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Introduction

Richmond Hill’s 2009 Strategic Plan identified the need to develop community performance measures as part of the commitment to take the Plan from vision to action. In 2011, 32 performance indicators were established to measure the Town’s progress in achieving the Strategic Plan goals. These community performance indicators have been tracked over the past six years and reported out regularly.

Now that a comprehensive set of community performance indicators has been established, there is an interest in expanding the Town’s approach to performance measurement to capture corporate key performance indicators (KPI’s). While community indicators measure how well the Town is achieving the vision and goals identified in the Strategic Plan, a set of corporate indicators will not only measure against the vision and goals but also measure the Town’s performance in terms of how well a program or service is working thereby informing decision-making and service improvement. Key performance indicators support the Town’s commitment to providing exceptional public service to the community and service excellence by focusing on measuring and improving operational efficiency and cost effectiveness.

This report describes the relationship with other Town initiatives and discusses our approach to key performance indicators and how they were developed. A detailed description of each of the KPI’s is provided. Finally, the report includes steps to expand and refine the KPI program over the next few years.
Relationship with Other Town Initiatives

The key performance indicator program is integrated with a number of other Town initiatives, including the Strategic Plan, Community Survey, Service Improvement Framework, Internal Audit and the Budget.

KPI’s help to implement the mission, vision and goals of the Strategic Plan. The 32 community performance indicators of the Strategic Plan, while more community focused, are complementary to the more internally focused key performance indicators. Together they provide a strong approach to measuring what matters to Richmond Hill.

Richmond Hill’s Community Survey obtains the views of the community on progress in achieving the four goals of the Town’s Strategic Plan (stronger connections; better choice; more vibrant and wise management of resources), determines overall impressions toward quality of life in Richmond Hill, identifies issues of importance to the community, measures resident satisfaction with the Town’s services, and identifies key areas for improving overall satisfaction with services moving forward. The latest Community Survey was undertaken in 2016.

The KPI program is aligned with Richmond Hill’s Service Improvement Framework and our service improvement initiatives. Service improvement is a tool that helps Richmond Hill achieve exceptional public service. It helps us identify when change is needed, and also prepare for and bring about change. A key part of each service improvement project is measuring performance after changes made and revisiting improvement to measure success and other areas to be ‘tweaked’. A number of the KPI’s selected for the program were established in the recommendations of service improvement projects (e.g. Recreation Program Utilization Rate).
Our Internal Audit Program has the goal of strengthening our operations, including ensuring that significant financial, managerial and operating information is accurate, reliable and timely, ensuring that resources are acquired responsibly and used efficiently, and fostering quality and continuous improvement in the Town’s control processes.

Richmond Hill’s operating and capital budgets identify the financial and staff resources which are approved annually for the delivery of services to our community. The budget is structured around a pyramid of factors with the base budget pressures, legislated requirements, growth, Council approved initiatives and new levels of service being identified separately. Supporting the budget are a range of work volume, effectiveness and efficiency reporting related to changes in the services delivered.
Development of Key Performance Indicator Program

Background Research

The first stage of the development of key performance indicators for Richmond Hill gathered background information so we could facilitate a meaningful discussion about how we would develop our KPI program. We researched performance measurement approaches and looked at how other municipalities, organizations and government agencies, both in the Greater Toronto Area and across North America, used KPI’s to support improving their performance.

There were a number of questions addressed at this stage:

1. What are the benefits of key performance indicators?
2. What is the definition of a key performance indicator?
3. What characteristics are important to choosing and establishing meaningful KPI’s?
4. How do we ensure that KPI’s lead to continuous learning and improvement?

We found a broad range of approaches to key performance indicator programs. One of the common themes that tied all the programs together was that KPI programs should be an extension of the culture and priorities of an organization. They should be authentic. What is meaningful for one organization might not be for another. Those programs which were most beneficial were the programs that organizations took the time to develop from the foundation up and which resonated with their established corporate goals and culture.

The background research identified a number of benefits of KPI’s including, a) aligning of actions with strategic directions, b) measurement of key processes to focus on short and long-term benefits, c) focusing attention on what matters most to success, d) improving service effectiveness and efficiency and e) facilitating continuous improvement.
Richmond Hill’s definition of and purposes for key performance indicators reflect our culture and priorities. They incorporate different aspects of performance measurement and take a systematic look at performance in the context of an engaged organization that is looking to lead through Courage, Collaboration, Care and Service.

**Definition of Key Performance Indicator**

A measure of performance that tracks progress towards an established outcome for the purpose of continuous learning and improvement.

**Purpose of Key Performance Indicators**

Help the organization focus on the vision, mission and goals and evaluate the Town’s performance in delivering services to the community.

Support the Town’s commitment to providing exceptional public service to the community and service excellence.

Just as defining and establishing the purpose of a KPI program is important, so too is establishing an understanding of how it will work. KPI programs are data and labour intensive and they penetrate into the core of the way an organization does business. There is often reluctance to engage at this level unless it is clear that the approach will be collaborative and beneficial. Richmond Hill’s KPI Program is embedded in its identity as a learning organization dedicated to continuous improvement. This is captured further in five philosophy statements.

**Philosophy of Key Performance Indicators**

1. We will ask questions and move towards continuous learning
2. We will reflect on current data and previous trends
3. We will promote a transparent and insightful discussion
4. We will determine the appropriate level of performance
5. We will invest in operational efficiency and cost effectiveness

Water valve maintenance
Development of a Key Performance Indicator Framework

The second stage of the development of KPI’s created a framework for a meaningful and authentic ‘made in Richmond Hill’ program. In our background research we noticed that municipal practice varied widely on the choice and number of measures. We also noticed that some programs focused on reporting numbers with little emphasis on how the organization was going to learn and improve from their KPI’s.

We used five steps during this stage to help us develop our own list of indicators. First we established and communicated the criteria that all proposed KPI’s must meet, informed by the experience of other organizations we had gathered in our background research.

**Key Performance Indicator Selection Criteria**

- The proposed indicator relates to departmental goals and objectives that support corporate priorities
- The proposed indicator demonstrates day-to-day efforts in meeting goals and objectives
- The proposed indicator is meaningful and easy to understand
- Data for the proposed indicator exists or is readily available
- There is a plan in place to manage or improve the indicator

Second we set realistic expectations for the first year of the program recognizing that there would be an opportunity to expand and strengthen the program in the years ahead. Each of our five departments were asked to provide a list of potential KPI’s with the understanding that two to three KPI’s per department would be selected for measurement and reporting in the first year. A standard template was sent out so each potential KPI came back with the information we would need to evaluate it.
Third, we evaluated each of the proposed KPI’s against the criteria and came up with a short list of KPI’s to evaluate further. Where we had gaps we went to the background research and proposed indicators that other organizations had found meaningful. At this stage it became clear that we needed to look further at types of indicators on our short list to ensure not only that all Departments were well represented but also that we were measuring both the efficiency and effectiveness of our services. By the end of the third step the eleven indicators for the 2016 program had been confirmed.

Fourth, we confirmed our targets. This was more challenging than anticipated. In the process we had to ask ourselves what makes a good target. What emerged were three key approaches to setting a target. We could compare our services against other municipalities such as is done through the Ontario Municipal Benchmarking Initiative (OMBI). We could compare ourselves to industry standards, such as call centre response times. Or we could set a target based upon internal aspirations for improvement. A combination of these three approaches was reflected in our first set of KPI’s. We chose not to establish targets for three indicators in the first year of the KPI program because more work was needed to set a meaningful target.
As we confirmed our targets we also considered the types of actions we would consider taking when targets were consistently met (e.g. should we stop measuring?) or when they were consistently not met (e.g. what type of follow up should be in place?) These questions were largely addressed by referring back to the plans that were in place to manage the service area that the KPI applied to. By linking KPI’s to existing service improvement initiatives, the rationale behind the types and extent of improvement desired was already in place and the need for additional action could be drawn from previously established directions and recommendations.

Finally, we reported out on the eleven key performance indicators as part of the 2017 Operating Budget. The goal, target, results compared to target and an analysis of the findings was included for each indicator, including explaining internal or external influences or trends affecting the results. This helped to answer the questions: Are we moving towards the target? How has performance changed or improved and why? What is the data telling us from year to year?

**2017 Key Performance Indicators**

- Access Richmond Hill Calls answered in 30 seconds
- Fire & Emergency Services Turnout Time
- Snow Windrow Clearing Time
- Recreation Program Utilization Rate
- Submissions Per Procurement
- Sustainability Metrics Applications above good
- Parking Tickets Processed to Resolution
- Corporate Building Energy Use per square foot
- Corporate Building Operating Cost per square foot
- Employee Turnover Rate
- IT Cost/Investment as % of total budget
2017 Key Performance Indicators

Eleven key performance indicators were established as part of the 2017 KPI Program. This chapter defines each KPI, describes how they are an important and meaningful performance measurement for Richmond Hill, identifies the source of data, reports on the current annual results and previous baseline results where available, identifies a target and the rationale for the target, outlines plans for improvement of the service area and points out internal or external trends that may have influenced the results.

Access Richmond Hill Calls Answered Within 30 Seconds

The Access Richmond Hill (ARH) Contact Centre, located at the Municipal Offices, helps with general inquiries, responds to questions or concerns about programs and services and accepts some in-person payments. Over 85,000 phone calls were received in 2016. The ARH Calls Answered Within 30 Seconds KPI relates to the corporate goal of providing exceptional customer service to our residents and businesses. Having a short wait time when phoning Richmond Hill will result in stronger connections with our residents and businesses and fewer people hanging up without the information they were hoping to receive from the Town. This KPI therefore measures service effectiveness, by tracking and reporting on the extent to which service levels are met.

The data for the ARH Calls Answered Within 30 Seconds KPI comes from telephony statistics that are collected by the Town’s phone system. This data is available on a quarterly and annual basis and is generated automatically by the system with little opportunity for error. Baseline information is available from 2013 to 2015 to compare to the 2016 data.

The target of answering 80% of calls in 30 seconds or less has been in place for many years but actual results prior to 2016 had fallen in the 73-74% range. This target is at the upper end of an industry standard for call centres which range from 70-80% of calls answered in 30 seconds or less. Service improvements in 2016 associated with the recommendations of a service improvement initiative, the Access Richmond Hill Review, resulted in the target being met for the first time since ARH was established.
Access Richmond Hill % of calls answered in 30 seconds or less

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>73.4%</td>
<td>73.6%</td>
<td>74.4%</td>
<td>80.4%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The improvements which resulted in the target being met in 2016 are expected to be sustained in 2017 through investment in new technology, including a new Customer Relation Management (CRM) system, clear service level agreements with other Town groups and continued staff training.

Fire & Emergency Services Turn Out Time

Richmond Hill provides Fire & Emergency Services to protect our community’s safety and security. The Fire & Emergency Services Turn Out Time KPI relates to the goal of planning and promoting readiness during times of crisis. Reducing response times means that emergency assistance is provided as early as possible during crisis situations. For this KPI, the response time being measured is the time from the receipt of the emergency call to the time when the emergency vehicle is leaving the station fully staffers and equipped to respond to the potential emergency. There are a number of factors that may affect the turnout time including call volume, time of calls, and what tasks or jobs the firefighters are performing when they receive calls. This KPI measures service effectiveness by tracking the extent to which established service levels are met.

The data for the Fire & Emergency Services Turn Out Time KPI comes from the FIREHOUSE software which captures emergency response information. Information is tracked by individual fire station and then amalgamated into an overall response effort. The data in this highly regulated area is considered to be reliable with little opportunity for error. Baseline information is available from 2014 to 2015 to compare to the 2016 data.

Fire Station 8-6
The target of a turnout time of 80 seconds or less 70% of the time was established for the KPI program. Previous to that there was no established target although the data was being collected. The target is an internal aspiration related to a desire for incremental improvement. Service improvements in 2016 resulted in the target being met. Improving response time was a key priority in 2016 and significant improvements were implemented to move towards reaching the target. Staff were educated on National Fire Prevention Association (NFPA) standards and how turn-out time is critical in the overall response time. Monthly reports were sent to station supervisors to let them know what their turn-out times were over the last 30 days. When KPI’s were not met, staff were required to explain the reason for the delay. Finally electronic clocks were installed where the crews can see them as they prepare and get onto the fire trucks. These clocks count up when a call is received, therefore the crews know exactly what their times are when they approach the trucks and how they are responding compared to the standard.

**Fire & Emergency Services % of responses with a turnout time of 80 seconds or less**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>32.8%</td>
<td>55.8%</td>
<td>78.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Looking forward, the *Fire & Emergency Services Turn Out Time KPI* has shown considerable improvement over the past three years and there is the potential of establishing a target in line with industry (NFPA) standards and the Fire Master Plan recommendation of 80 seconds 90% of responses.
Snow Windrow Clearing Time

Richmond Hill provides snow windrow removal services to seniors and those with disabilities who apply for the service with the goal of providing exceptional service to our residents. Snow windrows are the pile of snow that is left at the bottom of a driveway after the snow plow passes while responding to a winter event. These piles of snow are a barrier to mobility for those who have no means of clearing the pile so a timely response is important. For this KPI, the response time being measured is the time from the end of the winter event to the time that all snow windrows across the Town are cleared. The Snow Windrow Clearing Time KPI measures service effectiveness by tracking the extent to which established response times are met.

The data for the Snow Windrow Clearing Time KPI comes from internal paper work order records and is tracked by winter seasons rather than calendar years. Data is available after each winter event. Baseline information is available from 2014/15 and 2015/16 to compare to the 2016/17 year to date data.
The target of a turnout time of 30 hours was established prior to the KPI program and was met in 2014/15. In 2016, Richmond Hill changed its approach to snow windrow clearing due to resident requests for improved service. Hours of service were a significant barrier to staff performing this work. Dedicated contractors and equipment now work to clear windrows coordinated with the passage of the snow plows on the roads rather than waiting for all the roads to be plowed first. The actual service response time since 2015/16 greatly exceeds the 30 hour target.

### Snow Windrow Program average time to complete windrow clearing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2014/15</th>
<th>2015/16</th>
<th>2016/17</th>
<th>Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27 hours</td>
<td>14 hours</td>
<td>16 hours</td>
<td>30 hours</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Snow Windrow Clearing Time KPI has shown considerable improvement over the past three years since a change in the service approach was taken. The target was not changed in response to the service improvement and adjusting the target should be considered for future reporting years. In addition, rather than reporting on the average time to complete all windrows, measuring the percent of windrows cleared within the target time would be more meaningful.

### Recreation Program Utilization Rate

Richmond Hill provides a range of recreation programs to our community to offer better options for being active and involved. Recreational program registration is increasing, having grown from 682,000 participant hours in 2009 to 904,000 participant hours in 2016, a 32% increase. The Recreation Program Utilization Rate KPI, also known as fill rate, measures how full the recreation programs we offer to the community are relative to the capacity of the programs. The goal of this KPI is to establish strong data driven processes for recreation and culture program measurement. Offering classes closer to full capacity means we can have more participants with the same investment of space and staff resources. This KPI measures service effectiveness by tracking the extent to which established service levels are met.
The data for the *Recreation Program Utilization Rate KPI* comes from the CLASS system which is Richmond Hill’s recreation and culture program software. Recreation Information is tracked by individual program and then amalgamated into an overall utilization rate. The data in the CLASS system is considered to have some reliability issues and the aging system is currently being replaced with a new software system, ActiveNet. Baseline information is available from 2014 to 2015 to compare to the 2016 data.

The target of a program utilization rate of 65% was established for the KPI program. Previous to that there was no established target although the data was being collected. The target is an internal aspiration related to a desire for incremental improvement. Historically, recreation programs were offered to meet community demand as long as they met revenue targets. While overall participation is rising, program utilization rates during the baseline years were in the 50-60% range. Service improvements in 2015-16, resulted in utilization rates just above 60% as staff worked to move participants from classes with less registrants into other classes wherever possible.

**Recreation program % of registered spaces filled**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>53.2%</td>
<td>60.7%</td>
<td>60.7%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Looking forward, improving recreation program utilization rates is a key recommendation of the Recreation, Culture & Events Core Services Review and the new ActiveNet program registration software will give staff better data and new tools to market and manage the thousands of recreation and culture programs the Town currently offers. Therefore, it is expected that performance will improve in this area closer to the established KPI target.
Submissions per Procurement

Richmond Hill has a well established procurement process by which the Town procures goods and services to facilitate delivery of municipal services to our community. The goal of the procurement process is the effective and efficient use of the competitive procurement process to achieve value for money. The Submissions per Procurement KPI measures the average number of submissions per competitive procurement opportunity offered by the Town. A higher number of submissions per procurement means that more companies are offering their services to the Town usually resulting in more competitive pricing. This KPI measures service effectiveness by tracking the extent to which established service levels are met.

The data for the Submissions per Procurement KPI comes from records which are tracked as part of purchasing activities in accordance the Procurement By-law. The data in this highly scrutinized and audited area is considered to be reliable with little opportunity for error. Baseline information is available from 2011 to 2015 to compare to the 2016 data.

The target of four Submissions per Procurement on average was established for the KPI program. Previous to that there was no established target although the data was being collected. The target is an internal aspiration related to a desire for incremental improvement. Historically, average annual submissions per procurement have ranged between 3.1 and 3.8 and the number of bids was declining over time. Procurement response rates are dependent upon a number of factors, such as the length of time the bid is open, time of year, scope clarity, number of invited vendors and the extent of advertising. Service improvements in 2016, resulted in bids per submission increasing to 3.9, a large improvement over the previous year and just short of the target.

**Average annual number of competitive submissions received per procurement opportunity**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Looking forward, there are key opportunities for improvement by continuing to implement the recommendations of the Procurement Review. The upcoming e-tendering initiative is also expected to increase the average number of bids per submission by making procurement opportunities more accessible to the marketplace.
Sustainability Metrics Development Applications above Good

The Sustainability Metrics were implemented in 2015 to measure the sustainability performance of new development projects. The Sustainability Metrics Development Applications above Good KPI relates to the goal of wise management of resources by using land responsibly and the Official Plan vision of building a new kind of urban. Possible scores for sustainability performance are good, very good or excellent based upon the scoring of a development application against 45 factors. This KPI measures service effectiveness by tracking the extent to which established service levels are met.

The data for the Sustainability Metrics Development Applications above Good KPI comes from Planning & Regulatory Services Department records. Baseline information is available for 2015 to compare to the 2016 data.
There is currently no target for the Sustainability Metrics Development Applications above Good KPI. A Sustainability Metrics Monitoring and Incentives Program will evaluate the program in 2017 including setting a target. The data shows an increasing trend of development applications having a sustainability metric score of good or above.

**Sustainability Metrics percentage of development applications scoring above good**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>To be determined in 2017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Parking Tickets Processed to Resolution**

Richmond Hill is responsible for regulatory services to maintain a safe community through education and enforcement. This includes the management of parking ticket offences, of which there were over 40,000 in 2016. The *Parking Tickets Processed to Resolution KPI* looks at the percentage of tickets which are processed to resolution, either through them being paid to the Town, or some other arrangements being made. It is measured by comparing the number of tickets processed against the total number of tickets issued. More parking tickets being processed to resolution mean less resources being spent resolving outstanding offences. In 2017 Richmond Hill will be shifting to an Administrative Monetary Penalties System (AMPS) which is considered to be a more efficient system of resolving parking ticket offences. This KPI measures service effectiveness by tracking the extent to which established service levels are met.

The data for the *Parking Tickets Processed to Resolution KPI* comes from in-house Parking Control data which are required to be tracked as part of enforcement activities. Baseline information is available from 2013 to 2015 to compare to the 2016 data.
The target of 90% of tickets processed to resolution was established for the KPI program. Previous to that there was no established target although the data was being collected. The target is based upon the experience of other municipalities when they implemented an Administrative Monetary Penalties System. Historically, the percentage of tickets processed to resolution was declining, going from 89% in 2013 to 81% in 2015, largely due to the unavailability of court time for tickets that were being challenged. The decreasing trend continued in 2016 with only 73% of tickets being processed to resolution.

**Parking tickets percentage of tickets processed to resolution**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Looking forward, the Administrative Monetary Penalties System (AMPS) is scheduled to be implemented starting July 2017 and is anticipated to result in an improvement in the percentage of parking tickets processed to resolution.

**Corporate Building Energy Consumption per Square Foot**

Richmond Hill currently has a portfolio of 56 buildings that support delivery of municipal services to our community. These buildings include recreation centres, arenas, firehalls, libraries and our municipal offices and operations centre. The Corporate Building Energy Consumption per Square Foot KPI relates to the goal of wise management of resources by managing energy use and cost. All energy uses for each building are combined and expressed as kilowatt hours and divided by the gross area of the building in square feet. Improving building energy efficiency is a sound move financially as well as being good for the environment. This KPI measures service efficiency by tracking the relationship between resources used (energy) and services provided (municipal building space).
The data for the *Corporate Building Energy Consumption per Square Foot KPI* comes from utility invoicing for the 43 buildings reported under the *Green Energy Act*. Gaps in data may exist due to the combined metering of some facilities. The *Green Energy Act* requires municipalities to report energy use annually, and develop five year reduction plans. Baseline information is available from 2011 to 2015 to compare to the 2016 data.

There is currently no target for the *Corporate Building Energy Consumption per Square Foot KPI*. Annual energy use can be heavily influenced by seasonal weather trends. As a result, more work is needed to establish a meaningful target and this is scheduled to be undertaken in 2017. Baseline data shows a high degree of fluctuation from year to year, ranging from 40.4 to 47.2 kWh per square foot. Work is underway to normalize energy use to weather since heating of buildings is one of the heaviest energy uses in buildings and it is significantly influenced by seasonal climate trends.
Looking forward, Richmond Hill has developed a five year energy reduction plan for our buildings. Efforts are underway to implement that plan through improved operating practices and retrofitting of equipment and lighting with more efficient options which will help to reduce the energy use of our building portfolio.

**Corporate Building Operating Cost per Square Foot**

The *Corporate Building Operating Cost per Square Foot KPI* looks at the total cost per square foot to manage the Town’s current portfolio of 56 municipal buildings. Operating costs include energy costs, maintenance and repairs, and service contracts such as security and life safety. It does not include the costs of program delivery, such as recreation programs. The *Corporate Building Operating Cost per Square Foot KPI* relates to the goal of being responsible in the usage of our resources. This KPI measures cost efficiency by tracking the relationship between resources used (cost) and services provided (municipal building space).

The data for the *Corporate Building Operating Cost per Square Foot KPI* comes from Richmond Hill’s annual operating budget. Baseline information is available from 2013 to 2015 to compare to the 2016 data.
There is currently no target for the Corporate Building Operating Cost per Square Foot KPI. Operating cost per square foot differs by building type. For example, the average operating cost per square foot of arena or community centre with a swimming pool is higher than for municipal offices due to the energy demands of these specialized recreational facilities. More work is needed to establish a meaningful target and this is scheduled to be undertaken in 2017. Baseline data shows steadily increasing costs per square foot for Richmond Hill’s portfolio of buildings which would be expected given the increase in energy costs and the increased upkeep needed for our aging portfolio of buildings.

Richmond Hill Centre for the Performing Arts

| Corporate building operating cost per square foot ($/ft²) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | Target |
| $7.12 | $7.37 | $7.58 | $7.73 | To be determined in 2017 |

Looking forward, the Facility Repair Process Review set service level standards for our portfolio of municipal buildings and established a model for the efficient division of responsibilities between onsite operating staff and offsite technical staff and contractors. This model is reviewed annually to determine the most efficient way to deliver services.
**Employee Turnover Rate**

The greatest asset of any organization is their employees. The Employee Turnover Rate KPI measures the percentage of full-time employees who leave employment at the Town for both voluntary and involuntary purposes as a percentage of the total workforce. This KPI relates to the goal of reduced recruitment costs and better service delivery. While some employee turnover is expected and healthy for a workforce, when it rises too much it can be costly and disruptive to service delivery. This KPI measures service effectiveness by tracking the extent to which established service levels are met.

The data for the Employee Turnover Rate KPI comes from Richmond internal human resources statistics. Baseline information is available from 2011 to 2015 to compare to the 2016 data.

The target of a 5% or lower total Employee Turnover Rate was established for the KPI program. Previous to that there was no established target although the data was being collected. The target is based upon generally accepted industry standards in public sector organizations for a healthy turnover rate. Historically, the total (voluntary and involuntary) turnover rate has been below 5% for a number of years but has risen since 2015 primarily due to voluntary resignation or retirement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total employee turnover average annual percentage</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Looking forward, strategies such as the Employee Strategy will enhance Richmond Hill’s ability to remain competitive in the competition to retain and attract new employees.

**IT Investment as Percentage of Total Budget**

Investment in information technology (IT) is becoming increasingly important to facilitate the delivery of efficient and effective municipal services to our community. The IT Investment as Percentage of Total Budget KPI measures the annual capital and operating investment in IT as a percentage of the total Richmond Hill budget. This KPI relates to the goal of delivering services to staff and the community through a strategic investment in technology. It measures service efficiency by tracking the relationship between resources used (IT budget) and services provided (total budget).

The data for the IT Investment as Percentage of Total Budget comes from Richmond Hill’s budget. Baseline information is available from 2012 to 2015 to compare to the 2016 data.
The target range of 4-6% annual investment was established for the KPI program. Previous to that there was no established target. The target is based upon generally accepted industry standards for healthy IT investment in public sector organizations. Historically, the total investment has fluctuated as Richmond Hill continues to upgrade its major systems. In the baseline period the investment was below 4% most years, falling as low as 2.5 to 2.7% in 2013 and 2014. 2016 saw a much healthier investment of 4.7% which is within the target range.

<p>| IT Investment as a percentage of the total budget |
|----------------------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th><strong>2012</strong></th>
<th><strong>2013</strong></th>
<th><strong>2014</strong></th>
<th><strong>2015</strong></th>
<th><strong>2016</strong></th>
<th><strong>Target</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>4.1%</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.5%</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.7%</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.7%</strong></td>
<td><strong>4.7%</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>4-6%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Looking forward, an IT Strategy is being developed in 2017 which will describe in more detail the operating and capital investments that need to be made in the next few years.
Conclusions and Next Steps

The first year of Richmond Hill’s Key Performance Indicator Program has resulted in a framework for moving performance measurement forward, and the reporting out on eleven KPI’s. The KPI framework recognizes that effective performance measurement is more than just numbers. It is about improving service and efficiency by encouraging the characteristics of a learning organization such as a culture of asking questions, reflecting on results and engaging in open and transparent communication as decisions are made.

Richmond Hill’s KPI program is designed to grow over the next few years and have the flexibility to change as it matures. Investment in the Town’s IT systems now and in the future will produce new business data and provide the means to track and improve additional service areas. Five new indicators will be added in each of 2017 and 2018 bringing the total number of indicators to 21. There will be a review of each of the performance indicators on an annual basis to determine whether the indicator remains relevant and meaningful, and whether an indicator should be changed or even eliminated from the program after having served its intended purpose.

Moving forward, the Key Performance Indicators will be reported out annually as part of the budget process and a longer term data set and analysis of internal and external influences will allow Richmond Hill to make the best possible decisions as we strive to provide exceptional public service to our community.
Environmental Printing Summary
The following summarizes the state-of-the-art environmental practices that have been incorporated into the production of this report.

Ontario’s Environmental Leaders
The Printer is a Leader recognized by the Ontario Ministry of the Environment.
This report was printed by a printer that is a member of Ontario’s Environmental Leaders Program. The Leaders Program recognizes select companies that demonstrate leadership in the preservation of the environment by using environmentally friendly processes and increased efficiencies. The printer is committed to preserving the environment, promoting sustainability and reducing waste for the benefit of the community.
Sustainable and responsible business is good for the environment and a green economy.

Digital Printing
The printer has reached beyond the standard environmental practices to ensure it delivers the most environmentally friendly and high quality digital printing available.

Terrachoice-EcoLogo
Environmental certification by the Government of Canada
This report was printed by an EcoLogo certified printer. This program recognizes manufacturers and suppliers of environmentally preferable products that help consumers identify products and services that are less harmful to the environment.

Bullfrog Power
Clean, Reliable Electricity
This report was produced utilizing Bullfrog Power to power the digital printing. Bullfrog Power generates power exclusively from wind and low-impact water power generators and meet or exceed the federal government’s EcoLogo standards for renewable electricity.

Environmentally Friendly Paper (Recycled Paper)
This report was printed on Supreme Silk paper which is FSC® Certified and has 30% post-consumer recycled content.

Forest Stewardship Council® (FSC) Certification
This report was printed on paper and by a printer that are Forest Stewardship Council® (FSC) certified. FSC® promotes environmentally appropriate, socially beneficial and economically viable management of the world’s forests.

ISO 14001
This report was produced by an ISO 14001 certified printer. Fully committed to continuous improvements in waste reduction and pollution prevention, the printer has a comprehensive environmental management system that integrates sound business practices with environmental, health, safety and quality control practices.

Carbonzero
Carbonzero is a socially responsible enterprise with a mission to apply technology, design thinking and risk management to the massive reduction of our environmental footprint.

Richmond Hill, where people come together to build our community.
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