



STAFF REPORT ACTION REQUIRED

Toronto's 2006 Performance Measurement and Benchmarking Report

Date:	March 19, 2008
To:	Executive Committee
From:	City Manager
Wards:	All
Reference Number:	

SUMMARY

This and the accompanying report included as Attachment B, entitled Toronto's 2006 Performance Measurement and Benchmarking Report, provide service level and performance measurement results in nineteen service areas. It includes up to seven years of Toronto's historical data to examine internal trends, and compares results externally to fourteen other municipalities through the Ontario Municipal CAOs Benchmarking Initiative (OMBI).

In December 2007, the fifteen OMBI member municipalities released a joint report entitled OMBI 2006 Performance Benchmarking Report (OMBI Joint Report), which is included as Attachment C. The OMBI Joint Report provides 2005 and 2006 summary data in sixteen service areas. Municipal results for each performance measure are presented as information in alphabetical order, but the report does not attempt to interpret or rank the results of municipalities in any way.

Toronto's 2006 Performance Measurement and Benchmarking Report, expands on the OMBI Joint Report by focusing on Toronto's results in terms of our internal year-over-year changes and longer term trends, and the ranking of Toronto's results in an external comparison to the other OMBI municipalities. It also includes three additional service areas, more performance measures and service level indicators, and the identification of key factors influencing Toronto's results.

Toronto is unique among Ontario municipalities because of its size and its role as the centre of business, culture, entertainment, sporting and provincial and international governance activities in the Greater Toronto Area. The most accurate comparison for

Toronto is to examine our own year-over-year performance and longer-term historical trends.

Results show that for 83% of the service level indicators, Toronto's service levels were maintained (stable) or have increased in 2006 compared to 2005. Toronto's internal trends in performance measurement results (efficiency, customer service and community impact) indicate that 73% of the measures had results that were either improved or stable in 2006 in relation to 2005. This report also includes for each service area, a number of continuous improvement initiatives from 2007 and 2008 that may further improve Toronto's operations in the future.

Despite Toronto's unique place in Ontario, there is also value in comparing Toronto's 2006 results to those of other Ontario municipalities. Toronto's results have been ranked by quartile, in relation to other municipalities for 43 service level indicators and 89 performance measures. Between Toronto's 2005 and 2006 Benchmarking Reports, there has been very little change in Toronto's quartile ranking for each of the indicators and measures in relation to other municipalities. Changes in Toronto's quartile ranking for individual measures is more likely to occur over a five-year or longer period.

Factors that make Toronto unique, such as our high population density, fully developed urban form and older infrastructure, can have a significant influence on why Toronto's results are higher or lower in relation to other municipalities. To assist in understanding the impact these factors can have on Toronto's ranking, results in this report have also been grouped from across service areas with these key influencing factors.

It is also recognized that comparisons of Toronto's service delivery and quality of life should also go beyond Ontario and include results from other large Canadian and international cities if comparable data is available. Other national and international initiatives Toronto is involved in are described briefly in this report.

This report also includes as Attachment A, findings of a review undertaken of the winter control operations in the Transportation Services Division, with respect to their efficiency and effectiveness as well as initiatives that have and will take place to further improve their operations.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The City Manager recommends that:

1. Applicable sections of the attached report entitled Toronto's 2006 Performance Measurement and Benchmarking Report, be considered in the development and review of Service Plans; and
2. The General Manager of Transportation Services report back to the Public Works and Infrastructure Committee after the seven-year winter control contracts have been

awarded, on any savings or increased effectiveness that are expected to be realized in the future from these contracts.

FINANCIAL IMPACT

As this report deals with performance measurement results of prior years, there are no financial implications arising from this report.

EQUITY IMPACT STATEMENT

This report summarizes Toronto's performance measurement results in nineteen service areas and also includes data of up to fourteen other Ontario municipalities. The measures and indicators included are at a high level and therefore are not at a level of detail that would allow for an equity impact analysis to be undertaken.

DECISION HISTORY

In April 2006, Council recommended that "Benchmarking results of additional program areas, not covered by the provincially-mandated Municipal Performance Measurement Program (MPMP), also be reported to the Executive Committee. "

This report on Toronto's 2006 Performance Measurement and Benchmarking Results is the second such report that has been prepared.

In April 2007, Council recommended that the City Manager be requested to annually select, as the 'target improvement area of the year', one area where the City's performance is found to be within the fourth quartile, and to review that target improvement area and develop a remediation plan for consideration by the Executive Committee and the Budget Committee.

The winter control of Toronto's road network was the area selected by the City Manager to report on.

ISSUE BACKGROUND

From 2000 to 2005, the City Manager prepared a series of reports on Toronto's performance measurement results under MPMP, a provincially-mandated program that requires all Ontario municipalities to report annually on performance measurement results.

With the development of the Ontario Municipal CAOs Benchmarking Initiative (OMBI), which is more comprehensive than MPMP, the City Manager's April 2007 report on Toronto's 2005 Performance Measurement and Benchmarking Report, marked the first year that the focus was on reporting OMBI results.

This report on Toronto's 2006 Performance Measurement and Benchmarking results, builds on the work done in the 2005 report. It includes for the first time results for Building Services, Parks Services and Taxation Services.

City staff have been working for a number of years in collaboration with other Ontario municipalities through OMBI. In December 2007, the fifteen OMBI member municipalities released a joint report entitled OMBI 2006 Performance Benchmarking Report (OMBI Joint Report).

This OMBI Joint Report is included as Attachment C, and provides 2005 and 2006 summary data in sixteen service areas. Municipal results for each performance measure are presented as information in alphabetical order, but the report does not attempt to interpret or rank the results of municipalities in any way. Each OMBI member has the option of doing further analysis to interpret their own OMBI data and issuing a local public report.

Toronto's 2006 Performance Measurement and Benchmarking Report, is included as Attachment B. It differs from the OMBI Joint Report through the inclusion of:

- Three service areas not covered in the OMBI Joint Report (Children's Services, Hostel Services and Governance and Corporate Management).
- Additional performance measures and service level indicators not included with the sixteen service areas in the OMBI Joint Report.
- Up to seven years of Toronto's historical data, to better understand trends in our own internal service levels and performance, and the description of Toronto's 2005 to 2006 change as either favourable, stable or unfavourable.
- Ranking of Toronto's results, by quartile in relation to the other municipalities, to assist in interpreting how well Toronto is doing.
- Factors that have been identified as significantly influencing Toronto's results.
- Achievements from 2007 and initiatives planned for 2008 that could further improve Toronto's operations in the future.

This report is centred on results that can be quantified, however there are a number of qualitative factors, such as achievements or innovative initiatives currently being piloted, that are not captured in these results. Toronto has won numerous awards in recent years for quality and innovation in delivering public services. This information is equally important and must also be considered in any evaluation.

The City is also doing more to foster a climate and culture of continuous improvement in our programs. Attachment A to this report (Review of Winter Maintenance of Roads) is illustrative of this and describes staff efforts to find ways to improve services delivered to the public.

COMMENTS

Toronto's Performance Measurement Framework

In November 2001, Council approved a report from the City Manager on the City of Toronto's performance measurement framework for service delivery. This framework is used in Toronto's annual budget process and is similar to that used in OMBI. It includes the following four categories of indicators and measures:

- **Service Level Indicators-** provide an indication of the service levels, or amount of resources approved by Council or volumes of service delivered to residents. For the purposes of comparing to other municipalities it is often expressed on a common basis, such as the number of units of service per 100,000 population.
- **Performance Measures**
 - Efficiency - compares the resources used to the number of units of service provided or delivered. Typically this is expressed in terms of cost per unit of service.
 - Customer Service - measures the quality of service delivered relative to service standards or the customer's needs and expectations.
 - Community Impact - measures the outcome, impact or benefit the City program is having on the communities they serve in relation to the intended purpose or societal outcomes expected. These often tie to the mission statements of the program or service.

It is the responsibility of staff, with the financial resources and associated service levels and/or standards approved by Council, to deliver service as efficiently, and with the highest customer service and/or positive impact on the community, as possible.

Balancing the optimal combination of efficiency and customer service is an ongoing challenge. Too much focus on efficiency, in isolation, may have an adverse impact on customer service or community impact, and vice versa.

With respect to community impact measures, it is also a challenge to separate the portion of these impacts or outcomes that are related to City programs versus the efforts or responsibilities of partners, such as other orders of government or the private sector.

Using this performance measurement framework, Toronto's results can be examined internally over a period of years or externally in relation to other municipalities.

What is the Ontario Municipal CAOs Benchmarking Initiative (OMBI)?

For a number of years Toronto has been an active participant in OMBI. The fifteen municipalities that comprise OMBI, noted below, serve more than 9.1 million residents or 72% of Ontario's population for regional services. OMBI's members are comprised of the following eight single-tier cities/counties and seven regional or upper tier municipalities:

Single Tier Municipalities	Upper-Tier Municipalities
City of Hamilton	Regional Municipality of Durham
City of London	Regional Municipality of Halton
City of Ottawa	Regional Municipality of Niagara
City of Greater Sudbury	Regional Municipality of Peel
City of Thunder Bay	Regional Municipality of Waterloo
City of Toronto	Regional Municipality of York
City of Windsor	District of Muskoka
County of Brant	

Together, staff from our municipalities have gathered and examined data in a number of service areas. This initiative is unique for the spirit of openness in which it was conducted and for the scale of collaboration required to collect information.

The approach and methodologies developed through OMBI, have been constructed over a number of years to enhance the comparability of information and include:

- Detailed technical definitions for each performance measure
- Costing methodologies based on the Financial Information Return (FIR)
- A methodology to allocate program support costs (such as Human Resources and Information & Technology) to the operating programs they support. In this way, differences in organizational structure (centralized, de-centralized or mixed program support model) are not a factor in comparisons of costs
- Identification of factors that can influence municipal results for each measure
- A web-based data warehouse used to collect and share information

Panels of experts in each service area have been established with representatives from member municipalities meeting on a periodic basis, to plan for, and review data that has been collected.

The benefits of this collaboration through OMBI extend beyond the generation of performance measurement results to the identification and sharing of practices that can improve performance. A number of best practices have been identified in the roads, solid waste management and water and wastewater service areas, which are listed in Appendix F of the OMBI Joint Report.

What is Included in Toronto's 2006 Performance Measurement and Benchmarking Report?

Toronto is unique among Ontario municipalities because of its size and its role as the centre of business, culture, entertainment, sporting and provincial and international governance activities in the Greater Toronto Area.

Approximately 20 million tourists visited Toronto in 2006 and there is an estimated daily influx of 356,000 non-resident vehicles entering the City from surrounding regions during the morning rush hours, in addition to non-residents entering the City through public transit. All of these factors pose special demands on Toronto's municipal services.

Even our largest single-tier municipal comparators within Ontario, such as Hamilton and Ottawa, have a significant rural component that Toronto does not.

The most accurate comparison for any municipality is to examine one's own year-over-year performance and longer-term historical trends. For this reason, it was considered important to include up to seven years of Toronto's internal data in this report.

The external data obtained through OMBI, helps us better understand our own municipal performance over time within a broader context, by providing comparable information of other municipalities.

Toronto's performance measurement results are therefore examined from two perspectives:

- Internal comparison – comparing Toronto's 2006 versus 2005 results and examining longer-term trends for:
 - Service Levels - the amount of resources devoted to providing the service or the units of service provided
 - Results – measures related to the efficiency and effectiveness (customer service or community impact) of operations
 - Trends in Toronto's results are described as favourable, stable or unfavourable
- External comparison – comparing Toronto's 2006 performance measurement results to other OMBI municipalities for:
 - Service Levels - the amount of resources devoted to providing the service or the units of service provided
 - Results – measures related to the efficiency and effectiveness (customer service or community impact) of operations
 - Municipal results are sorted from what would be considered as the most to least desirable and Toronto's result is placed in the appropriate quartile (1st quartile has the best performance measurement results or highest service levels)

Attachment B includes a section that describes in more detail this methodology and how to interpret the colour-coded summaries and charts in Toronto's Benchmarking Report.

The nineteen service areas included in Toronto's Benchmarking Report are:

Building Services	Road Services
Children's Services	Social Assistance Services
Emergency Medical Services	Social Housing Services
Fire Services	Solid Waste Management Services
Governance and Corporate Management	Sports and Recreation Services
Hostel Services	Taxation Services
Library Services	Transit Services
Long Term Care/Homes for the Aged	Wastewater Services
Parks Services	Water Services
Police Services	

Internal Comparison - How Have Toronto's Service Levels Changed Between 2006 and 2005?

Of the thirty-five service level indicators included in Toronto's 2006 Performance Measurement and Benchmarking Report, 2006 service levels have been maintained (stable) or have increased (favourable) for 83% of the indicators in relation to 2005.

Examples of some of the areas in which Toronto's service levels or levels of activity have increased in 2006 are:

- More ICI (Industrial, Commercial and Institutional) building permits were issued
- There was an increased investment in Children's Services and increased number of both regulated and subsidized child care spaces
- An increase in the number of emergency medical calls responded to by EMS
- There are more hostel beds in shelters
- Increased kilometres of trails in the Parks system
- Additional police officers
- The capacity for registered sports and recreation programming was increased
- More public transit vehicle hours were provided

The areas where Toronto's service levels have decreased is related to lower number of service units delivered in 2006 such as:

- Fewer residential building permits were issued by Building Services
- Lower levels of EMS vehicle hours
- Fewer incidents responded to by Fire Services
- Lower volumes of drinking water distributed and wastewater treated

Internal Comparison- How Have Toronto's Performance Measurement Results Changed between 2006 and 2005?

Of the eighty-seven performance measurement results of efficiency, customer service and community impact included in Toronto's 2006 Performance Measurement and Benchmarking Report, 73% of the measures examined, had 2006 results that were either improved or stable relative to 2005.

Examples of areas in which Toronto's 2006 performance has improved include:

- Increasing construction value of ICI building permits issued
- Increasing supply of regulated and subsidized child care spaces relative to the child population
- Shorter EMS response times and a decreasing cost per patient transported
- Decreasing rates of residential structural fires, and fire related injuries and fatalities, and a shorter response time to emergency calls
- Increasing usage by residents of both electronic and non-electronic library services
- Reduced/shorter length of stay for families in shelters
- Continuing high rate of resident satisfaction in homes for the aged
- Decreasing total (non-traffic) crime and violent crime rates and an increased clearance rate for total (non-traffic) crimes
- Decreasing vehicle collision rate
- Improving pavement condition of Toronto's roads system
- Decreasing costs of winter maintenance on roads
- Decreasing (improving) length of time clients are receiving social assistance, and decreasing administration costs per case
- Decreasing cost of social housing per unit
- Increasing solid waste diversion rates and reduced rate of complaints regarding collection
- Increasing use of registered sports & recreation programs
- Decreasing amounts of property tax arrears
- Increasing public transit trips per person
- Decreasing costs of wastewater collection
- Decreasing rates of drinking water used in homes, fewer water main breaks and lower costs of water treatment and distribution

The areas where the internal trends in Toronto's performance measurement results are unfavourable or have declined include:

- Ten efficiency measures, where the costs of providing a unit of service have increased in 2006, due to wage increases in collective agreements
- Decreasing construction value of residential building permits issued
- Increased costs of solid waste disposal arising from contractual agreements with haulers of the waste to Michigan

- Increased costs of solid waste diversion as new programs are introduced in order to achieve higher diversion rates
- Higher costs of wastewater treatment relating to higher costs of energy and the disposal of biosolids

External Comparison- How Do Toronto's 2006 Service Levels Compare to Other Municipalities?

There are forty-three service level indicators, in Toronto's 2006 Performance Measurement and Benchmarking Report where Toronto's results can be compared and ranked with other municipalities and placed in quartiles.

Some of the key factors that influence Toronto's results and rankings, such as Toronto's much higher population density are common to multiple service areas. Results have been grouped by these key influencing factors and are described below.

- Services where Toronto's size and high population density requires higher service levels, which are indicative of large densely populated cities
 - the highest number of police staff (officers and civilians) per 100,000 population
 - the highest number of transit vehicle hours per capita, because of Toronto's multi-modal system and high transit use
 - the highest number of library holdings (collection) per capita, due to our extensive research and reference collections, electronic products and multilingual collections
- Services where there is a higher need or demand for social programs in large cities
 - the highest childcare investment per child aged 12 and under
 - the highest number of social assistance cases per 100,000 households
 - the highest number of emergency shelter beds per 100,000 population
 - the highest number of social housing units per 1,000 households
- Services where a different service delivery model may be used in Toronto than in other municipalities
 - Toronto has a higher number of medical incidents and high number of total incidents responded to by fire services per 1,000 population
 - Toronto has the highest proportion (53%) of paramedics that are qualified as Advanced Care Paramedics
 - Toronto has a lower proportion of municipally operated long term care beds in relation to all beds in the community from all service providers

Areas where Toronto's service levels or levels of activity are lower (3rd or 4th quartile) relative to other municipalities, are primarily related to much higher population densities in Toronto than in the other OMBI municipalities. This includes:

- Fewer facilities or less infrastructure required in densely populated municipalities like Toronto because of proximity and ease of access, while other less densely populated municipalities require proportionately more facilities or infrastructure to be within a reasonable travel distance of their residents.
 - lower numbers of large and small sports & recreation community centres, and indoor ice pads per 100,000 population (in contrast Toronto has a higher number of indoor pools)
 - lower number of library hours per capita (resulting from a lower number of library branches)
 - lowest number of road lane kilometres per 1,000 population
 - lowest hectares of parkland and kilometres of trails in relation to population
 - the lowest number of residential building permits and lower levels of ICI permits issued per 100,000 population because most of Toronto's geographic area is fully developed

- Fewer emergency services vehicle-hours may be required in densely populated municipalities like Toronto for emergency response because of the close proximity of vehicles and stations to residents. Those municipalities with lower population densities (including rural areas in some municipalities) may require proportionately more vehicle hours in order to provide acceptable response times.
 - lower number of fire vehicle hours per capita
 - lower number of EMS vehicle hours per 1,000 population

- Older age of Toronto's infrastructure in relation to other municipalities.
 - Toronto's indoor ice pads and indoor pools are older
 - Toronto's underground water distribution and wastewater collection pipes are older

External Comparison - How Do Toronto's 2006 Performance Measurement Results Compare to Other Municipalities?

There are eighty-nine performance measures of efficiency, customer service and community impact, in Toronto's 2006 Performance Measurement and Benchmarking Report where Toronto's results can be compared and ranked with other municipalities and placed in quartiles.

Areas where Toronto has the top/best result of the OMBI municipalities are:

- Shortest EMS response time to emergency calls
- Lowest rate of residential fire related injuries per 100,000 population
- Lowest rate of governance and corporate management costs as a percentage of total operating expenditures (single-tier municipalities)
- Highest rate of total library uses, electronic library uses and non-electronic uses per capita, as well as the highest turnover rate (number of times an item is borrowed) of the circulating collection

- Highest percentage of a municipality's geographic area that is parkland (both maintained parks and natural areas)
- Highest rate of decrease in the 2006 total non-traffic crime rate
- Highest pavement quality rating for our roads system
- Highest possible result (100%) for the number of winter event responses on roads meeting standard
- Lowest social housing administrative cost per social housing unit
- Highest rate of residential solid waste diversion for single unit homes/houses
- Lowest amount of current and prior years property tax arrears outstanding
- Highest rate of transit trips per capita and the highest number of transit trips per vehicle hour
- Lowest cost of drinking water treatment per megalitre
- Best possible result for drinking water quality (no boil water advisories)

Performance measures where Toronto's result is better than the OMBI median (1st or 2nd quartile) include:

- Higher number of regulated child care spaces per 1,000 children and higher number of subsidized spaces per 1,000 children from low income families, as well as lower child care costs per subsidized space
- Lower rate of residential structural fires, lower rate of fire related fatalities and a lower fire response time (at median) to emergencies
- Higher occupancy rate of beds in emergency shelters
- Lower cost per library use
- High rates of long term care resident satisfaction and low costs per bed day
- Lower property crime rate and lower youth crime rate and a higher rate of decrease in the 2006 rate of reported violent crime
- Lower administration cost of social assistance per case, and lower (shorter) response times for eligibility notification of social assistance clients.
- Lower overall residential (single-unit homes/houses and apartments) solid waste diversion rate and lower solid waste collection cost per tonne
- Higher usage (visits) of registered sports and recreation programming per capita and a higher percentage of the available capacity utilized in these programs
- Lower cost of providing transit services per passenger trip
- Lower water use per household

There are also a number of the areas in which Toronto's performance measurement results fall below, the OMBI median. Some of the key factors that influence Toronto's lower rankings, such as Toronto's much higher population density are common to multiple service areas. Measures where Toronto falls below the OMBI median in the 3rd or 4th quartile have been grouped by these key influencing factors described below.

Measures in social programs that Toronto has little control over:

- The highest percentage of children that are in low income families

- High length of stay in Toronto's emergency shelters due to shortage of available social housing and the availability of transitional shelter beds in Toronto, which have longer stays
- A lower rate of long term care beds (both municipal and other providers) as a percentage of the population age 75 and over
- Higher benefits costs per social assistance case due to a greater percentage of Toronto's clients reaching the maximum of the shelter component resulting from higher housing costs in Toronto
- Low percentage of the social housing waiting list is placed annually (longer wait times) because of a shortage of social housing
- Higher subsidy costs per social housing unit because initial land and construction costs were higher in Toronto (resulting in higher mortgage costs) and a higher proportion of Rent Geared to Income (RGI) units with RGI costs directly related to the high market rents in Toronto

Measures impacted by Toronto's high population density and urban form include:

- Lower residential and ICI construction values per capita of building permits issued and lower levels of new residential housing is being created because of Toronto's fully developed urban form
- Higher violent crime and total (non-traffic) crime rate and a higher rate of increase in the 2006 property and youth crime rates. Densely populated municipalities tend to have higher violent crime rates. Toronto's results compare favourably to other heavily urbanized municipalities in Canada and the United States
- Highest rate of traffic congestion on roads and the highest vehicle collision rate on these congested roads
- Higher cost of solid waste transfer/disposal per tonne. Without our own local municipal landfill site, which is not practical in this urban setting, Toronto's cost of waste transfer and disposal will always be higher than those municipalities that have the advantage of a local landfill site

Measures where Toronto's less favourable results are heavily influenced by the advanced age of our infrastructure include:

- Higher cost of wastewater collection per km. of pipe, higher rate of sewer back-ups per 100 km. of sewer line and higher percent of wastewater by-passing treatment – more than 30% of the Toronto sewer system is over 50 years old and 24% of it is combined sanitary/storm sewers, requiring higher and more costly maintenance levels. There are also approximately 80,000 homes, which have downspouts connected to the sanitary/storm sewer system, contributing to sewer back-ups and by-pass events, especially during rain storms.
- Higher costs of wastewater treatment per megalitre, due the age of our plants (the oldest has been in operation since 1929) and the costs of disposing of biosolids
- Higher cost of water distribution per km. of pipe and higher number of water main breaks per km. of pipe – more than 20% of Toronto's water system is over 80 years

old, leading to more watermain breaks and higher costs relative to municipalities with newer water distribution systems.

Measures with high costs required for more effective service delivery or because of the service delivery model used:

- Higher costs of shelters per bed night due to the operation of our own shelters (36% of beds), while most other municipalities contract out or purchase all of their shelter beds
- Toronto has high costs of roads maintenance but also has the highest pavement condition rating of the OMBI municipalities
- Higher cost of winter roads maintenance per lane km. but Toronto also has high winter maintenance standards, the driveway windrows clearing program and our urban form, including narrow streets, on-street parking and traffic congestion during storm events, add to our costs
- High costs for solid waste diversion per tonne but Toronto also has the highest diversion rate for single unit homes/houses of the OMBI municipalities
- High transit cost per vehicle hour and per revenue vehicle hour, however this is due to Toronto's multi-modal system with subways, streetcars and the light rail transit more expensive to maintain than buses, which are used exclusively in other municipalities. This multi-modal system leads to the highest transit use per capita of the OMBI municipalities.

Other performance measures where Toronto's results fall below the OMBI median and where improvements in efficiency and effectiveness can be made over time include:

- Higher EMS cost per in-service vehicle hour and per patient transported
- Higher fire costs per in-service vehicle hour
- Highest cost of parks maintenance per hectare
- Lower clearance rates for violent and total non-traffic criminal code incidents and a lower number of Criminal Code incidents in the municipality per police officer
- Higher average time period that an individual or family receives social assistance - Toronto staff that support social assistance cases, carry a high case load in relation to other municipalities which could be a factor
- Lower solid waste diversion rates in apartments and higher level of complaints regarding solid waste collection often associated with the introduction of new diversion programs
- Higher costs of maintaining a property tax account and a lower percentage of accounts enrolled in pre-authorized payment plans
- Lower percentage of the population using registered sports and recreation programs at least once

Continuous Improvement

Each of the service areas included in Toronto's 2006 Performance Measurement and Benchmarking report includes a section that identifies some of the initiatives completed in 2007 or planned in the future that could further improve the efficiency and effectiveness of operations. Highlights from the service areas are:

- In early 2008, the Children's Services Division introduced a quality ratings system for all child care centres that have a service contract with the City of Toronto. A formal assessment is made for each centre relative to specified quality standards and the ratings for each centre are available on Toronto's website. In 2007, the amount of school age child care was increased through the development of After School Recreation and Care programs by Children's Services and the Parks, Forestry and Recreation Division. The programs will be fully implemented in 2008.
- In 2007, EMS implemented a new wireless electronic patient charting system that will make paramedics more efficient and effective in terms of patient care paperwork processing time, which in turn will increase their availability for response to other calls. A complete re-design was undertaken of the process by which EMS receives, prioritizes and dispatches ambulance calls in Toronto. Implementation and training of staff is expected to be completed in 2008.
- In 2008, Fire Services will implement mobile data terminals and software to improve the efficiency of fire prevention inspectors. Reductions are expected in 2008 in the number of days lost due to firefighter injuries, which could lead in the future to fewer vehicles being removed from service due to insufficient staffing levels. Options for reducing turnout time at fire stations will also be examined to improve response times.
- Hostel Services implemented the Hostels to Homes program, which is a provincial pilot to test whether lengths of stay in shelters can be reduced by making appropriate follow up supports available when people leave the shelter system.
- In January 2007, the Toronto Public Library was able to increase the service hours at over 50 branches within the existing operating budget. A new Toronto Public Library website is being developed, and an online program database will be introduced.
- Long Term Care/Homes for the Aged Services implemented emerging *Best Practice Guidelines* in 2007 for the provision of skin care, wound management, dementia care, nutritional care and falls management, with evaluation providing evidence of improved outcomes. The Division also implemented RAI-MDS (e-health documentation) in five homes, with the other five homes in a state of readiness for 2008.
- In 2008, the Parks Forestry and Recreation Division will be analyzing the proximity of parkland in relation to Toronto's population and Toronto's Capital Plan proposes the development of trails and may include the utilization of bicycle lanes on streets as part of the City's bike plan.
- Since 2006, the Toronto Police Service has redeployed 200 officers to front-line operations. A new deployment model has been implemented to ensure officers are

used in the most efficient and effective manner possible and absenteeism has continued to decrease in 2007 for both uniform and civilian personnel.

- To improve road safety for motorists and pedestrians Transportation Services is installing additional red light camera systems, pedestrian countdown signals and expanding the RESCU system's 75 cameras enabling greater monitoring and vehicle assistance coverage of the City's expressways to minimize expressway congestion.
- In 2007, with Toronto Social Services support, a total of 7,694 youth on social assistance started employment and in total, more than 26,000 clients reported starting employment.
- Social Housing Services is involved in implementation of an Asset Management Preventative Maintenance Program designed to minimize future capital costs and is also working on Energy Saving Initiatives to reduce utility costs.
- The Solid Waste Management Division has a pilot project underway in 30 high-rise apartment complexes to test the feasibility and cost effectiveness of collecting organics. Roll-out of the recycling and residual waste bins to single-unit homes will also start in 2008.
- In addition to development of After School Recreation and Care programs, the Parks Forestry and Recreation Division in 2008 will continue development of the Aquatics Indoor Pool Strategy - The Aquatics Strategy that is currently under development will be the framework for future programming, location and capital development decisions. The Indoor Ice Facilities Strategy will present a framework for addressing indoor facility needs over the next 25 years.
- The Revenue Services Division will be introducing new user fees related to tax collections (i.e. statement fees and fees for notification), which is expected to result in lower costs for the collection process and improvements in the overall collection rate for tax arrears.
- In 2008, the Toronto Transit Commission is expanding to match service to ridership in order to both address overcrowding on some routes and accommodate the expected increase in ridership. In the fall of 2008, bus service hours will be extended on most routes to match those of the subway, which operates from 6 a.m. to 2 a.m. In 2007 and early 2008, the TTC introduced more accessible bus routes. To provide enhanced security and safety in 2007, there were 11 new TTC Special Constables added and in 2008 the system of closed-circuit cameras in place in subways and some buses will be expanded to cover all 1,750 buses and streetcars.
- For Wastewater Services (Toronto Water), the Wet Weather Flow Master Plan over the next 25 years will help reduce the amount of wastewater that bypasses treatment during rain storms. Trenchless rehabilitation techniques were enhanced to extend the useful life of the City's Sewer Infrastructure and minimize the impact on adjacent homes and businesses. To lower costs, new technology was used through installation of combination sewer cleaners, vacuum excavation equipment, and closed circuit camera equipment for sewer inspections.
- In 2007, Water Services (Toronto Water) completed a water loss detection study that identified a number of measures that can be implemented during 2008 and beyond to reduce the amount of water lost throughout the distribution system. In 2008, lower overall water consumption is forecasted as residents respond to water efficiency awareness campaigns and reduce their use of water. There is also an increasing

amount of capital investment (\$125M for 2008) to replace and rehabilitate the water distribution system and substandard water services.

Review of Winter Maintenance of Roads

In April 2007, when Council reviewed the City Manager's 2005 Performance Measurement and Benchmarking Report, Council requested in the future that the City Manager annually select one target improvement area where the City's performance is found to be within the fourth quartile, and to develop a remediation plan for consideration by the Executive Committee and the Budget Committee.

The area selected for this review was the winter maintenance of roads where Toronto's costs have historically been higher than those of other municipalities.

This review was not limited to just costs, but also included other aspects of service delivery, specifically in the following areas:

- Current winter maintenance processes, resources and standards
- Collision data during the winter months to determine if the roads are safe for motorists and pedestrians
- Factors that increase Toronto's costs in relation to those of other municipalities
- Actions taken by staff to reduce costs and the impact of salt usage on the environment
- Additional work staff will be taking in the future to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of operations

The findings of this review are included as Attachment A to this report. In summary, Toronto's winter maintenance costs for roads are higher than other municipalities on a per lane kilometre basis, however the key driver of these costs appears to be high service standards for the ploughing and salting of roads, physical characteristics of streets in the core area of the City, as well as the Driveway Windrow Clearing program, which is unique to Toronto.

The Transportation Services Division has and continues to take steps to reduce costs such as amending the policy for standby pay for City staff to be based on storm probability, and reductions in salt usage. After each winter season, the Division holds a de-briefing session to review operations and to identify what procedures should be changed. This spring for example the Division will review procedures for winter maintenance of streets in the inner City where parked cars can hamper operations when there is an accumulation of snow.

New alternatives to salt are being studied for de-icing activities and there will also be a greater use of technology to better predict and plan for winter events through remote road weather information stations embedded in pavement, and the use of Global Positioning Systems on all winter maintenance vehicles.

Winter control costs should not be examined in isolation, but must also consider the effectiveness of winter operations in terms of road safety, traffic flow, and environmental impacts from salt usage.

When rates of collisions are examined over the winter season it is evident that collision rates are no higher on Toronto roads in the winter months than during the good weather months, which shows our roads are safe.

To provide immediate response to winter events there are 120 contracted salt vehicles and operators stationed at 11 depots throughout the City on a 24-hour basis. There may be periods of time when there is no inclement winter weather forecasted, and these contracted salt vehicle operators could be idle.

There is the possibility that during these idle periods, when there is a very low probability of salting activities, these contracted operators could perform other services for the City. However, management of the Transportation Services Division and Employee & Labour Relations would need to review this issue further to ensure that any such services would not contravene the Local 416 collective agreement.

From an environmental perspective, new procedures and salt management practices have been implemented that have reduced the application rate of salt by 10% without compromising road safety. This has both reduced costs and minimized the impact on the environment. When snow accumulates to the point that it must be removed from streets, snow melters are used on-site and if snow disposal sites must be utilized, they have been placed in areas of the City away from watersheds and where runoff and residual litter can be retained.

Future work will focus on the establishment of new external contracts that will be extended to cover a seven-year period to give contractors more certainty about work, making it more attractive for them to invest in new equipment. This is expected to benefit the City through a greater number of bidders and lower costs. The new contracts will also introduce the use of new and more versatile equipment (combination units) that will have the capability to both plough and/or salt, which is also expected to generate savings for the City.

It is recommended that the General Manager of Transportation Services report back to the Public Works and Infrastructure Committee after the seven-year winter control contracts have been awarded, on any savings or increased effectiveness that are expected to be realized in the future from these contracts.

Comparing Toronto to Cities Beyond Ontario

The recent report of the Independent Fiscal Review Panel called *A Blueprint for Fiscal Stability and Economic Prosperity — A Call to Action*, recommended that Toronto expand its benchmarking efforts to major cities within a North American context.

Toronto has been involved in a number of initiatives that have looked at indicators beyond Ontario. Much work has been done in the world on quality of life type indicators, but there is much less comparable information available on municipal service delivery.

Some of the other initiatives that the City is currently involved in with other Canadian and international cities are described in the following sections.

World Bank Initiative to Develop City Indicators

In November 2005, Toronto staff were approached by officials of the World Bank (Latin America and Caribbean Region Branch), regarding participation in an initiative to develop an integrated approach for measuring and monitoring the performance of cities. Their objective is to develop a standardized set city indicators that measure and monitor city performance and quality of life globally.

The key benefits that led to Toronto's agreement to participate in the initiative were:

- the opportunity to have some influence at the pilot stage, in the identification of city indicators, that if successful, could be adopted worldwide.
- the possibility in the future, of gaining access to comparable information from major Canadian and international cities, that would allow for meaningful comparisons of the service levels and performance of Toronto's services, as well as the quality of life of Toronto residents.

The initiative was launched in June 2006 at the World Urban Forum and the pilot process involved nine cities from four countries:

- Canada - Cities of Toronto, Montreal and Vancouver
- United States – King County, Washington
- Brazil - Cities of São Paulo, Belo Horizonte and Porto Alegre
- Columbia - Cities of Bogotá and Cali

The objective for the indicators developed in this pilot process was that they would be applicable to all cities in the world regardless of geography, culture, affluence, size, economic strength, or political structure.

The indicators identified covered a total of twenty-two theme areas, fourteen of which relate to services provided by city governments and eight, which are quality of life indicators as listed in the table on the next page.

City Services	Quality of Life
Education	Civic Engagement
Energy	Culture
Finance	Economy
Fire and Emergency Response	Environment
Governance	Shelter
Health	Social Equity
Recreation	Subjective Well-Being
Safety	Technology & Innovation
Social Services	
Solid Waste	
Transportation	
Urban Planning	
Wastewater	
Water	

The responsibility of city governments under these theme areas can vary from one country to another as well as within a country. The federal and provincial or state governments also play an important part in the outcomes in many of these theme areas. In the case of Toronto and the other cities, it was felt that regardless if City governments had little or no involvement in these theme areas, they are important to residents and every effort should be made to collect data once the indicators have been established.

Cities participating in the pilot were asked to collect and submit data to the World Bank's consultants in June 2007. At the beginning of the process, Toronto staff highlighted the need for precise technical definitions and consistent data sources for the information collected to be comparable between cities and countries. Unfortunately, the World Bank's consultants were not able to provide this guidance to the degree Toronto staff feel was required.

Commencing in May 2008, the City Indicators Initiative will be managed by a newly established "City Indicators Facility" within the Cities Center at the University of Toronto. Financial support for the facility will be provided by the World Bank's Development Grant Facility and others, for the next three years.

Recent discussions with World Bank officials indicate that one of the first steps of the City Indicators Facility will be a review of the initial data collected during the pilot process in terms of its comparability and consistency.

The World Bank also indicates that discussions on expanding the pilot program have been held with representatives of several cities, such as London, New York, San Francisco, Aden (Yemen), Tokyo, and cities in China and India. There are also discussions on expanding to more cities within Brazil, Colombia and Canada.

It would be fair to say that Toronto staff have made a significant contribution to the World Bank's work to date, such as the sharing of our experiences in benchmarking work done through OMBI and FCM's Quality of Life Initiative.

It is expected that this initiative will take a number of years before comparable results will become available, but if successful it will provide a valuable additional source of information to assess how well Toronto is doing from both a service delivery and quality of life perspective.

Federation of Canadian Municipalities – Quality of Life Indicators

Toronto has been a participant for a number of years in the Quality of Life Reporting System (QOLRS) of the Federation of Canadian Municipalities. The objective of the QOLRS is to measure, monitor and report on the quality of life in Canadian urban municipalities.

Toronto's participation in the QOLRS is being led by the Social Development Finance & Administration Division. Other members include Vancouver, Calgary, Edmonton, Regina, Saskatoon, Winnipeg, Sudbury, London, Hamilton, Niagara, Waterloo, Ottawa, Toronto, Peel, York, Durham, Halton, Quebec City, Montreal, Laval, Gatineau and Halifax.

QOLRS Indicators have been developed in the areas of :

- Affordable, and Appropriate Housing
- Civic Engagement
- Community and Social Infrastructure
- Education
- Employment
- Local Economy
- Natural Environment
- Personal and Community Health
- Personal Financial Security
- Personal Safety

As part of the QOLRS work, a housing theme report has been recently completed and another theme report is planned in the fall of 2008 on immigration/diversity.

Conference Board of Canada - Benchmarking the Attractiveness of Canada's CMAs

On December 12, 2007, the Conference Board of Canada released its report entitled *City Magnets- Benchmarking the Attractiveness of Canada's CMAs*. The premise of the report is that Cities must act as magnets to attract highly skilled workers and mobile populations

in order to stay prosperous in the years ahead. Worldwide, cities with a high quality of life will be the most successful in attracting and keeping talented and skilled workers.

The report examined data of 27 Canadian census metropolitan areas (CMAs) using 46 indicators in the following seven domains:

- Economy
- Health
- Society
- Housing
- Environment
- Innovation
- Education

The Conference Board was not able to isolate City of Toronto data from the larger Toronto CMA, but assigned the Toronto CMA an overall grade of "A", ranking second overall in Canada behind only Calgary, with the stronger Calgary economy being the key differentiating factor.

The report also compared the Canadian CMAs against 27 American CMAs, however it used only 17 indicators common to the two countries due to the lack of comparable U.S. data that was available.

Conclusion

Toronto has made progress in the reporting of performance measurement results from both an internal and external perspective that has strengthened accountability and enhanced the level of transparency in the way performance of City services is reported.

The work being done with other Ontario municipalities through OMBI has been instrumental in gaining access to information provided directly by other municipalities, that is as comparable as possible. The inclusion of up to seven years of data used to examine Toronto's own internal trends in results, is equally important. Together, these internal and external perspectives have proven to be very useful in providing a better understanding of our operations and, where appropriate, identify areas for improvement.

There are a number of areas where Toronto has the best result of the OMBI municipalities such as the highest pavement quality of roads, the highest solid waste diversion rate for houses, the shortest EMS response time, the highest rates of library and transit use by residents and the lowest costs of water treatment, and social housing administration.

There are also a number of areas where results show Toronto does not do as well. In these areas, we have tried to identify the reasons behind these results, and recognize that certain factors such as urban form and population density are not controllable and are some of

the reasons why Toronto is unique among Ontario municipalities. All service areas continue to look for opportunities to improve operations and a number of these initiatives completed in 2007 and planned in 2008 have been described in this report.

This report focuses on performance measurement results in specific service areas, however it is by no means the only type of reporting done in this area. There are also other report card initiatives or monitoring reports that are produced on a periodic basis such as:

- Quality of Life Reporting through the Federation of Canadian Municipalities (FCM)
- The Toronto Report Card on Children
- The Toronto Report Card on Housing and Homelessness
- Toronto Health Status
- Reports on Economic Indicators

This report is also centred on results that can be quantified, however there are a number of qualitative factors, such as achievements or innovative initiatives currently being piloted, that are not captured in these results.

Further work is to be done with our OMBI partners to expand the program areas we are able to report benchmarking results on, and identify and share practices that can improve performance.

The value of comparing Toronto's results to other large Canadian and International cities has also been recognized. Toronto is participating in other initiatives such as the World Bank's City Indicators Initiative but it is expected that this initiative will take a number of years before comparable results of other world cities will become available.

CONTACT

Lorne Turner
Senior Financial Advisor
City Manager's Office
Phone: (416)-397-0533
Fax: (416)-392-1827
E-mail: lturner@toronto.ca

SIGNATURE

Shirley Hoy
City Manager

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment A: Review of Winter Maintenance of Roads

Attachment B: Toronto's 2006 Performance Measurement and Benchmarking Report

Attachment C: OMBI 2006 Performance Benchmarking Report (OMBI Joint Report)