Compared with Inches of Snowfall <i>(Note: Reported national measure but not part of Oregon Consortium)</i>	√	√
Citizen Ratings of Road Condition	√	√
Citizen Ratings of Street Sweeping	√	√

### Human Resources

CORE MEASURE	FY10 REPORTING	FY11 REPORTING
Working Days for External Recruitment	√	√
Working Days for Internal Recruitment	√	√
Working Days to Reclassify an Occupied Position	√	√
Turnover Rates: Total, Nonpublic Safety and Public Safety Employees	√	√
Turnover Rates: IT Employees	√	√

Sick Leave Hours Used per 1,000 Hours Worked	√	√
Number of Employee Grievances and Appeals per 100 Employees	√	√
Percentage of Grievances Resolved before Passing from Management Control	√	√
Percentage of Employee Performance Reviews Completed on Schedule	√	√
Customer Satisfaction <i>(Note: reported national measure but not part of Oregon Consortium)</i>	√	√
Ratio of Human Resources FTEs to total Jurisdiction FTEs	√	√
Employee Benefits as a Percentage of Total Compensation	√	√

## Information Technology

CORE MEASURE	FY10 REPORTING	FY11 REPORTING
Central IT Expenditures per Workstation <i>(Note: reported national measure but not part of Oregon Consortium)</i>	√	√
IT O&M Expenditures as a Percentage of Total Operating Expenditures	√	√
Ratio of Total Workstations to Total Employees in Jurisdiction	√	√
Central IT Organization's Total Expenditures per Workstation	√	√
Telephone System Problem Resolution: Percentage Corrected Within 24 Hours <i>(Note: Albany uses VOIP technology for telephones which is specifically excluded from this calculation by ICMA.)</i>	√	√
Internal Customer Satisfaction: Telephone Services: Overall Satisfaction <i>(Note: reported national measure but not part of Oregon Consortium)</i>	√	√
Repair Calls for Network Services Resolved Within 24 Hours	√	√
Network and Desktop Device Moves, Additions, or Changes Completed When Scheduled		
Repair Calls for Application Services Resolved Within 24 Hours	√	√
Help Desk Calls: Resolved at Time of Call, Within 4 Hours, and Within 8 Hours	√	√
Internal Customer Satisfaction: General IT Services: Overall Satisfaction <i>(Note: reported national measure but not part of Oregon Consortium)</i>	√	√

## Library Services

CORE MEASURE	FY10 REPORTING	FY11 REPORTING
Registered Borrowers as a Percentage of Service Area Population	√	√
Circulation Rates per Capita	√	√
Circulation Rates per Registered Borrower	√	√
Patron Internet Usage per Terminal	√	√
Visitation Rates per Capita	√	√
Visitation Rates per Registered Borrower	√	√
Library Operating and Maintenance Expenditures per Capita	√	√
Operating and Maintenance Expenditures per Registered Borrower	√	√
Operating and Maintenance Expenditures per Item Circulated	√	√
Number of Paid and Volunteer FTEs per 1,000 Population	√	√
Citizen Ratings of Overall Library Services	√	√
Total Program Attendance per 1,000 Population	√	√

## Parks &amp; Recreation

CORE MEASURE	FY10 REPORTING	FY11 REPORTING
Net Parks & Recreation Revenue per Capita - Excluding Golf Expenditures and Revenues	√	√
Parks & Recreation Revenue Received from Endowments, Grants, and Foundations, per Capita	√	√
Parks & Recreation FTEs per 1,000 Population - Excluding Golf FTEs	√	√
Citizen Ratings of Overall Satisfaction with Parks & Recreation in the Jurisdiction <i>(Note: reported national measure but not part of Oregon Consortium)</i>	√	No Citywide Survey Performed
Citizen Ratings of the Quality of Parks & Recreation Programs <i>(Note: reported national measure but not part of Oregon Consortium)</i>	√	No Citywide Survey Performed
Citizen Ratings of the Range of Parks & Recreation Activities <i>(Note: reported national measure but not part of Oregon Consortium)</i>	√	No Citywide Survey Performed
Developed Park Acres per 1,000 Population	√	√
Total Park Acres per 1,000 Population	√	√
Net Annual O&M Expenditures (No Utilities) per Capita for Parks & Recreation (Excluding Specialized Facilities)	√	√

Total Number of Hours Worked by Volunteer Staff in Support of Parks & Recreation Activities	√	√
---	---	---

## Permits/ Land Use/Plan Review

MEASURE	FY10 REPORTING	FY11 REPORTING
Valuation of Residential & Commercial Construction	√	√
Average Time for Plan Approval Residential & Commercial	√	√
Total Number of Building Inspections	√	√
Average # of Inspection Performed per FTE	√	√
Number of Development Plan Reviews	√	√
Number of Subdivision Reviews	√	√

## Police Services

CORE MEASURE	FY10 REPORTING	FY11 REPORTING
Sworn and Civilian FTEs per 1,000 Population	√	√
Total Operating and maintenance Expenditures Charged to the Police Department per Capita		
Number of Top Priority Police Calls per 1,000 Population	√	√
Response Time in Minutes to Top Priority Calls	√	√
UCR Part I Crimes Reported per 1,000 Population	√	√
Total Arrests for UCR Part I Crimes per 1,000 Population	√	√
Total Arrests for UCR Part I Crimes per Sworn FTE	√	√
Juvenile Arrests for UCR Part I Crimes as Percentage of Total Arrests for UCR Part I Crimes	√	√
Total Arrests per 1,000 Population	√	√
Percentage of UCR Part I Crimes Cleared	√	√
UCR Part I Crimes Cleared per Sworn FTE	√	√
Total Arrests for UCR Part II Drug Offenses per 1,000 Population	√	√
Juvenile Arrests for Part II Drug Abuse Offenses as a Percentage of Total Arrests for UCR Part II Drug Offenses	√	√
DUI Arrests per 1,000 Population	√	√
Fatal Traffic Accidents per 1,000 Population	√	√
Citizen Rating of Safety in Their Neighborhood During the Day (Note: reported national measure but not part of Oregon Consortium)	√	√

Citizen Rating of Safety of their Neighborhoods After Dark <i>(Note: reported national measure but not part of Oregon Consortium)</i>	√	No Citywide Survey Performed
Citizen Rating of Business Areas During the Day <i>(Note: reported national measure but not part of Oregon Consortium)</i>	√	No Citywide Survey Performed
Citizen Rating of Business Areas After Dark <i>(Note: reported national measure but not part of Oregon Consortium)</i>	√	No Citywide Survey Performed

**Risk Management**

CORE MEASURE	FY10 REPORTING	FY11 REPORTING
Total Property Loss, Premiums, and Other Expenditures per \$1,000 of Property Value at Risk		
Expenditures for Liability Claims per Capita – Commercial General or Public Entity Liability		√
General Liability Claims Per 10,000 Population Served	√	√
Percentage of Commercial General/Public Entity Liability Claims that Proceeded to Litigation		√
Traffic Accidents per 100,000 Miles Driven–Law Enforcement Vehicles		
Traffic Accidents per 100,000 Miles Driven – Light Vehicles I		
Number of Workers’ Compensation Claims per 100 FTEs	√	√
Expenditures for Workers’ Compensation per \$100 of Total Jurisdiction Salaries and Benefits		
Number of Worker Days Lost per Claim	√	√
Number of Worker Days Lost to Injury per FTE	√	√

***Citizen Survey***

An important component of the ICMA performance measurement system is surveying the community to scientifically determine citizen satisfaction with government services. Council has a stated goal to perform a citywide survey every two years.

ICMA has for many years encouraged cities to participate in the National Citizens Survey, a standardized approach used nationwide. This standardized survey provides measurements across the wide variety of services provided by government and allows for inclusion of policy related questions that individual jurisdiction may wish to include. The city of Corvallis has a history of using this survey.

Due to budget considerations, no survey was performed for FY2010-2011. Funds were included in the FY2011-2012 to perform a survey this fiscal year since we were not able to proceed last year. At this time

staff is not pursuing a survey until there is further clarification in the City's financial picture for FY2011-2012.

***Conclusion***

This report provides a systematic analysis of the status of our core reporting for national performance benchmarking efforts. The goal of staff is to continually improve on our tracking abilities until no appropriate measures remain in the "not reporting" status.

Improving our reporting can be relatively slow and incremental. Even on those areas where we might improve tracking or data retrieval before the end of this fiscal year, it will take another full year of actual measurements in order to report true numbers.

The next report on our efforts is scheduled for November 2013.

**Budget Impact:**

There is no budget impact in the preparation of this annual report.

BW:de



TO: Albany City Council  
FROM: Wes Hare, City Manager *WH*  
DATE: October 28, 2011, for the November 2, 2011, City Council Meeting  
SUBJECT: Budget Options

RELATES TO STRATEGIC PLAN THEME: • An Effective Government

Action Requested:

Council direction regarding the options to deal with the decreased revenue.

Discussion:

The unexpected decrease in property tax revenue recently reported by the county assessor leaves us with approximately \$1 million less than we projected in the General, Public Safety levy, and Parks funds in this fiscal year ending June 30, 2012. We expect that figure to increase to \$1.8 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 2013.

Following meetings with the department directors, I am recommending that we focus on three options to begin the discussion about how the Council may want to deal with the decreased revenue:

**Option 1**

Our best estimate is that we will need to lay off approximately 15 employees as soon as possible if the Council prefers to address the issue by only reducing expenses. There are many possible variations on which employees would need to be cut and what services would need to be eliminated. Cuts could be spread over all General Fund, levy, and Parks activities or they could be concentrated on specific services.

**Option 2**

We currently transfer approximately \$750,000 annually from our Water and Sewer funds to our Street Fund as payment in lieu of franchise fees. All other franchise fees from other utilities (electric, gas, etc.) are dedicated to the General Fund. The Council could choose to take the money from the Street Fund and put it into the General Fund to partially offset the reduced property tax revenue. This option would still require us to lay off approximately seven people. The Council could also choose to consider a street utility fee at a future date to sustain current street maintenance levels.

**Option 3**

We have the ability to use PepsiCo settlement resources to pay off General and Parks Fund debt amounting to about \$2.3 million in principal and interest. If we did so, we would reduce expenses in the General Fund by approximately \$240,000 annually and Parks Fund costs by \$179,000. Settlement fund resources could also be used to reimburse the Public Works funds for the approximately \$1.5 million that was spent to design the 53<sup>rd</sup> Avenue overpass associated with the PepsiCo project. This money would offset the transfer of utility franchise fees for two years. Option 3 would probably preclude moving forward with either the police or fire facility projects in the immediate future, assuming the Council wants to maintain a \$4.8 million economic development balance. Option 3 would also require additional personnel cuts, although it would certainly reduce the number.

**Summary**

I believe Option 3 is the best of the three alternatives because it does the most to maintain service levels at a time when those services continue to be in high demand. We have already reduced our staffing from a peak of 421 in 2009 to less than 390 today. Regardless of which option you choose, I expect this trend to continue until there is a significant increase in real estate prices and/or a building boom. Either Option 1 or 2 would allow use of the PepsiCo settlement money for a new police or fire station. Most of our residents are seeing a noticeable reduction in property taxes so there may be some willingness to consider measures that would pay for new police and fire facilities as the economy improves.

WH:de