

Performance Measures

Background

One of the City Council priorities is "Doing Business Efficiently." Establishing performance measures as a decision-making and management tool for the organization is responsive to this policy direction and is reflected throughout the City's adopted two-year budget for 2002/2003 and 2003/2004. Redwood City's goal in comparing our performance to the other cities is to improve Redwood City's services by learning from successful practices in those cities.

1. International City/County Management Association (ICMA) Performance Measures

The information was developed through our participation in a nation-wide study led by the International City/County Management Association (ICMA). As you will see in this budget document, each graph is annotated with: a definition (what is being measured); an analysis (what the data means and what steps have been taken in the last year); and next steps (what we plan to do with the data).

Reporting Structure

The budget includes 33 performance measures that have broad interest to the City Council, the public and the following departments: Police, Fire, Human Resources, Library, Parks, Recreation and Community Services, Community Development Services, Finance and Public Works Services. The ICMA study does not collect any measures for the City Manager, City Clerk, City Attorney or City Council functions. However, the support from these departments for the City-wide performance measure effort was critical to the success of collecting the data for measures and completing our fourth year in the program.

The performance results achieved by the City of Redwood City are compared with other cities shown on the graphs. We have attempted to select five comparison full service cities that are similar to Redwood City in size and structure. These five cities are Merced, Santa Monica, Davis, Carlsbad, and San Mateo. In previous years Daly City was one of our comparison cities. Unfortunately we learned that Daly City is no longer participating in the ICMA studies. In several cases, the data was not collected by all cities for a specific measure. In these cases, the next larger or smaller city, outside of the group of five cities, was used for comparison for that measure. We also found that some cities would report one year, but not the next. As a result, in many cases, it was necessary to select additional cities for comparison purposes. This reporting process will continue to evolve as ICMA works with member cities to refine the measures and the definitions.

On each graph there are two legends. The top legend shows the annual median for the cities on that graph. The bottom legend shows the national median for cities under 100,000 in population for the year 2000. While we don't have the national median data for previous years, we plan to include it on future graphs as it becomes available. We believe the national median will be more valuable as it provides a more accurate and broader comparison.

In addition, you will note that we are concentrating on 2000 data. However, you will also see 1998 and 1999 data so that we cannot only compare ourselves to other cities' 2000 data, but we can also compare ourselves to other cities' previous years' data as well as our own. Finally, you will see that we have also included 2001 data for Redwood City and a few of the comparison cities. Since Redwood City's 2001 information is available, as well as a few select comparison cities, we have included the information as it provides an additional year to track our progress to improve services. ICMA has made some improvement in their data collection and reporting systems. We will receive all of the information from ICMA regarding other cities in June 2002.

Even with these time limitations, we continue to find this process to be highly valuable, and we are committed to the process. We view the measures as the "door" we will use to open conversations and share ideas with other cities. In addition, the process demonstrates that we are:

- Open to a review of our methods;
- Willing to share with others;
- Interested in examining best practices;
- Seeking opportunities to challenge ourselves; and
- Promoting continuous improvement and innovation.

The ICMA Comparative Performance Measurement Program has become another way we are working to assure that we are providing exceptional Redwood City services. The program provides an effective means of being accountable for our performance and communicating our findings to the Council and citizens. The networks we are developing with comparable cities will provide a wealth of information and ideas. We anticipate the next ICMA data will be helpful to develop and refine policies and set priorities for this budget, especially at mid-budget review.

Performance Measures

2000 Comparison Cities Population Statistics

Jurisdiction	Population	Square Miles
Alameda	74,259	12.0
Antioch	84,485	29.0
Bellevue, Washington	106,400	31.0
Carlsbad	82,030	42.0
Daly City (no longer reporting)	104,200	8.0
Davis	58,629	10.0
Fullerton	128,500	22.0
Gresham, Oregon	85,435	23.0
La Mesa	59,210	9.0
Lodi	57,935	12.0
Merced	63,330	20.0
Pomona	147,700	23.0
Redwood City	78,000	34.0
Riverside	256,843	79.0
San Bernardino	184,500	59.0
San Jose	923,591	177.0
San Mateo	95,400	16.0
Santa Monica	96,528	8.0

2. Other Performance Measures

As you will see in the budget document, several departments are using comparative performance measures independent of the ICMA effort. This separate data collection effort confirms that this process is of great value to the departments. You will see examples of non-ICMA measures in Public Works Services, Human Resources and Finance.