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Key Takeaways

• Comparisons help us understand what we do, track our progress, and provide accurate information about service delivery

• To succeed you need jurisdictional commitment, mutual trust, data sharing and a partnership with a neutral facilitator
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THE CASE FOR COMPARISON
Comparisons can be challenging
Context is needed
How do our cities compare?

Do you wonder how many police officers work in your city, and how that fares with other Valley municipalities? Use our guide to find that out, and see what resources local cities have for parks, pools, libraries and more.

Who has the most parks? The smallest police force? The biggest budget?

Take a look at these comparisons from fiscal 2011. All data is per 10,000 residents. To compare data, click the enter button above.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parks Spending</th>
<th>Police Officers</th>
<th>Libraries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Glendale</td>
<td>$850,625</td>
<td>Avondale</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| El Mirage      | $491,833        | Scottsdale| 0.262
| Chandler       | $473,493        | Mesa      | 0.091
| Phoenix        | 21.8            |           |
| Tempe          | 20.9            |           |
| Gilbert        | 10.3            |           |
Office of Information Technology

Information Technology (IT) services can be largely grouped into categories of resident and/or business-facing and staff-facing services. Resident/business-facing systems are systems that residents or businesses interface with directly. Staff-facing services include IT infrastructure that must be dependable so employees can effectively leverage IT systems to more efficiently provide service to the community. Keeping these systems operational is essential to providing service to the community.

**Benchmark: Application Availability** – Online applications like utility bill payment and parks and recreation enrollment are systems that provide direct services to residents and businesses. An application outage is a service disruption and inconvenience to the Town’s customers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City/Town</th>
<th>Performance (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gilbert, AZ</td>
<td>99.92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chandler, AZ</td>
<td>99.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tempe, AZ</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Collins, CO</td>
<td>99.83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henderson, NV</td>
<td>99.29%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Only reported whole numbers.
**Note: Henderson, NV reports availability for critical systems, which include application, network and telephone availability. No figures reported for all three.*

**Benchmark: Network Availability** – The town’s data network is essential to the successful use of applications used for service delivery by customer-facing business units. A network outage has a direct and immediate impact on customer service and employee productivity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City/Town</th>
<th>Performance (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gilbert, AZ</td>
<td>99.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chandler, AZ</td>
<td>99.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tempe, AZ</td>
<td>99.93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Collins, CO</td>
<td>99.63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henderson, NV</td>
<td>99.20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Only reported whole numbers.
**Note: Fort Collins does not have ability to record network availability per city staff, looking forward to having that capability in the future.**

**Benchmark: Telephone Availability** – The town’s telephone system is essential to interacting with residents and businesses in need of town services. A telephone outage has a direct and immediate impact on customer service and employee productivity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City/Town</th>
<th>Performance (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gilbert, AZ</td>
<td>99.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chandler, AZ</td>
<td>99.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tempe, AZ</td>
<td>99.93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Collins, CO</td>
<td>99.93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henderson, NV</td>
<td>99.29%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Only reported whole numbers.
**Note: Data source: Municipal FY13 budget documents, IT department staff and municipal websites.**

To view FY14 performance measures and objectives for IT, [click here](#).
CREATING A CONSORTIUM
City’s spending questioned

For Scottsdale, workers are the largest expense

By Beth Duckett
The Arizona Republic

Despite deep cuts planned to city services and personnel next year, Scottsdale’s general-fund budget — the money it spends on basic services — is estimated to be millions of dollars greater than other Valley cities with larger or similar populations.

Many officials defend the higher budget in relation to the number of residents, saying it’s the price the city must pay to cater to tourists and residents who demand better services and programs in a city known for its upscale neighborhoods and lifestyle.

But others suggest the city needs to take a harder look at what it’s spending in relation to its population.

A good portion of a Scottsdale's general-fund expenses are spent on employee-related costs. An analysis provided by the city shows Scottsdale ranks the highest among the Valley’s largest cities when it comes to the number of employees. The city has 11.7 full-time equivalent employees per 1,000 residents, compared with Phoenix’s 10.8 and Chandler’s 6.9.

Scottsdale Vice Mayor Bob Little-

See SCOTTSDALE, Page B8

Lacy Fons of Milwaukee tries on hats while shopping last week in Old Town Scottsdale. Tourism is a big driver of general-fund spending, city officials say, as Scottsdale caters to its visitors as well as its residents. DAVID KADLUBOWSKI/THE REPUBLIC
**POPULATION VS. BUDGET SIZE**

Scottsdale’s projected operating budget is higher than those of other Valley cities of larger or comparable populations. Figures are based on the 2010 census and recent reports from cities. Budget numbers are subject to change as cities refine their plans for the 2011-12 budget year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Operating budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mesa</td>
<td>439,041</td>
<td>$228 million (may increase)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chandler</td>
<td>236,123</td>
<td>$174 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glendale</td>
<td>226,721</td>
<td>$170.8 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scottsdale</td>
<td>217,385</td>
<td>$235.2 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilbert</td>
<td>208,453</td>
<td>$103.7 million</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**EMPLOYEE COSTS OF MAJOR VALLEY CITIES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Total employees</th>
<th>Employees per 1,000 residents</th>
<th>Personnel costs*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mesa</td>
<td>3,597.4</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>$219.3 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chandler</td>
<td>1,625</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>$151.1 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glendale</td>
<td>1,971</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>$149.7 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scottsdale</td>
<td>2,546.5</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>$160.4 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilbert</td>
<td>1,181</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>$66 million</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Phoenix is almost 7 times larger than Scottsdale!
How do we compare with neighboring cities? Scottsdale’s tax rates are among the lowest of the larger cities.

- Estimated City Property Tax on a $250,000 House
- Estimated City Sales Tax on a $25,000 Car
- Monthly Residential Utility Bill

ScottsdaleAZgov, Heidi Greasby, Amanda Coe, Jessica Lee Miller and 4 others like this.

Marie Cannon: It seems like Scottsdale provides better services, too. We get more bang for our buck. 😊
Valley Benchmark Cities
Early Comparative Efforts

- Sales Taxes
- Property Taxes
- Utility Bills
- Permit and Development Fees
- Land Use Impacts
- Salaries and Benefits
- Sustainability Indicators
Monthly Residential Utility Bill

Source: City of Tempe. Typical water, garbage and sewer charges as of January 2012
What is the composition of each city’s tax base?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Avondale</th>
<th>Chandler</th>
<th>Gilbert</th>
<th>Glendale</th>
<th>Goodyear</th>
<th>Mesa</th>
<th>Peoria</th>
<th>Phoenix</th>
<th>Scottsdale</th>
<th>Surprise</th>
<th>Tempe</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commercial/Industrial (Assessed at 19.5%)</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ag/Vacant/Open Space (16%)</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Residence (10%)</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Residential (10%)</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Uses (5%)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Maricopa County Assessor, 2013 State Abstract (August).
FY 2013/14 Combined City Property Tax Rate per $100 assessed value

- **Surprise**: 0.78
- **Mesa**: 0.00 - 0.86 = 0.86
- **Gilbert**: 0.00 - 1.15 = 1.15
- **Chandler**: 0.33 - 0.94 = 1.27
- **Scottsdale**: 0.53 - 0.76 = 1.29
- **Peoria**: 0.19 - 1.25 = 1.44
- **Avondale**: 0.79 - 1.02 = 1.81
- **Phoenix**: 1.47 - 0.35 = 1.82
- **Goodyear**: 1.20 - 0.70 = 1.90
- **Glendale**: 0.50 - 1.79 = 2.29
- **Tempe**: 0.92 - 1.57 = 2.49

**Source**: Maricopa County Finance Department, 2013 Tax Rates
Valley Benchmark Cities
Single Family Residential Owner Occupied Parcels
2013 Assessed Tax

DRAFT

Less than - $750.00
$750.01 - $1,000.00
$1,000.01 - $1,500.00
$1,500.01 - $2,200.00
More than $2,200.00

City | Mean | Median | Maximum
--- | --- | --- | ---
Avondale | $1,177.89 | $1,195.49 | $5,909.30
Boulder | $1,234.46 | $1,239.54 | $5,139.00
Goodyear | $1,290.36 | $1,288.13 | $24,944.62
Glendale | $1,299.16 | $1,298.24 | $24,944.62
Peoria | $1,299.74 | $1,294.96 | $24,995.98
Phoenix | $1,296.13 | $1,293.70 | $56,193.46
Surprise | $1,291.63 | $1,290.00 | $24,995.98
Tempe | $1,293.48 | $1,285.24 | $24,877.84
Police Response Time

Length of time it takes for police to arrive after a resident calls 9-1-1, measured in minutes and seconds.

- Phoenix: Police Department reports the median response time, not the average response time due to known outlier calls that statistically skew the average.
- Glendale: A new CAD system was implemented in November 2013, which created a data discrepancy due to a change in the method for recording “Time Received”. For consistency the number here uses “Time Entered”.
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ASSEMBLING COMPARATIVE DATA AND THE REPORT
Valley Benchmark Cities
FY 2013/14 Report
Typical Monthly Bill for Water and Sewer

Lower Water Use

Higher Water Use

- Assumes Single-Family Residential Water Use 9,000 gallons on 3/4" Meter; Sewer Use 8,000 gallons
- Chandler’s seasonal rates have been averaged
- Taxes are not included in computations
- Rates are for municipal water providers only

- Assumes Single-Family Residential Water Use 17,000 gallons on 1" Meter; Sewer Use 12,000 gallons
- Chandler’s seasonal rates have been averaged
- Taxes are not included in computations
- Rates are for municipal water providers only

Valley Benchmark Cities Report – FY 2013/14
Bond Rating
The Standard & Poor’s bond rating as of July 2013

- Note: S&P was chosen because all communities hold this rating.
- Ratings are the most recent rating for general obligation debt only

Valley Benchmarking Cities Report - FY 2013/14
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Police Services

Police services aim to uphold the laws that allow residents of each community to feel safe and secure in their places of residence. Through problem solving, pursuit of those involved with criminal activity, and professional security services, police departments work to ensure the security and lawfulness of their communities. Specific objectives include the following:

- Enforcing the law
- Prevention of crime
- Protecting residents
- Providing emergency response
- Investigating and solving of crime

Influencing Factors:

**Community Characteristics:** The geographic size, diversity of the landscape, and the developed environment of a community can impact the amount and the type of areas that a police department needs to serve.

**Impact of Non-Residents:** Visitors to a particular city who do not maintain a formal residence impact the need for public safety services. These visitors could be seasonal residents, commuters, from neighboring cities, or tourists.

**Citizen Engagement with Police:** The extent to which police officers are involved in the community and residents are aware of the services provided by the department. Some police forces are supplemented by civilian staff to provide additional resources and support in the community.

**Demographics:** This factor considers the socioeconomic status of community residents, along with race, gender, age, and economic health as potential predictors of demand for police services.

**Deployment Strategies:** How police resources are utilized within a community can vary based on multiple community factors. For example, some agencies place an emphasis on non-sworn roles in patrol support that can offset the cost of more traditional sworn positions.
Forecast Population Growth Rate

Projected 2040 population divided by the 2013 population to reveal growth projections for upcoming 25 years

- Peoria: Only includes the portion within Maricopa County
- Sources: July 1, 2013 Population estimates from Arizona Office of Employment and Population Statistics and Maricopa Association of Governments (Approved by the Maricopa Association of Governments Regional Council, December 2013) and June 2013 MAG Socioeconomic Projections, Population, Housing, and Employment by Municipal Planning Area and Regional Analysis Zone
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SUCCESS FACTORS
Valley Benchmark Cities

The purpose of the Valley Benchmark Cities initiative is to have an ongoing benchmarking project to obtain relevant statistics and indicators from peer cities in the Valley to aid in management decision-making and elected official policy making process. Participating communities include the 11 largest cities and towns in the Valley of the Sun, Phoenix, Mesa, Chandler, Glendale, Scottsdale, Gilbert, Tempe, Peoria, Surprise, Avondale and Goodyear. Partners include the Alliance of Innovation, Arizona State University and the ICMA Center for Performance Analytics.
Parks and Recreation

Fire & Public Works

Average Calendar Days from Development Permit Application to Issuance

Population Breakout

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population Breakout</th>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Avg cal days Residential permits</th>
<th>Avg cal days Commercial permits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 25,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25,000-49,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000-99,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100,000-149,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150,000-249,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 1,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[Graph showing data]
welcome
center for urban innovation
school of public affairs
The x factor
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CREATING YOUR OWN CONSORTIUM
You can do it too!

• Identify similar size and scope jurisdictions within your region
• National comparisons are more complex due to differences in climate, geography, demand levels, political environment, funding differences, etc.
Key steps for use by others

• Identify and invite key leaders
• Identify potential university partners
• Build rapport by learning from others
• Dialogue about efforts already underway
• Begin collecting and sharing information
• Consolidate key findings into a report
“Residents who experienced … ‘operational transparency’ in government services – seeing the work that government is doing – expressed more positive attitudes toward government and greater support for maintaining or expanding the scale of government programs.”

Harvard Business School study, 2013
Questions/Comments?

Add Report Link to ASU site here.