Commission on Productivity and Innovation Status Report

Finance, Audit and Accountability Committee

June 11, 2007

Background

 The Commission on Productivity and Innovation (CPI) was established in February 2004 to provide a private sector evaluation of specific City services that may be improved through increased productivity, efficiencies, privatization or other innovations

Past Highlights

- Centralized Collections Unit established to perform delinquent revenue collections for multiple departments;
 - Formulated original idea for a single invoice which is now being incorporated into the new water billing system called PAY 1
- Parking Management outsourced to ACS
- Centralized Loss Prevention (Safety) function established within Risk Management/Human Resources
- Repair and maintenance of Heavy Sanitation equipment fleet outsourced to Serco
- Verified Response recommended to reduce time officers spend responding to false alarms and focus on true crime
- Procedural improvements developed and recommended for the sale of surplus real estate

Current Initiatives

- Multi-Family Recycling Worked with Sanitation department and external experts to evaluate feasibility of multi-family recycling, including Mayor's 2003 Recycling Task Force recommendations
 - Recommendations from the CPI Multi-Family Recycling subcommittee were approved by the full Commission on May 21, 2007 and are being forwarded to the City Manager for comments
- 2. High Technology Recycling Work with Sanitation department to explore a collection based recycling program for mobile telephones, personal computers, and consumer electronics. Identify potential private industry partnerships and develop a consistent approach for collection
 - The CPI Multi-Family Recycling sub-committee is currently conducting research for this initiative
- 3. Development Services Work with Development Services department to investigate outsourcing options for plan review, occupancy permit function, and inspection, to improve efficiency and customer satisfaction of the development process
 - Waiting on a new Building Official before starting this project

Current Initiatives

- 4. Retirement Options Review the current pension plan and the long term viability of pension plans; assess impact on employee recruiting; and develop alternative retirement program approaches to reduce economic risk and improve recruiting
 - A CPI sub-committee is working with Administrator Cheryl Alston and researching retirement options
 - Recommendations to the full Commission are scheduled for July and w
 - Approved recommendations will be forwarded to Finance, Audit, and Accountability in August
 - Recommendations will also be forwarded to the Employee's Retirement Fund Board
- 5. Permit Compliance Software Develop an approach to identify businesses operating without a permit; and investigate software designed to improve operating permit compliance for alcohol, foodservice, adult business, and other major permit categories
 - A CPI sub-committee is currently researching options to meet the objectives of this task
- 6. Sanitation Efficiency Measures Work with Sanitation on policy and garbage collection methods to increase efficiency and reduce cost
 - Working with the director, Mary Nix, to develop recommendation that will be offered in the near term

Current Initiatives

- 7. Performance Evaluation System Work with Strategic Customer Services and Human Resources to develop an ongoing method of linking performance management objectives with the employee performance appraisals
 - CPI sub-committee is actively working with the Human Resources director, David Etheridge, to understand the existing system and offer recommendations for improvement
 - The Commission supports the HR training initiatives
- 8. Porous Pavement Work with Public Works and Transportation to investigate new porous pavement options; and evaluate the costs and benefits of utilizing paving alternatives
 - On hold pending recommendations from the city's environmental committee
- 9. Street Lighting Worked with Public Works and Transportation to investigate options to maximize lighting uptime while minimizing labor costs
 - Recommendations from the CPI Street Lighting sub-committee were approved by the full Commission on May 21, 2007 and are being forwarded to the City Manager for comments

Continuing Initiatives

- City Attorneys Office Continue working with City Attorneys Office to increase accountability and efficiency; and implement procedures to control costs and improve customer service
 - Continuing to work with Tom Perkins to implement our recommendations
 - Tracking contracts City Manager now requires all contracts to be completed prior to council approval; a new tracking system is also being implemented
 - Client relations Tom has met with all department heads and discussed lawyer-client expectations; he plans to do this annually to improve communications and efficiency
 - Tracking attorney time the new computer system gives management the option of tracking attorney's time; after full implementation of the system we will work with Tom to jointly identify areas where tracking time is beneficial
 - Work flow Management and Costs allocation monitoring New management software has been purchased; training and conversion will be completed by the end of summer

Continuing Initiatives

- Loss Control Continue to work with Human Resources on the implementation of effective loss control procedures
 - Consolidation completed with the exception of Police and Fire
 - Workers' Compensation costs were reduced by \$3.2 million in FY 05-06 since the consolidation of loss prevention (safety) and change in third party administrators *
- 12. Surplus Property Worked with Real Estate Services to reinforce marketing strategy developed in 2006; and consider an employee incentive program to expedite property sales
 - Waiting on City Attorneys Office to draft language to incorporate Commission's recommendations

^{*} City of Dallas, Risk Control Scorecard included in the Exhibits

Update to Past Initiatives

13. Fair Park Asset Performance

No progress

14. Fleet Maintenance

- On May 21, 2007 received staff briefing on the status of the first full year of outsourcing
- Commission supports Staff's effort to issue an RFP for possible outsourcing of an entire service center

15. Parking Meters

No action

16. Commercial Verified Response

CPI Sub-committee continues to monitor

17. Vital Statistics

 Commission continues to monitor progress of options being implemented to improve customer service

Exhibit

City of Dallas, Risk Control Scorecard FY 2006-2007 **Human Resources Department** October 1, 2006 through March 31, 2007

ment	Industry Benchmark (10 Points) Goal - 2				Claim Cost pal - 20 Percent Reduction (10 Points)			Safety Training (10 Points)			Vehicle Collisions Goal - 20 Percent Reduction (40 Points)					Facility and Equipment Inspections (10 Points)				Injury Claims Goal - 20 Percent Reduction (20 Points)						Subrogation Recovery Notices (5 Points deducted if response rate less than 75%)			s YTD					
Department	Dept Incidence Flate	BLS- Incidence Rate	Mid Year Grade	Three Year Average Cost per Claim	Cost Per Claim FYTD 06-07 thru 3/31/07	Mid Yoar Grade	Mid Year Goal	Completed Training Hours	Percent Of Mid-Year Goal	Mid Year Grade	Mid Year Collisions (Three year average)	Collisions 10/1/06 thn 3/31/07	1st Quarter	2nd Quarter	3rd Quarter	4th Quarter	Mid Year Grade	Conducte d 10/01/06 thru 3/31/07	Total Findings	Findings Corrected	Urgent Findings (-1 each)	Mid Year Grade	Mid Year Injury Rate (Three year average)	Injuries 10/1/2006 thru 3/31/2007	1st Quarter	2nd Quarter			rade S	Notices Sent to F Depts	e	Dept. Response Rate (percent)	Recovery Points	Total Points
//	7.10	6.8	D	11,858	3,874	Α	1,591	469	29%	F	1	.0	0	0			Α	0	0			Α	12	14	9	5			D	$\neg \uparrow$	_	0	0	75
M	0.00	0.9	Α	18,785	0	Α	212	0	0%	F	0	C	0	0			Α	0	0			A	1	1	0	1			С			0	0	80
т	0.00	1.0	Α	5,316	840	Α	699	180	26%	F	LO		C	0		5	1 A	0	0			Α	3	2	2	o			Α			0	0	9:
JD	0.00	0.2	Α	0	0	Α	137	0	0%	F	q	7 T #	2	0		52	٦A	0	0			Α	0	0	0	0			Α			0	0	9
10	0.00	3.5	6/30/2010/2010	0	0	Α	209	0	0%	F	q		7	120	\mathbf{H}		ľΑ	0	0			Α	1	0	0	0			Α			0	0	9
30	0.00	1.6		61	0	Α	79	0	0%	F	ď			13	Ш	$\sqcup \sqcup$	٩A	0	0			Α	1	0	0	o			Α			0	0	9
/S	0.00	1.0		0	0	A	93	0	0%	F	0	C	C	O			Α	0	0			Α	1	0	0	0			Α			0	0	9
:s	3.03	5.5	67.000.000.000	5,725	1,677	Α	1,618	1,278	79%	С	8	C	<u> </u>	0			Α	0	0			A	29	18	11	7			Α			0	0	9
S	1.30	0.7		4,123	875	Α	748	36	5%	F	2	С	1	1 4	\sqcup		Α	0	0			Α	3	8	11	4		-	F			0	0	-
rs	3.17	3.7	000000000000000000000000000000000000000	4,252	1,665	A	641	582	91%	Α	1	0	1 0	0	\sqcup		Α	0	0			Α	6	2	-	0		_	Α			0	0	
v	1.16	2.6	200/0000220000000	5,829	1,547	A	818	18	2%	F	2	1	0) 1	\sqcup		Α	0	0			Α	10	5	1-1	0		-	A			0	0	
-	0.76	1.0		1,713	2,125	A	1,230	953	78%	C	6	4	2		\sqcup		Α	0	0			Α	6	4	1-1	3			A			0	0	
F	0.00	1.8		21,801	0	A	180	0	0%	F	0	0	1 0	0	\square		Α	0	0			Α	0	0	1 4	0		-	A			0	0	
is I	1.44	1.5		7.404	0	A	80	0	0%	F	0	C	1 0) 0			Α	0	0			Α	0	0	1 4	이		_	A	\dashv	\dashv	0	0	
s	3.12	4.3		7,461 4,147	288	<u> </u>	1,894	721	38%	F	3	1	1 0	1	\vdash		A	0	0			Α	21	14		10		-	A			0	0	
R	5.71	15.8	0.0000000000000000000000000000000000000	3,707	1,970 7,648	A	2,843 1,069	1,716	60%	D	6	4	1 3	1	├		Α	0	0			Α	27	16		8			A			0	0	
u l	0.00	5.7	0.0200000000000000000000000000000000000	1,050	1,000		623	24	0%	F	64	33	-	15			A	0	0			Α	280	192		111		_	A			0	0	
n d	0.00	0.8		1,148	1,000	A	363	24 45	4%	F	1	0	 `	1 0	\vdash		Α	0	0			Α	3	1	0	-1			A	\rightarrow		0	0	
u l	0.00	0.5		1,140	0	Â	200	45 0	12% 0%	F	1	Ċ	1 -	1 0	\vdash	_	A	0	0			Α	3	0	0	0		_	Α	\rightarrow	$-\!\!\!\!+$	0	0	
3	0.00	2.1		3,739	1,781	A	2,038			F	- 0	0	 	1 0	\vdash	_	A	U	0			Α	,	0	0	- 0			A			0	0	
c +	4.13	2.6		5,774	19,214	$\frac{\lambda}{\lambda}$	2,038	- 0	0% 0%	F	0	0	1 -	1 0	\vdash		A	0	0			Α	9	3	2	1		_	A :		$-\!\!\!\!+$	0	0	
SA	0.00	7.0	-	3,634	13,414	^	376	132	35%	F	0	0	-	1 0	$\vdash \vdash \vdash$.A	٥				A	1	2	0	- 2		_	F		\longrightarrow	0	0	
<u>a</u>	0.00	3.9	17.00//10.000	0,034	0	^	85	132	35%	F	0	0	1	1 - 0	$\vdash \vdash \vdash$		A	0	0			A	1 0	0	0	-0	-		A		\longrightarrow	0	0	
-s	0.00	1.6		9,714	0	A	489	- 0	0%	F	0	- 0		1 0	$\vdash \vdash \vdash$		A					A	1	1.00		- 4	+		A		\longrightarrow	0	0	9
EM	0.00	3.9		3,, 14	0	A	51	54	107%	A	0	- 0	1	1 - 1	$\vdash \vdash \vdash$		A	0	- 0			A	0	1.00	0	- 1		-	C	\dashv		0	0	
(R	2.70	8.8	200000000000000000000000000000000000000	3,516	2,779	A	6,479	12,008	185%	A	22	17	1 -		├─┤		A	<u>۱</u>			\vdash	A	98	80	1 4	33			A A	-	6	90	0	10
a de	6.11	12.3	A	4,339	4,954	A	3,242	12,000	0%	F	178	147	61	86	$\vdash \vdash$	-	A	0	0		 	A	507	466		251			A	57	18	86 32	0	10
P	0.00	0.8	***************************************	7,000	7,004	A	J,E.42	- 0	0%	F	1/0	147	-	00	\vdash		A	H 1		4	 	A	507	466	215	201	\dashv	_	C A	-5/	18	32	-5	
vr 1	3.02	5.7		3,112	6,417	A	2,458	894	36%	F	19	21	 	12	$\vdash \vdash \vdash$		D	'	- '			A	14	17	1 7	10			_	204	170	87	0	9
W	3.60	6.5	200000000000000000000000000000000000000	6,587	3,172	A	3,859	3,113	81%	В	82	69	29	_	-	\dashv	В	- 0	- 0			A	59	43		10		_		204 10	178	70	0	
s	3.06	5.7				-								_		-		<u>ا</u>	- /		\vdash					12	+		A				-5 ^	
VU	1.22	2.6				***************************************							-	-		-		<u>ار</u>								25	\dashv	_	_		49			9
tals										v			_				U				- ,	Α			-			_			201		-5	7
VU					8,932 4,381 4,567	4,381 3,533	4,381 3,533 A	4,381 3,533 A 9,687	4,381 3,533 A 9,687 7,674	4,381 3,533 A 9,687 7,674 79%	4,381 3,533 A 9,687 7,674 79% C	4,381 3,533 A 9,687 7,674 79% C 59	4,381 3,533 A 9,687 7,674 79% C 59 61	4,381 3,533 A 9,687 7,674 79% C 59 61 35	4,381 3,533 A 9,687 7,674 79% C 59 61 35 26	4,381 3,533 A 9,687 7,674 79% C 59 61 35 26	4,381 3,533 A 9,687 7,674 79% C 59 61 35 26	4,381 3,533 A 9,687 7,674 79% C 59 61 35 26 D	4,381 3,533 A 9,687 7,674 79% C 59 61 35 26 D 0	4,381 3,533 A 9,687 7,674 79% C 59 61 35 26 D 0 0	4,381 3,533 A 9,687 7,674 79% C 59 61 35 26 D 0 0	4,381 3,533 A 9,687 7,674 79% C 59 61 35 26 D 0 0	4,381 3,533 A 9,687 7,674 79% C 59 61 35 26 D 0 0 A	4,381 3,533 A 9,687 7,674 79% C 59 61 35 26 D 0 0 A 74	4,381 3,533 A 9,687 7,674 79% C 59 61 35 26 D 0 0 A 74 54	4,381 3,533 A 9,687 7,674 79% C 59 61 35 26 D 0 0 A 74 54 29	4,381 3,533 A 9,687 7,674 79% C 59 61 35 26 D 0 0 A 74 54 29 25	4,381 3,533 A 9,687 7,674 79% C 59 61 35 26 D 0 0 A 74 54 29 25	4,381 3,533 A 9,687 7,674 79% C 59 61 35 26 D 0 0 A 74 54 29 25	4,381 3,533 A 9,687 7,674 79% C 59 61 35 26 D 0 0 A 74 54 29 25 A	4,381 3,533 A 9,687 7,674 79% C 59 61 35 26 D 0 0 A 74 54 29 25 A 6	4,381 3,533 A 9,687 7,674 79% C 59 61 35 26 D 0 0 A 74 54 29 25 A 6 3	4,381 3,533 A 9,687 7,674 79% C 59 61 35 26 D 0 0 A 74 54 29 25 A 6 3 50	4,381 3,533 A 9,687 7,674 79% C 59 61 35 26 D 0 0 A 74 54 29 25 A 6 3 50 -5

Distinguished = 90-100 Superior = 80 -89 Fully Successful = 70 - 79

The Scorecard indicators tell how well departments are doing on safety; training employees, keeping collisions and injuries from happening and making sure their vehicles, Industry Benchmark- Departments are awarded more points for being further offices and work areas are maintained and in working order. Benefits of using the Sc

Scorecard Grading

Maximum Points

away from the industry benchmark.

10 Points

Industry standard vs department actual Bureau of Labor Statistics "Standard for Injuries". Injuries x 200,000 (40 hours/week X 50 weeks/year) H

10 Points

40 Points

10 Points

20 Points

-5 Points

100 Points

10 Points

				-5 Points Total 100 Points
Point Scale for Industry Benchmark	Point Scale for Claim Cost	Point Scale for Safety Training	Point Scale for Collisions	Point Scale for Injury Claims
20 % Reduction = A	20 % Reduction = A	>= 100% Compliance= A	20% Reduction = A	20 % Reduction = A
10% Reduction = B	10% Reduction = B	90-99% Compliance = A	10% Reduction = B	10 % Reduction = B
No Reduction = C	No Reduction = C	80-89% Compliance = B	No Reduction = C	No Reduction = C
10 % Greater = D	10 % Greater = D	70-79% Compliance = C	10% Greater = D	10 % Greater = D
20 % Greater = D	20% Greater = D	60-69% Compliance = D	20% Greater = D	20 % Greater = D
30 % Greater = D	30 % Greater = D	50-59% Compliance = F	30% Greater = D	30% Greater = D
40% Greater = D	40 % Greater = D	40-49% Compliance = F	40% Greater = D	40% Greater = D
50 % or Greater = F	50 % Greater = D	30-39% Compliance = F	50% Greater = D	50% and Higher = F
	Greater than 60 %= F	20-29% Compliance = F	60% or Greater = F	
		10-19% Compliance = F		

0-9% Compliance = F