

ICMA Benchmarking Project FY2007 Data Report

Briefing to Small Group
Housing Department
September 23, 2008



FY2007 ICMA / City Overview

Background



ICMA Center for Performance Measurement

- **Purpose:** To help local governments improve the effectiveness and efficiency of public services through the collection, analysis, and application of performance information in 15 service areas including housing services
- Over 170 local governments in US and Canada
- 3 of 10 largest US cities currently participate:
Phoenix, San Antonio, Dallas
- Tool to track and manage data over time and against jurisdictions across the country
- Data analysis can result in management and service delivery changes



City of Dallas

- Fourth year of participation
- Participated in data compilation in key service areas including housing services
- Data analysis
 - Examine Dallas' Relative Position from FY04 to FY07
 - Compare Dallas to other peer jurisdictions for FY07
 - Present “Proposed Actions” or Next Steps based upon data analysis



Housing Department

FY07 ICMA Services Assessment*

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



Dallas' Relative Position to All Reporting Jurisdictions

	Outside Capital as % of Total Funding	Constructed or Rehabilitated Units Added to Housing Stock No. of units per \$100,000 Public Assistance	Home Purchases No. of units per \$100,000 Public Assistance	Rehabilitation of Owner-Occupied Units No. of units per \$100,000 of Assist. (Public/Outside Cap)
FY2004				
Dallas	NA	2.8	12.2	NA
Mean	64.3%	10.2	13.2	12.0
Median	63.2%	4.4	10.0	9.1
FY2005				
Dallas	58.9%	2.3	9.1	15.6
Mean	50.7%	9.3	13.3	10.7
Median	54.4%	4.3	10.6	6.7
FY2006				
Dallas	65.0%	2.1	11.6	15.5
Mean	49.3	5.1	9.7	8.9
Median	57.3	2.6	10.2	6.5
FY2007				
Dallas	61.9%	1.9	9.8	12.4
Mean	51.8%	6.4	9.6	9.7
Median	55.1%	2.3	9.3	6.7



Relative Position to All Reporting Jurisdictions FY06 / FY07

- Areas of Strength

- Outside capital leveraged decreased slightly* overall but still exceeded mean and median for all jurisdictions and peer jurisdictions
- Home purchases subsidy per \$100,000 of public funding exceed mean and median for all jurisdictions and peer jurisdictions
- Owner-occupied units rehabilitated per \$100,000 of total funding exceed mean and median for all jurisdictions and peer jurisdictions
- New units added to housing stock from public funds increased 70% from FY06 to FY07

*Decrease in production of multi-family units contributed to decrease in outside capital leveraged, but City's focus is on production of single-family units



FY07 Peer City Comparison

Peer Jurisdictions (Populations 300,000+)	Population	Outside Capital as % of Total Funding	Constructed or Rehabilitated Units <u>Added to Housing Stock</u>	<u>Home Purchases</u>	Rehabilitation of <u>Owner-Occupied Units</u>
			No. of units per \$100,000 of Public Assistance	No. of units per \$100,000 of Public Assistance	No. of units per \$100,000 of Total Asst. (Public/Outside Cap)
Mean		52.5%	4.1	7.1	11.4
Median		48.3%	1.8	5.7	7.0
Phoenix	1,514,369	81.1%	8.4	1.5	29.8
Nassau County	1,325,662	18.0%	1.7	6.4	5.9
San Antonio	1,312,286			7.2	
Dallas	1,280,500	61.9%	1.9	9.8	12.4
Fairfax County	1,067,216	45.4%	1.6	.8	17.4
Austin	724,117	48.3%	3.3	10.7	28.9
Fort Worth*	686,850		1.0	10.7	30.1
Pinellas County	584,726	64.6%	.7	1.5	4.1
Portland	562,690			4.6	3.1
Oklahoma City	555,000		1.6	18.7	
Mesa	493,077	62.9%	3.9	2.1	8.3
Long Beach	491,564	75.7%	1.0		2.8
Virginia Beach	433,549	28.5%	14.9	14.2	3.5
Santa Barbara County	421,625		2.3	.7	
Reno	409,085			4.9	
Colorado Springs	398,258		18.3		8.1
Prince William County	381,221	47.8%		1.0	2.1
Sarasota County	379,386	42.8%	1.8	4.0	3.7
Arlington	364,300		.3	16.2	
Aurora	306,908			13.1	

*First year participant

Note: Benchmark jurisdictions are highlighted

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



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

	<u>Outside Capital as % of Total Funding</u>	<u>Constructed or Rehabilitated Units Added to Housing Stock</u> No. of units per \$100,000 Public Assistance	<u>Home Purchases</u> No. of units per \$100,000 Public Assistance	<u>Rehabilitation of Owner-Occupied Units</u> No. of units per \$100,000 of Assist. (Public/Outside Cap)
FY2004	NA	12th out of 17	4th out of 17	NA
FY2005	4th out of 7 (at the median)	13th out of 16	8th out of 21	3rd out of 13
FY2006	2nd out of 9	9th out of 17 (at the median)	7th out of 18	3rd out of 17
FY2007	5th out of 11	7th out of 15	7th out of 18	5th out of 14



FY07 Peer City Comparison

- Dallas Position with Peer Cities
 - Outside capital as % of total funding – 5th out of 11 (position dropped from FY06 but exceeds mean and median for all jurisdictions and peers)
 - Units added to housing stock per \$100,000 of public funding – 7th out of 15 (position improved from FY06 and slightly exceeds the median for peer jurisdictions)
 - Home purchases per \$100,000 of public funding – 7th out of 18 (no change in position from FY06 and exceeds mean and median for all jurisdictions and peers); produced the greatest number of total units
 - Rehabilitation of owner-occupied units per \$100,000 of total funding – 5th out of 14 (position dropped from FY06 but exceeds mean and median for all jurisdictions and peers)



FY07 Peer City Comparison (cont'd)

- Areas of Strength
 - Rehabilitation of owner-occupied units standing has improved
 - Provision of subsidies for home purchases remained the same in a faltering market
- Areas of Concern
 - Constructed or rehabilitated units per \$100,000 of public funding remained the same
 - Constructed or rehabilitated units include both multi-family and single-family units, and Dallas continues to need increased production of single-family units, especially in the Southern area of the City



CUSTOMER FEEDBACK

- Homerepair Program
 - Homeowner Questionnaire – Used for past 5 years
 - Helpfulness of City staff and contractor
 - Construction Workmanship
 - Comments and suggestions
 - Inspector Questionnaire – Used for past 4 years
 - Construction started and work completed on time
 - Contractor followed specifications & work write-up
 - Contractor & subcontractors professional & courteous
 - Contractor Questionnaire – Used for past 3 years
 - Clarity and completeness of write-up
 - Response to request for inspections within 48 hours
 - Professional behavior
 - Homeowner questionnaire tracked in Management Focus with continued 91% satisfaction rate
 - Homerepair Program changes implemented in FY08 has increased funding for each system repaired or home built and provides additional choice of plans for replacement homes to increase satisfaction rate



CUSTOMER FEEDBACK (cont'd)

- People Helping People Program
 - Homeowner Questionnaire – Used for past 6 years
 - Were staff and volunteers courteous
 - Was work completed
 - Were your questions and concerns addressed
 - Volunteer Questionnaire – Used for past 6 years
 - Match of volunteer construction skills to project
 - Receipt of all materials for scope of project
 - Ways in which program can be improved
 - Homeowner questionnaire tracked in Management Focus with 100% satisfaction rate
- Mortgage Assistance Program Questionnaire developed in FY06-07 and implemented in FY07-08 to evaluate customer satisfaction



BENCHMARKING

- ICMA Benchmarking FY06 And FY07 Data
 - Phoenix, San Antonio, Fort Worth (1st year participant and replaces San Jose, which has discontinued reporting)
 - ICMA Data Observations
 - Overall, Dallas is second among the benchmark cities in total number of units produced and also ranks second in number of units per \$100,000 public funds spent for home purchases. Dallas was first in both categories in FY06.
 - Dallas places greater emphasis on production of home purchases
 - Dallas continues to successfully leverage its dollars to maximize homeownership opportunities with a slight increase from FY06
 - Dallas is third behind Phoenix and Fort Worth in the number of owner-occupied units rehabilitated
 - Although production of multi-family units is not a priority, Dallas uses HFC bond funds to produce a number of units, which per \$100,000 of funding trailed both Phoenix and San Antonio in FY06 and follows only Phoenix in FY07
 - Dallas ranks first in production of new owner occupied units in FY06 and FY07



BENCHMARKING (cont'd)

- Benchmark Cities Priorities And Funding
 - Housing Priorities – Dallas has prioritized production of new owner-occupied residential units in contrast to the emphasis on new rental units in Phoenix. San Antonio gives rehabilitation of rental units its highest priority, and Fort Worth places highest priority on rehabilitation of owner-occupied units. Both Dallas and Phoenix also places significant emphasis on owner-occupied unit rehabilitation. Dallas continues giving priority to financing homeownership while both Phoenix and San Antonio have decreased production in this area.
 - Funding – Dallas has the highest total expenditure of public financial assistance in FY06 and FY07. Phoenix provides more bond funding for housing. San Antonio and Fort Worth fund housing from their HUD entitlement grants, and Fort Worth has small amount of funding from private donations and State grants.
 - Expenditures - Dallas uses significantly more funding overall than benchmark cities for production of housing units. Dallas ranks first in public funding used in both FY06 and FY07 for completed new owner-occupied and rental units, rehabilitation for owner-occupied units, and homeownership assistance. Dallas has spent the most funding on housing, and Fort Worth has spent the least in FY07.



PROPOSED ACTIONS

- Results of FY05-06 Proposed Actions
 - City Council has approved modification of Basic Service Repair and Replacement Housing Programs to increase total number of repairs and replacements
 - First-time homebuyers purchased 100 homes from Community Housing Development Organizations as a result of the \$1,000,000 in Mortgage Assistance Program funding specifically set aside to increase the number of home sales by non-profit developers*
 - Implemented 11th month inspection of homerepair and replacement projects to seek customer feedback and review construction viability and warranty concerns

*The Community Housing Development Organizations built and sold 122 homes in FY2006-07



PROPOSED ACTIONS (cont'd)

- FY07-08 Proposed Actions
 - Sale of Certificates of Obligation for public infrastructure related to housing
 - Creation of interdepartmental team to increase efficiency of production of units
 - Changes of homerepair program statement modifying reconstruction project lien terms to increase program income providing more available funding for housing programs

