

# ICMA Benchmarking Project FY 2006 Data Report

Charles Brideau, Assistant Director  
Housing Department  
February 4, 2008



# ICMA Benchmarking

- Dallas is entering its 4<sup>th</sup> year of participation in the International City/County Management Association (ICMA) Center for Performance Measurement
- The Center's purpose is to help local governments improve the effectiveness and efficiency of public services through the collection, analysis, and application of performance information
- The Center outlines a method for systematically collecting performance data for each participating organization's program or service



# ICMA Benchmarking (Continued)

- Over 160 jurisdictions participate with populations from 5,000 to 3.1 million
- 5 of 10 largest US cities currently participate:  
Houston (joined ICMA in FY06 and is expected to enter housing data for FY08)  
Phoenix, San Antonio, Dallas, San Jose
- 71 or 45% of participating jurisdictions provide housing data



# FY06 ICMA Services Assessment\*

- Housing Department Data analysis
  - Examine Dallas' Relative Position to all jurisdictions from FY04 to FY06
  - Compare Dallas to peer cities for FY06
    - Peer Cities – 21 cities reporting Housing data and having populations greater than 300,000
  - Compare Dallas to benchmark cities
    - Benchmark cities – 3 cities in Sunbelt with populations closest to Dallas
  - List “Proposed Actions” or actions taken based upon data analysis

\* The ICMA comparative analysis covers only a portion of the Housing Department activities and funding. The 05-06 fiscal year had 15% non-ICMA activities while 07-08 fiscal year projections anticipate a 50/50 split.



# Dallas' Relative Position to All Reporting Jurisdictions

	Outside Capital as % of Total Funding	<u>Constructed or Rehabilitated Units Added to Housing Stock</u> No. of units per \$100,000 Public Assistance	<u>Home Purchases</u> No. of units per \$100,000 Public Assistance	<u>Rehabilitation of Owner-Occupied Units</u> No. of units per \$100,000 of Assist. (Public/Outside Cap)
<b>FY2004</b>				
Dallas	NA	2.8	12.2	NA
Mean	64.3%	10.2	13.2	12.0
Median	63.2%	4.4	10.0	9.1
<b>FY2005</b>				
Dallas	58.9%	2.3	9.1	15.6
Mean	50.7%	9.3	13.3	10.7
Median	54.4%	4.3	10.6	6.7
<b>FY2006</b>				
Dallas	65.0%	2.1	11.6	15.5
Mean	49.3	5.1	9.7	8.9
Median	57.3	2.6	10.2	6.5



## Relative Position to All Reporting Jurisdictions FY05 / FY06

- Areas of Strength
  - Outside capital leveraged and number of owner-occupied units rehabilitated per \$100,000 exceed mean and median for all jurisdictions and peer jurisdictions
- Area of Concern
  - Production of new owner-occupied and multi-family units decreased slightly from FY05 to FY06



# FY06 Peer City Comparison

Peer Jurisdictions (Populations 300,000+)	Population	Outside Capital as % of Total Funding	Constructed or Rehabilitated Units <u>Added to Housing Stock</u>	<u>Home Purchases</u>	Rehabilitation of <u>Owner-Occupied Units</u>
			No. of units per \$100,000 of Public Assistance	No. of units per \$100,000 of Public Assistance	No. of units per \$100,000 of Total Asst. (Public/Outside Cap)
<b>Mean</b>		44.6%	3.1	9.3	10.2
<b>Median</b>		49.3%	2.1	10.4	7.5
Phoenix AZ	1,507,130	55.4%	3.1	2.7	17.0
Nassau County NY	1,333,137		1.6	7.7	11.9
San Antonio TX	1,319,500		3.8	10.5	5.6
Dallas TX	1,260,950	65.0%	2.1	11.6	15.5
Fairfax County VA	1,072,233	43.8%	1.8	.5	14.3
San Jose CA	953,679		1.6		
Austin TX	707,952	65.6%	1.9	10.8	34.6
Las Vegas NV	588,615		.6	12.1	14.1
Pinellas County FL	583,204	29.9%	1.2	1.3	4.7
Portland OR	556,370		3.0		6.2
Oklahoma City OK	543,800		1.9	19.3	
Long Beach CA	490,166	9.3%			3.1
Mesa AZ	455,984	49.3%	3.3	4.8	7.5
Virginia Beach VA	437,778	23.8%	2.4	12.7	4.6
Santa Barbara County CA	421,625		2.9		
Prince William County VA	420,978			1.3	2.7
Colorado Springs CO	394,914		13.0	9.3	
Reno NV	396,844			10.3	5.8
Sarasota County FL	367,867			1.9	
Arlington TX	348,965		1.8	16.6	8.4
Rockford IL	339,178	59.2%	6.1	20.0	11.0
Aurora CO	303,833		3.1	13.9	5.8

Note: Data is not available for the areas that are blank for the respective jurisdictions



## Dallas' Position with Peer Cities (Populations 300,000 or More)

	<u>Outside Capital as % of Total Funding</u>	<u>Constructed or Rehabilitated Units Added to Housing Stock</u>  No. of units per \$100,000 Public Assistance	<u>Home Purchases</u>  No. of units per \$100,000 Public Assistance	<u>Rehabilitation of Owner-Occupied Units</u>  No. of units per \$100,000 of Assist. (Public/Outside Cap)
FY2004	NA	12 <sup>th</sup> out of 17	4 <sup>th</sup> out of 17	NA
FY2005	4th out of 7 (at the median)	13 <sup>th</sup> out of 16	8 <sup>th</sup> out of 21	3 <sup>rd</sup> out of 13
FY2006	2 <sup>nd</sup> out of 9	9 <sup>th</sup> out of 17 (at the median)	7 <sup>th</sup> out of 18	3 <sup>rd</sup> out of 17



# FY06 Peer City Comparison

- Dallas Position with Peer Cities
  - Outside capital as % of total funding – 2nd out of 9 (position improved from FY05, exceeding mean and median for all jurisdictions and peers)
  - Units added to housing stock – 9<sup>th</sup> out of 17 (position improved from FY05 and at the median for peer jurisdictions)
  - Home purchases – 7<sup>th</sup> out of 18 (exceeds mean and median for all jurisdictions and peers)
  - Rehabilitation of owner-occupied units – 3<sup>rd</sup> out of 17 (exceeds mean and median for all jurisdictions and peers)
- Areas of Strength
  - Leveraging
  - Rehabilitation of owner-occupied units



# FY06 Peer City Comparison Continued

- Areas of Concern
  - Constructed or Rehabilitated Units Public Funding
    - Constructed or rehabilitated units includes both multi-family and single-family units, and Dallas' priority is to produce single-family units, and
    - Dallas' multi-family production comes from Dallas Housing Finance Corporation
  - Home Purchases Public Funding
    - Peer cities have large differences in market value of properties for sale, and
    - There is a difference in types of subsidies offered (down payment v. principal reduction above down payment and closing costs)



# CUSTOMER FEEDBACK

- Homerepair Program
  - Homeowner Questionnaire – Used for past 4 years
    - Helpfulness of City staff and contractor
    - Construction Workmanship
    - Comments and suggestions
  - Inspector Questionnaire – Used for past 3 years
    - Construction started and work completed on time
    - Contractor followed specifications & work write-up
    - Contractor & subcontractors professional & courteous
  - Contractor Questionnaire – Used for past 2 years
    - Clarity and completeness of write-up
    - Response to request for inspections within 48 hours
    - Professional behavior
  - Homeowner questionnaire tracked in Management Focus with 91% satisfaction rate
    - Proposed Homerepair Program changes will increase funding for each system repaired or home built and will require additional choice of plans for replacement homes to increase satisfaction rate



# CUSTOMER FEEDBACK

- People Helping People Program
  - Homeowner Questionnaire – Used for past 5 years
    - Were staff and volunteers courteous
    - Was work completed
    - Were your questions and concerns addressed
    - Questionnaire tracked in Management Focus with 98% satisfaction rate
  - Volunteer Questionnaire – Used for past 5 years
    - Match of volunteer construction skills to project
    - Receipt of all materials for scope of project
    - Ways in which program can be improved
- Mortgage Assistance Program Questionnaire Developed in FY06-07 and will produce first full year of data in FY07-08



# BENCHMARKING

- ICMA Benchmarking FY05 And FY06 Data
  - Phoenix, San Antonio, San Jose
  - ICMA Data Observations
    - Overall, Dallas is first among the benchmark cities in total number of units produced and ranks first in number of units per \$100,000 public funds spent for home purchases.
    - Dallas places greater emphasis on production of home purchases.
    - Dallas is successfully leveraging its dollars to maximize homeownership opportunities.
    - Dallas is second only to Phoenix in the number of units of owner-occupied rehabilitation.
    - Although production of multi-family units is not a priority, Dallas uses HFC bond funds to produce a number of units per \$100,000 of funding that is competitive with San Jose in FY05 and FY06 but behind Phoenix and San Antonio for both years.



# BENCHMARKING

- **Benchmark Cities Priorities And Funding**
  - **Housing Priorities** – Dallas has prioritized production of new owner-occupied residential units in contrast to the emphasis on new rental units in San Jose and Phoenix. San Antonio gives rehabilitation of owner-occupied units its highest priority. Both Phoenix and Dallas also give priority to financing homeownership.
  - **Funding** – Dallas has the highest total expenditure of public financial assistance in FY05 and was second to San Jose in FY06. San Jose and Phoenix provide more bond funding for housing. San Antonio funds housing from its HUD entitlement grants, and of the benchmark cities, spends the least on housing.
  - **Expenditures** - Dallas ranks second behind San Jose in public funding used for completed owner-occupied and rental units in FY06 but is first in FY05. Dallas was second only to Phoenix in public funds for rehab for owner-occupied and rental units. Dallas uses significantly more funding for homeownership assistance than benchmark cities.



# ACTIONS TAKEN

- Program Changes
  - City Council gave authority to modify Basic Service Repair and Replacement Housing Programs to increase total number of repairs and replacements.
  - \$1,000,000 was set aside in home buyer subsidy funding for nonprofit Community Housing Development Organizations to increase number of home sales by nonprofit developers.
  - 11<sup>th</sup> month inspection of homerepair and replacement projects was added to seek customer feedback and review construction viability and warranty concerns.



# Next Steps in ICMA Benchmarking

- Participating City Departments are preparing to report FY 2007 data
- Meeting with participating North Texas Cities to benchmark service delivery - Winter 2007-08
- Departments continue to contact other jurisdictions to research best practices and methods to improve service delivery

