



City Assessor Performance Measures

Goal 1:				
To achieve a reasonable assessment-to-sale value ratio by assessing all real property within the City fairly and equitably.				
Objective:				
Completion of the 2009 general reassessment and appeals with values based on real estate market trends and sales.				
Performance Measure:	Projected FY2008	Actual FY2008	Projected FY2009	Projected FY2010
Assessment-to-Sale Value Ratio as determined by the State Ratio Study.	0.90	0.88	0.85	0.90
Analysis of the Data:				
The Virginia Department of Taxation conducts this annual assessment/sales ratio study. During FY 2008, the real estate market was appreciating with property selling higher than the previous assessments established for July 1, 2007.				
In odd numbered years, this ratio is expected to be lower because the City reassesses real property biennially.				

Goal 2:				
Assess all real property within the City, fairly and equitably, at fair-market value by having accurate data with a recent on-site inspection.				
Objective:				
Review property by visiting all improved parcels, measuring buildings, and verifying the data is accurate.				
Performance Measure:	Projected FY2008	Actual FY2008	Projected FY2009	Projected FY2010
Property Reviews Completed	70%	65%	85%	90%
Analysis of the Data:				
This project is very time consuming. Although in FY 2008, the goal of 70% of properties reviewed by staff was not met, the Office is on track to achieve a higher percentage (85%) in FY 2009. Appraisers remeasure and inspect property to correct data errors as needed. This task is very important toward achieving a high quality reassessment.				

Benchmark Localities:
Charlottesville, Danville, Hampton, Norfolk, Richmond, Roanoke



Communications and Marketing Performance Measures

Goal 1:				
Ensure public information services are aligned with the needs and expectations of Lynchburg citizens.				
Objective:				
Increase the percentage of Lynchburg residents rating public information services as good or excellent on the City's biennial Citizens Survey.				
Performance Measure:	Projected FY 2008	Actual FY 2008	Projected FY 2009	Projected FY 2010
Percent rating services as good or excellent	60%	71%	None, biennial survey	76%
Analysis of the Data:				
FY 2008 Actual exceeded the FY 2008 Projected by 11%. As a result, and to continue on the path of improvement, the FY 2010 projected rating is 76%.				

Goal 2:				
Provide useful and timely information to the citizens of Lynchburg via the internet.				
Objective:				
Increase the number of page views on www.lynchburgva.gov.				
Performance Measure:	Projected FY 2008	Actual FY 2008	Projected FY 2009	Projected FY 2010
Number of page views	New Measure	1,908,975	2,099,872	2,309,859
Analysis of the Data:				
Based on a greater emphasis on marketing the City and promoting the Lynchburg brand, the department anticipates an annual increase of 10% in FY 2009 and FY 2010.				

Goal 3:				
Produce quality programming on LTV that are both entertaining and informative.				
Objective:				
Increase the number of original programs produced and broadcast on LTV.				
Performance Measure:	Projected FY 2008	Actual FY 2008	Projected FY 2009	Projected FY 2010
Number of programs produced	New Measure	45	65	80
Analysis of the Data:				
LTV, the City's local government channel, was created in FY 2009 and had the ability to focus solely on the production of local government programming. With a year of experience, staff projects an increase in programs to 80 annually.				

Benchmark Localities:
Hampton, Fairfax, Falls Church, and Roanoke, VA



Financial Services Performance Measures

Goal:				
To ensure vendor, customer, and citizen trust through sound financial management (of all City funds).				
Objective 1:				
Place the City in the best financial position possible by maintaining a AA bond rating and receiving the Government Finance Officers' Association (GFOA) awards of excellence.				
Performance Measure:	Projected FY2008	Actual FY2008	Projected FY2009	Projected FY2010
Bond rating	AA	AA	AA	AA
Financial presentation awards	Comprehensive Annual Financial Report (CAFR) and Budget Presentation awards from GFOA	CAFR and Budget Presentation awards from GFOA	CAFR and Budget Presentation awards from GFOA	CAFR and Budget Presentation awards from GFOA
Audit findings	Not previously projected	8	7	6
Analysis of the Data:				
Due to economic and per capita statistics, it is unlikely Lynchburg would ever be upgraded from a AA rating by the rating agencies - AAA ratings are generally given to larger localities with higher median incomes. However, receiving awards from the Government Finance Officers' Association for the CAFR and the Budget document reflect a recognition of strong and prudent financial management, which is noted by rating agencies. While the economy has slowed and Lynchburg has seen a reduction in revenues, it is expected that the City will maintain its highly favorable bond rating and recognition of excellence in financial reporting. The number of audit findings should continue to decrease as the City and Schools staffs work together to improve procedures.				
Objective 2:				
Make the payment of taxes and fees by citizens and businesses as economically efficient as possible.				
Performance Measure:	Projected FY2008	Actual FY2008	Projected FY2009	Projected FY2010
Percent of payments made electronically	Not Measured	Not Measured	12.4%	13.0%
Analysis of the Data:				
An increase in the percentage of electronic payments is expected due to the implementation of e-bills and a stronger web presence.				
Objective 3:				
To increase the timeliness and quality of services delivered by the Procurement Division.				
Performance Measure:	Projected FY2008	Actual FY2008	Projected FY2009	Projected FY2010
Percent of users rating timeliness of services as good or excellent.	No survey performed	No survey performed	No survey performed	70%
Percent of users rating quality of service as good or excellent.	No survey performed	No survey performed	No survey performed	75%
Analysis of the Data:				
While a satisfaction survey was not performed in FY 2008 or 2009, one is planned for FY 2010. It is anticipated that users may experience a decrease in the timeliness and quality of service due to the combination of school consolidation resulting in more duties for the department coupled with the retirement of a senior buyer.				
Benchmark Localities:				
City of Roanoke, Roanoke County, and City of Charlottesville, VA				



Human Resources Performance Measures

Goal 1: Provide excellent customer service to the workforce.				
Objective: 80% of survey respondents rate overall Human Resources' (HR) services as Excellent or Good.				
Performance Measure:	Projected FY2008	Actual FY2008	Projected FY2009	Projected FY2010
% employees rating HR services as excellent or good	80.0%	86.1%	80.0%	80.0%
Analysis of the Data: Specific strategies developed from survey trend analysis, such as spending more time interacting directly with employees and providing additional supervisory training, appear to have increased the satisfaction ratings over expected levels.				

Goal 2: Support effective recruitment processes.				
Objective: In a timely manner, following the posting close date, develop and deliver to hiring officials a list of certified (qualified) applicants for non-public safety positions.				
Performance Measure:	Projected FY2008	Actual FY2008	Projected FY2009	Projected FY2010
Average number of days to screen and deliver a certified list.	New Measure	New Measure	5 work days	5 work days
Analysis of the Data: HR supports a quick and effective recruitment process by evaluating applicants and referring the most qualified to departments in a timely manner. The quicker the department has the list of certified candidates, the faster they can begin their selection process thereby reducing non-productive time.				

Goal 3: Support effective employee performance management.				
Objective: Performance evaluations are completed and shared with employees in a timely manner.				
Performance Measure:	Projected FY2008	Actual FY2008	Projected FY2009	Projected FY2010
% of performance evaluations completed on time.	100%	100%	100%	100%
Analysis of the Data: Performance evaluations are required for all employees at the end of the fiscal year and usually the ratings are used to determine pay adjustments. The driving forces for timely performance evaluation appear to be the organizational focus on performance evaluation all at one time and the link to pay increases.				

Benchmark Localities:
ICMA-CPM data continues to provide the most effective benchmark for the measures above. Additional comparisons will be sought throughout the upcoming year.



Information Technology Performance Measures

Goal 1: Overall employee satisfaction with IT services.				
Objective: To ensure the information technology services provided by the department are meeting the needs of the users of the services and to improve from the prior year.				
Performance Measure:	Projected FY 2008	Actual FY 2008	Projected FY 2009	Projected FY 2010
Annual survey rating: 4 = Excellent 3 = Good 2 = Fair 1 = Poor	> 3.36	3.50	3.57	> 3.57
Analysis of the Data: The goal for this measure is to improve on the prior year's rating, using feedback from one year's survey to improve service delivery and, hopefully, the satisfaction level in the next year. This goal was achieved in both 2008 and 2009.				

Goal 2: Maximum availability of critical network services.				
Objective: To provide network availability during normal general government business hours (8:30am - 5:00pm, M-F) for at least 99.99% of the year.				
Performance Measure:	Projected FY 2008	Actual FY 2008	Projected FY 2009	Projected FY 2010
Network availability of Priority 1 devices	99.99%	99.99%	99.99%	99.99%
Analysis of the Data: The Projected FY 2009 availability is based on the year-to-date measure of 99.994%, as of March 2009. It is anticipated the annual goal of 99.99% will be met.				

Goal 3: Service requests completed on time.				
Objective: To meet the agreed-upon due date for Incidents and Small Projects at least 85% of the time.				
Performance Measure:	Projected FY 2008	Actual FY 2008	Projected FY 2009	Projected FY 2010
Percentage of Incidents and Small Projects completed on time.	85.0%	90.6%	91.1%	90.0%
Analysis of the Data: The Projected FY 2009 on-time completion percentage is based on the year-to-date measure of 91.1%, as of March 2009.				

Benchmark Localities: Danville, Stafford, Staunton, and Williamsburg, VA
--



Police Department Performance Measures

Goal 1:				
To maintain life safety through effective response time and addressing the community perception of rapid response equating to improved personal safety.				
Objective:				
To maintain the response time to priority calls for service in light of current staffing and overall responsibilities.				
Performance Measure:	Projected FY2008	Actual FY2008	Projected FY2009	Projected FY2010
Computer-Aided Dispatch (CAD) response time inclusive of dispatch and travel time.	6.50 minutes	7.17 minutes	7.17 minutes	7.17 minutes
Analysis of the Data:				
With the implementation of twelve-hour shifts and its unknown impact in this area as well as the potential for staffing shortages and increased calls for service, the Department expects to maintain the current response time.				

Goal 2:				
To improve public safety and the perception of crime in the community by successfully investigating and clearing a greater percentage of the violent and property crimes that occur and are reported.				
Objective:				
To increase the clearance rate for reported violent and property crimes.				
Performance Measure:	Projected FY2008	Actual FY2008	Projected FY2009	Projected FY2010
Crime clearance rates				
Violent	50.0%	40.8%	62.0%	62.0%
Property	27.4%	22.5%	30.9%	30.9%
Analysis of the Data:				
Crime clearance rates are a measure of the effectiveness of investigative measures applied by the police department; however, these rates are also impacted by timely reporting by citizens and the cooperation of victims and witnesses. In the past, the Department has normally met or exceeded national standards; however, FY 2008 posed some challenges, which prevented meeting these goals. As FY 2008 was an unusual year, the Department intends to meet and sustain the national standards in FY 2009 and FY 2010.				

Goal 3:				
To increase safety by reducing dangerous actions by individuals operating motor vehicles, as these actions contribute to injuries and fatalities involving the motorists as well as innocent bystanders.				
Objective:				
To increase traffic safety enforcement efforts, focusing on Driving Under the Influence (DUI) arrests, occupant safety summonses, and speeding summonses.				
Performance Measure:	Projected FY2008	Actual FY2008	Projected FY2009	Projected FY2010
DUI Arrests	238	259	266	274
Occupant Restraint	643	663	682	702
Speeding Enforcement	5,250	5,616	5,784	5,957
Analysis of the Data:				
Traffic safety enforcement has the dual benefit of positively impacting traffic safety and educating citizens. However, enforcement efforts are impacted by staffing levels and by other calls for service that reduce time available for proactive enforcement. Over time the Department has found ways to reduce this impact; therefore, an increase is projected based on the percentage of growth in prior years.				

Benchmark Localities:
Charlottesville, Chesapeake, Danville, Roanoke, and Suffolk, VA



Fire Department Performance Measures

Goal 1: Increase the likelihood of survival for patients who are in cardiac arrest.				
Objective: Increase the percentage of patients that regain Return of Spontaneous Circulation (ROSC) after cardiac arrest. Strategies include increasing the use of the AutoPulse devices and implementing current recommendations of AHA (American Heart Association) in reference to the treatment of cardiac arrest patients.				
Performance Measure:	Projected FY2008	Actual FY2008	Projected FY2009	Projected FY2010
Meet or exceed AHA National average of 5-7% of patients with ROSC	New Measure	New Measure	New Measure	5%
Analysis of the Data: The department is working on a procedure to be able to track patients who regain ROSC after cardiac arrest; it will be ready for implementation July 1, 2009.				

Goal 2: Respond in a safe and expeditious manner to emergency incidents (dispatched equipment).				
Objective: Maintain (without compromising safety) an average response time of 360 seconds or less to emergency incidents (response time = time of dispatch to time of arrival of the 1st unit). Strategies include examining response times to determine if another response zone is more appropriate and evaluating traffic patterns and construction zones.				
Performance Measure:	Projected FY2008	Actual FY2008	Projected FY2009	Projected FY2010
Average response time to an emergency incident	Not Projected	314 seconds	324 seconds	329 seconds
Analysis of the Data: Call volume continues to increase; this increases response time due to the need for equipment to respond outside of designated response zones. Also, upcoming construction on major roads may negatively impact response time.				

Goal 3: Maintain or reduce average structure fire loss (in dollars) per incident.				
Objective: Limit structure fire loss per incident to below \$40,000. Strategies include increasing the number of inspections, the number of public education events, and the oversight in new construction and site design.				
Performance Measure:	Projected FY2008	Actual FY2008	Projected FY2009	Projected FY2010
Average structure fire loss per incident per fiscal year	Not Projected	28,252	28,260	29,413
Analysis of the Data: Projections are based on a 5-year trend analysis utilizing historical data from FY 2004 through FY 2008.				

Benchmark Localities:
Charlottesville, Danville, Roanoke, Staunton, Hampton, and Petersburg, VA



Public Works Performance Measures

Goal 1: Provide solid waste collection as economically as possible.				
Objective: Collect solid waste in a cost effective and efficient manner.				
Performance Measure:	Projected FY2008	Actual FY2008	Projected FY2009	Projected FY2010
Operating and maintenance expenditures per ton of refuse collected.	\$43.56	\$41.48	\$45.74	\$48.03
Analysis of the Data: Actual costs reflect a very efficient operation. The employees have been involved in analyzing and balancing routes. Employees are strongly committed to providing excellent customer service in a cost efficient manner. The cost is expected to increase each year due to higher fuel, parts, and repair costs.				
Benchmark Localities: Chesapeake, Danville, Harrisonburg, and Spotsylvania County, VA; Longmont, CO				

Goal 2: Citizen approval of the appearance of parks and recreation facilities.				
Objective: Increase the percentage of citizens giving an excellent or good rating of the appearance of parks and recreation facilities.				
Performance Measure:	Projected FY2008	Actual FY2008	Projected FY2009	Projected FY2010
Percentage of Parks and Recreation facilities rated as excellent or good.	63.00%	Question was not asked on survey.	None, biennial survey	66.15%
Analysis of the Data: This performance measure helps the City understand the users' rating and perception of the City parks and recreation facilities. This area was rated in 2006 and left off in 2008, but will be placed back in for rating in 2010.				
Benchmark Localities: Charlottesville, Danville, Harrisonburg, Herndon, and James City County, VA				

Goal 3: Support the safety of the traveling public and the operating efficiency of the streets infrastructure system as economically as possible.				
Objective: Perform street maintenance activities in a cost effective and efficient manner.				
Performance Measure:	Projected FY2008	Actual FY2008	Projected FY2009	Projected FY2010
Road rehabilitation expenditures per paved lane mile.	\$3,197	\$2,487	\$3,357	\$3,525
Analysis of the Data: Actual costs reflect a very efficient operation. Costs to maintain and repair streets have been very dynamic during the past several years with the cost of asphalt and patching material increasing significantly. The City has sought to perform more maintenance in order to lengthen the life of the streets leading to the expected increase in cost per lane mile.				
Benchmark Localities: Blacksburg, Danville, Harrisonburg, and Richmond, VA; Salem, OR				



Juvenile Services Performance Measures

Goal 1: Program participants will successfully complete Juvenile Services programs.				
Objective: Participants will successfully complete all program requirements as outlined in the Individualized Service Plans (ISPs).				
Performance Measure:	Projected FY2008	Actual FY2008	Projected FY2009	Projected FY2010
At least 75% of participants will successfully complete the program (average of all programs).	New Measure	83%	85%	87%
Analysis of the Data: While the State Department of Juvenile Justice has set a 75% successful completion rate, it is anticipated, based on the current treatment plan methodologies and past success rates that Juvenile Services can achieve an 87% success rate for FY 2010. However, it is important to note that there are various, uncontrollable factors that impact successful program completion.				

Goal 2: Outreach Detention program participants are in compliance with court orders.				
Objective: Participants are available for all scheduled court appearances.				
Performance Measure:	Projected FY2008	Actual FY2008	Projected FY2009	Projected FY2010
At least 95% of program participants will be present at all scheduled court hearings.	New Measure	100%	96%	97%
Analysis of the Data: While Juvenile Services achieved 100% attendance in FY 2008, it is very difficult to project 100% success when providing services to at-risk youth. A number of uncontrollable factors can impact whether or not a youth is available for and present at all scheduled court hearings; as a result, projected figures are less than 100%.				

Goal 3: Participants will gain an appreciation of the value of community service.				
Objective: Program participants will successfully complete court-ordered community service activities (service learning) and projects.				
Performance Measure:	Projected FY2008	Actual FY2008	Projected FY2009	Projected FY2010
At least 90% of program participants will complete court-ordered community services activities.	New Measure	100%	90%	93%
Analysis of the Data: As with Goal 2, it is very difficult to project 100% success when providing services to at-risk youth. A number of uncontrollable factors can impact successful completion of community services hours; as a result, projected figures are less than 100%.				

Benchmark Localities: Roanoke, Newport News, and Petersburg, VA



Social Services Performance Measures

Goal 1: Provide timely financial assistance services (Food Stamps, Medicaid and Temporary Assistance to Needy Families) to eligible clients.				
Objective: Meet or exceed State timeliness target of 96.5% for these programs.				
Performance Measure:	Projected FY2008	Actual FY2008	Projected FY2009	Projected FY2010
Percentage of cases meeting State and federal programmatic timeliness policy.	96.5%	93.0%	96.5%	97.0%
Analysis of the Data: Significant turnover and policy changes during FY 2008 contributed to the failure to meet target. A relatively stable workforce, which is close to fully trained, should enable the department to achieve its target for FY 2009 and FY 2010.				

Goal 2: Protect at risk children by providing excellent Child Protective and Family Services.				
Objective: Reduce the occurrence of repeat maltreatment of children to the State target of 6.1% or less.				
Performance Measure:	Projected FY2008	Actual FY2008	Projected FY2009	Projected FY2010
Repeat maltreatment	0.0%	0.0%	2.0%	2.0%
Analysis of the Data: Emphasis on preventive ongoing services to abused children will continue to protect them from repeat maltreatment.				

Goal 3: Provide outstanding customer service to citizens.				
Objective: Meet or exceed statewide benchmark of 92% client satisfaction rate.				
Performance Measure:	Projected FY2008	Actual FY2008	Projected FY2009	Projected FY2010
Percentage of customers rating services as satisfactory or better.	96.0%	96.6%	97.0%	97.0%
Analysis of the Data: Staff exceeded the projected satisfaction level in FY 2008 by 0.6%. As a result, the projected FY 2009 and FY 2010 goals reflect an increase to 97%. With a reduced workforce due to economic challenges, this goal may be challenging to meet.				

Benchmark Localities: Petersburg, Charlottesville, Danville, Roanoke City, Chesterfield, and Hanover, VA
--



Public Library Performance Measures

Goal 1: Increase circulation per capita.				
Objective: To provide a diverse collection of materials which are useful to our community.				
Performance Measure:	Projected FY 2008	Actual FY 2008	Projected FY 2009	Projected FY 2010
Circulation per capita	7.9	8.2	8.0	8.1
Analysis of the Data: FY 2009 showed the highest circulation in the library's 44-year history due in large measure to the worsening economy, forcing citizens to seek free services close to home. However, following a shooting at the Main Library in January 2009, concerns over safety slowed this growth - subsequent months showed a 2% reduction in use from FY 2008. Projections for FY 2010 are conservative to reflect the potential need to reduce the number of hours the library is open (due to lack of adequate staffing) and possible State Budget cuts resulting in less money to buy new books, DVDs, etc. The reduction in hours and/or new materials will directly and negatively impact the number of people served and the number of items circulated. (Note: FY 2008 population was 68,758; the FY 2009 population was 70,734.)				

Goal 2: Increase program attendance per capita.				
Objective: To provide programming to reach a broad section of the community, for both youth and adults.				
Performance Measure:	Projected FY 2008	Actual FY 2008	Projected FY 2009	Projected FY 2010
Program attendance per capita	0.20	0.20	0.16	0.16
Analysis of the Data: A vibrant youth program reaches thousand of children annually. Adult programs such as Lynchburg Reads appeal to hundreds of teens and adults. However, the freeze on hiring has had a negative impact on the number of programs staff can physically provide. A shrinking staff is unable to manage increased use at the public information desks, 65,000 personal computer (PC) user sessions, and continue to provide programming at previous levels. Projections for FY 2010 show no increase for these reasons. (Note: FY 2008 population was 68,758; the FY 2009 population was 70,734.)				



Public Library Performance Measures - continued

Goal 3: Increase on-site, through-the-door visitorship.				
Objective: To encourage the community to visit the library facilities by offering a wide range of materials, PCs, and programs.				
Performance Measure:	Projected FY2008	Actual FY2008	Projected FY2009	Projected FY2010
Visits per capita	4.7	4.9	4.4	4.5
Analysis of the Data: FY 2009 was the busiest in the library’s history, but the decrease in visits per capita is a direct result of public concerns over security, especially after the January 2009 shooting. Projections for FY 2010 are conservative to reflect the potential need to reduce the number of hours the library is open (due to lack of adequate staffing) and possible State Budget cuts resulting in less money to buy new books, DVDs, etc. The reduction in hours and/or new materials will directly and negatively impact the number of people served and the number of items circulated. (Note: FY 2008 population was 68,758; the FY 2009 population was 70,734.)				

Benchmark Localities: Data for the VA First Cities' public libraries was retrieved from the Library of VA database: Appomattox Regional, Blue Ridge Regional, Central Rappahannock Regional, Danville Public, Hampton Public, Jefferson Madison Regional, Newport News Public, Norfolk Public, Petersburg Public, Portsmouth Library, Richmond Public, Roanoke City Public, Staunton Public, and The Handly Library.
--



Museums Performance Measures

Goal 1:				
To offer quality interpretive programs that are mission driven, accessible to the public, and of interest to residents and visitors.				
Objective:				
Present exhibits, tours, special events, and outreach programs to 13,000 visitors annually.				
Performance Measure:	Projected FY2008	Actual FY2008	Projected FY2009	Projected FY2010
Number of annual visitors to the Museum System	11,500	13,995	12,000	13,000
Analysis of the Data:				
Many museums in Virginia are seeing declines in visitation with the economy, fuel costs, and cutting of field trips. In FY 2008, the Museum benefited from the expected "honeymoon" period when it reopened with over 3,000 visitors in the first two months. In FY 2009, KidsHaven ended its annual event at Point of Honor, which previously brought 500 visitors. The end of this event coupled with the D Street Bridge closing, resulted in a projected decline. For FY 2010, the Department is striving to increase school tours and programs to offset these current challenges.				

Goal 2:				
Provide opportunities for the community to participate in Lynchburg's history.				
Objective:				
Acquire a broader base of volunteer support for the Museum System's mission by increasing volunteer hours.				
Performance Measure:	Projected FY2008	Actual FY2008	Projected FY2009	Projected FY2010
Value of volunteer hours	\$41,000	\$49,261	\$49,000	\$46,000
Analysis of the Data:				
The data is expressed as total volunteer hours donated multiplied by the Federal hourly rate for volunteer service. The number of hours donated in 2008 totalled 2,230 valued at \$22.09 (\$49,261). A decrease is expected in FY 2010 due to one less major event (KidsHaven), less overall activity, and demographic trends in volunteerism, which include an aging pool and people returning to work.				

Goal 3:				
To provide quality experiences for visitors (local, regional, and traveling) who tour the Lynchburg Museum and Point of Honor.				
Objective:				
To achieve at least an 80% satisfaction rating on visitor surveys completed by those who visit either site.				
Performance Measure:	Projected FY2008	Actual FY2008	Projected FY2009	Projected FY2010
Customer satisfaction level	New Measure	New Measure	New Measure	80%
Analysis of the Data:				
A satisfaction question was added to the customer survey in FY 2009. Based on initial scores, a projected FY 2010 satisfaction rate of 80% is expected.				

Benchmark Localities:
 Manassas, Portsmouth, Newport News, and Petersburg, VA



Parks and Recreation Performance Measures

Goal 1: Manage parks, trails, and civic facilities for the benefit of Lynchburg citizens and create opportunities for citizens of all ages and abilities to participate in a rich variety of recreational activities.				
Objective: Provide quality recreation programs and excellent customer service to the citizens of Lynchburg, increasing the percentage of citizens rating Parks and Recreation programs as good or excellent.				
Performance Measure:	Projected FY 2008	Actual FY 2008	Projected FY 2009	Projected FY 2010
% of citizens rating Parks and Recreation programs as good or excellent.	60%	60%	61%	65%
Analysis of the Data: FY 2008 median data is not yet available for this measure; however, when comparing FY 2008 actual percentages with the FY 2007 data from the ICMA Performance Measurement Survey, Lynchburg ranks below the national median rate (for other localities reporting on this survey) which show that 82% of citizens rank Parks and Recreation programs as good or excellent.				

Goal 2: Manage parks, trails, and civic facilities for the benefit of Lynchburg citizens and create opportunities for citizens of all ages and abilities to participate in a rich variety of recreational activities.				
Objective: Provide effective and efficient services.				
Performance Measure:	Projected FY 2008	Actual FY 2008	Projected FY 2009	Projected FY 2010
Parks and Recreation FTEs per 1,000 population	0.90	0.90	0.85	0.80
Analysis of the Data: Represents the combined FTEs per 1,000 population for parks and recreation operations, including maintenance provided by Public Works. The median for localities reporting on the ICMA survey in 2007 is 0.89 FTEs (0.41 Parks Maintenance & Operations, 0.47 Recreation). Lynchburg had 0.38 Parks and 0.52 Recreation FTEs in FY 2008 and had the lowest number of FTEs for all Virginia localities reporting on the survey.				

Goal 3: Create opportunities for citizens of all ages and abilities to participate in a rich variety of recreational activities.				
Objective: Develop and fund a scholarship program to ensure recreation programs are affordable to all City residents.				
Performance Measure:	Projected FY 2008	Actual FY 2008	Projected FY 2009	Projected FY 2010
Total number/value of scholarships awarded	350/Not Projected	347/\$8,579	350/\$9,000	375/\$12,000
Analysis of the Data: Reliance on the scholarship fund continues to increase slightly. The vast majority of scholarships are given to youth attending center-based summer camps and youth participating in basketball. It is difficult to benchmark with other localities as scholarship program structures vary widely or are nonexistent in other cities.				

Benchmark Localities: Charlottesville, Hopewell, Newport News, and Williamsburg, VA; Johnson City, TN



Community Development Performance Measures

Goal 1:				
Improve the timeliness and on-budget delivery of capital projects managed by the Engineering Division in excess of \$1.0 million.				
Objective:				
Complete capital project delivery within the City that is both on time and within budget as defined on the capital improvement program project detail sheet.				
Performance Measure:	Projected FY2008	Actual FY2008	Projected FY2009	Projected FY2010
Percentage of Projects:				
On time	New Measure	New Measure	New Measure	75%
Within budget	New Measure	New Measure	New Measure	80%
Analysis of the Data:				
This is a new performance measure and will become the baseline in FY 2010. Staff's long-term goal is to be within budget and on time with 90% of the projects.				
Benchmark Localities:				
Virginia Department of Transportation; Roanoke and Danville, VA				

Goal 2:				
Facilitate development by reviewing and processing site plans, subdivision plats, and public hearing items.				
Objective:				
Identify ways to improve the quality and timeliness of reviews while ensuring compliance with City Code and fulfilling the Goals and Objectives of the Comprehensive Plan.				
Performance Measure:	Projected FY2008	Actual FY2008	Projected FY2009	Projected FY2010
Percentage of reports reviewed and processed within the designated time period.	New Measure	New Measure	87%	95%
Analysis of the Data:				
The number of development reviews can be directly correlated to overall economic conditions. The analysis of the percentage of reviews that City staff complete with in the allotted time periods can help determine staffing needs to the Technical Review Committee (TRC).				
Benchmark Localities:				
Charlottesville, Spottsylvania, Albemarle, and City of Roanoke, VA				



Community Development Performance Measures - continued

Goal 3:
 Preserve and improve the physical, social, and economic health of neighborhoods through housing and community development projects, downtown redevelopment, environmental code enforcement, and building code enforcement.

Objective:
 Streamline the process by responding to customer/citizen requests for service within forty-eight hours from the time of the request. This only includes customers/citizens who provided contact information.

Performance Measure:	Projected FY 2008	Actual FY 2008	Projected FY 2009	Projected FY 2010
Respond within 36 hours: Zoning / Erosion Sediment Control	New Measure	New Measure	New Measure	100%
Environmental Code Enforcement	New Measure	New Measure	New Measure	100%
New Construction Inspections	New Measure	New Measure	New Measure	100%
Housing Code Inspections	New Measure	New Measure	New Measure	100%

Analysis of the Data:
 Response will only be available to those leaving contact information; some customers/citizens choose to remain anonymous.

Benchmark Localities:
 Danville and Roanoke, VA



Economic Development Performance Measures

Goal 1:				
Relationship management and building through business engagement.				
Objective:				
Establish the Office of Economic Development (OED) as a primary resource to promote retention and expansion of the City's existing businesses through multiple types of communications, informational meetings, events, and programs.				
Performance Measure:	Projected FY 2008	Actual FY 2008	Projected FY 2009	Projected FY 2010
Number of participants	307	610	564	350
Analysis of the Data:				
Relationships with and connections made for the City's business community are a priority for the OED. The department tracks all connections made with customers (City businesses) using a specialized database. While every effort is made to increase the number of "touches," reductions in staff and monetary resources are reflected in the projections.				

Goal 2:				
Business recruitment and development.				
Objective:				
Strengthen and support a business environment which attracts and develops businesses through a "value added" model of state and local innovative incentive programs and strategic regional alliances.				
Performance Measure:	Projected FY 2008	Actual FY 2008	Projected FY 2009	Projected FY 2010
Number of inquiries	New Measure	New Measure	400	500
Analysis of the Data:				
Increased inquiries have been shown to boost participation in programs. Limited resources will impact OED's ability to communicate, market, and administer programs at an optimal level.				

Goal 3:				
Marketing, information management, and workforce development initiatives.				
Objective:				
Collect, market, and distribute information both internally and externally to market the City as a great place to live, work, and play. Connect the public and private schools with the business community to create organic workforce development.				
Performance Measure:	Projected FY 2008	Actual FY 2008	Projected FY 2009	Projected FY 2010
Number of Initiatives	New Measure	New Measure	10	10
Analysis of the Data:				
With limited resources OED will seek opportunities to collaborate and share resources to accomplish innovative, agile initiatives to promote the City and its assets. The department plans to track initiatives and participation and continue to seek innovative organic approaches to workforce development, marketing, and branding as well as effective, efficient data collection methods. Reduced staff and budget will impact capacity.				

Benchmark Localities:				
Virginia's First Cities - Charlottesville, Danville, Fredericksburg, Hampton, Hopewell, Martinsville, Newport News, Norfolk, Petersburg, Portsmouth, Richmond, Roanoke, Staunton, and Winchester				



Fleet Services Performance Measures

Goal 1:
Enable the efficient delivery of city services by providing expedient repairs to vehicles making them available for duty each day.

Objective:
Maintain a 97% fleet availability rate.

Performance Measure:	Projected FY2008	Actual FY2008	Projected FY2009	Projected FY2010
Fleet availability rate	98.0%	97.9%	98.0%	97.0%

Analysis of the Data:
The FY 2010 budget did not include any vehicle replacements due to financial constraints. As a result, it is expected the availability percentage will drop 1% since more vehicles will require maintenance while the number of repair staff will remain const

Goal 2:
To repair police fleet vehicles at a competitive and minimal cost.

Objective:
Repair light duty police vehicles at a cost of \$0.165 cents or less per mile driven.

Performance Measure:	Projected FY2008	Actual FY2008	Projected FY2009	Projected FY2010
Cost per mile driven	\$0.16	\$0.15	\$0.15	\$0.16

Analysis of the Data:
It is expected that the aging police fleet, due to limited vehicle replacement, will drive the FY 2010 figure to \$0.16.

Goal 3:
To provide excellent customer service.

Objective:
Maintain a Good/Excellent customer satisfaction rating (98% or greater).

Performance Measure:	Projected FY2008	Actual FY2008	Projected FY2009	Projected FY2010
Customer satisfaction rating	New Measure	98%	98%	98%

Analysis of the Data:
Although an older fleet requires more maintenance and may increase service response time, the Department expects to maintain its customer satisfaction rate.

Benchmark Localities:
Fairfax County, Roanoke, and Charlottesville, VA; Longmont, CO; Durham, NC



Lynchburg Regional Airport Performance Measures

Goal 1:
Attract additional passengers, increase airport revenues, and contribute to the City's overall economic development potential.

Objective:
Increase the number of daily departure seats available from the Airport by attracting additional airline service and/or low fares.

Performance Measure:	Projected FY2008	Actual FY2008	Projected FY2009	Projected FY2010
Daily departure seats	287	247	274	287

Analysis of the Data:
Efforts to increase the number of daily departure seats offered by Lynchburg airline service providers during FY 2008 were hampered by unprecedented aviation fuel prices and a sluggish economy. However, significantly lower fares introduced in July 2008 make the FY 2009 and FY 2010 goals attainable.

Goal 2:
Produce additional direct and secondary revenue to the Airport.

Objective:
Increase airline passenger traffic served by the Airport.

Performance Measure:	Projected FY2008	Actual FY2008	Projected FY2009	Projected FY2010
Passenger traffic	112,000	98,423	132,000	144,000

Analysis of the Data:
The airline passenger traffic goal for FY 2008 was not met due primarily to cutbacks by business travelers as a result of the sluggish economy. Generally high fares prior to July 2008 discouraged leisure travelers as well. However, significantly lower fares implemented in July 2008 make the FY 2009 and FY 2010 goals attainable.

Goal 3:
Eliminate the annual operating subsidy from the City to the Airport by FY 2013.

Objective:
Reduce annually the operating subsidy from the City to the Airport.

Performance Measure:	Projected FY2008	Actual FY2008	Projected FY2009	Projected FY2010
Operating Subsidy	\$399,265	\$359,364	\$310,000	\$286,401

Analysis of the Data:
The annual subsidy has declined each year since a high of \$614,530 in FY 2002. A lower subsidy was achieved for FY 2008 primarily by generating modest revenue increases combined with decreased debt service.

Benchmark Localities:
There is no other locality in Virginia which owns a commercial service airport and our goals are not comparable to any other airport.



Utilities Department - Water Performance Measures

Goal 1:				
Maintain a high level of customer satisfaction with the quality and quantity of water produced.				
Objective:				
Produce safe, high quality water on an uninterrupted basis with sufficient volume and pressure for consumption and fire protection throughout the Lynchburg water system.				
Performance Measure:	Projected FY 2008	Actual FY 2008	Projected FY 2009	Projected FY 2010
Drinking Water Compliance Rate (Percent of time compliant with National Primary Drinking Water Regulations).	100%	100%	100%	100%
Analysis of the Data:				
Drinking water quality consistently exceeds all state and federal standards.				

Goal 2:				
Deliver water on an uninterrupted basis while maintaining a high level of customer satisfaction.				
Objective:				
Maintain and operate the water system such that customer complaints and service disruptions are minimized.				
Performance Measure:	Projected FY 2008	Actual FY 2008	Projected FY 2009	Projected FY 2010
Water Distribution System Integrity (breaks per 100 miles of distribution pipe).	24	21	25	27
Analysis of the Data:				
The water distribution system is aging. The consequence will be a steady increase in the number of water main breaks.				

Goal 3:				
Operate the water treatment plants and pump stations efficiently.				
Objective:				
Operate the Water Treatment Plants in a cost-effective and efficient manner.				
Performance Measure:	Projected FY 2008	Actual FY 2008	Projected FY 2009	Projected FY 2010
Overall water treatment cost per million gallons treated.	\$640	\$664	\$754	\$735
Analysis of the Data:				
Projected FY 2009 and FY 2010 increases are due primarily to rising chemical and power costs as well as additional regulatory requirements.				

Benchmark Localities:
Charlottesville, Danville, Hampton, Richmond, and Roanoke, VA; American Water Works Association (AWWA)



Utilities Department - Sewer Performance Measures

Goal 1: Protect the environment and promote the general health and welfare of the citizens of Lynchburg while maintaining a high level of customer satisfaction.				
Objective: Provide pollution and flood control through the maintenance of the sanitary and storm sewer systems.				
Performance Measure:	Projected FY2008	Actual FY2008	Projected FY2009	Projected FY2010
Sewer Overflow Rate (reportable overflows per 100 miles of sewer line).	4.0	3.6	7.3	7.5
Analysis of the Data: This measure reflects overflows not associated with Combined Sewer Overflow (CSO). Significant work has been performed on the combined portion of the system; meanwhile, the separated sewer system continues to age resulting in an anticipated increase in overflows.				

Goal 2: Protect the environment and promote general health and welfare.				
Objective: Treat wastewater from the City of Lynchburg and Amherst, Bedford, and Campbell Counties to meet or exceed all state and federal regulatory requirements.				
Performance Measure:	Projected FY2008	Actual FY2008	Projected FY2009	Projected FY2010
Treatment Effectiveness Rate (% of days in compliance with numerical VA Pollutant Discharge Elimination System permit limits).	100%	100%	100%	100%
Analysis of the Data: Wastewater Treatment Plant effluent quality is consistently better than permitted requirements.				

Goal 3: Operate the Wastewater Treatment Plant in a cost-effective and efficient manner.				
Objective: Treat wastewater in a technically-sound and efficiently-operated Regional Wastewater Treatment Plant on an uninterrupted basis.				
Performance Measure:	Projected FY2008	Actual FY2008	Projected FY2009	Projected FY2010
Overall treatment cost per million gallons treated.	1,194	1,186	1,407	1,437
Analysis of the Data: Projected FY 2009 and FY 2010 increases are due primarily to rising chemical and power costs as well as additional regulatory requirements.				

Benchmark Localities: Charlottesville, Danville, Hampton, Richmond, and Roanoke, VA; American Water Works Association (AWWA)				
--	--	--	--	--



Risk Management Performance Measures

Goal 1: Reduce safety and loss control hazards to lessen or prevent injuries to employees and citizens, while protecting city assets from damage or destruction.				
Objective: Inspect 5% of City owned facilities and buildings (approximately 13) annually, recommending corrective measures to departments when required. The City owns approximately 250 buildings/facilities.				
Performance Measure:				
	Projected FY 2008	Actual FY 2008	Projected FY 2009	Projected FY 2010
% of facilities inspected with comprehensive repairs sent to departments.	New Measure	New Measure	New Measure	5%
Analysis of the Data: Each facility inspected will have a report prepared detailing deficiencies and follow-up when corrective measures have been completed.				

Goal 2: Assist all city departments to achieve OSHA compliance, reduce employee injuries, and lower associated workers compensation claims.				
Objective: Provide the City Manager with an annual report evaluating each department's progress towards OSHA compliance. To assist and monitor department progress towards OSHA compliance.				
Performance Measure:				
	Projected FY 2008	Actual FY 2008	Projected FY 2009	Projected FY 2010
Percent of departments evaluated for OSHA compliance.	New Measure	New Measure	New Measure	100%
Analysis of the Data: Departmental progress will be monitored on a monthly basis detailing Risk Management assistance and cooperative efforts within departments.				

Benchmark Localities: Charlottesville, Hampton, Petersburg, Portsmouth, and Roanoke, VA
