



City of Gahanna

Meeting Minutes

Metrics Development

Office of the Clerk of Council
200 South Hamilton Road
Gahanna, Ohio 43230

Brian D. Larick, Chair, Stephen A. Renner, Michael Schnetzer

Monday, January 26, 2015

6:30 PM

Committee Rooms

Members -

Present 3 - Brian D. Larick, Michael Schnetzer, and Stephen A. Renner

Additional Attendees -

Clerk of Council Kim McWilliams, Jennifer Teal, Council Member Angelou

Larick called the Metrics Committee to order at 6:30 p.m.

ITEMS - For Discussion

Metrics Supporting Documents

1. Q3 2014 Performance Dashboard

Larick noted we need to structure what the discussion for metrics will be, and where we focus and what steps we should take when considering how we utilize the metrics; plan for tonight we would be to discuss possible data gathering categories and point evaluation; noted laying out a table to attempt to define layers of responsibility and get the data down to a place where we can identify what work is done at each level and then find good measurements to help the City evaluate the content; noted examples like the 2015 budget demonstrates a good breakdown of pieces for evaluation; Renner inquired by "work done" are we looking for service delivered or internal department to department evaluations; Larick clarified Finance's example of "days to close a PO"; what is the time for that process to be completed; starting level as generic as possible; once evaluated at that level we can then move to more summarized levels; effective to find starting point and get initial layer of data; as long as we can get a couple of points in a few areas we can expand on the ideas and build a better picture; noted table lays out the broad directive levels, it also transitions into high level responsibilities; Larick inquired what would be an additional level of detail that could be helpful, simple example being economic development, permits, and inspections; Teal replied a good place to

start would be in budget codes, as it is what we fund to within divisional departments; for example in planning and economic development there are many levels: Building, Zoning, etc.; In many cases would be an effective starting point; another good example is Parks that has Recreation, Golf, Parks Facilities, Pools, and Parks; would outline core accounting functions at each level; would have their own leadership structures and levels; Larick agreed the breakdown at Parks and Recreation level would be valuable; inquired what "Parks" entails; Teal replied the administrative divisions; Larick inquired would there be a logical breakout within Recreation like Camps that wouldn't be Golf Course or Pool, but would add an additional level; Teal replied that would be one of the breakdowns. Larick noted this is an important question to ask; this is an outline and how would we might layer this down to gather important pieces of information and arrive at appropriate layers for evaluation; end objective from Council is wherever we are, the data points are simple, functional, and also manageable so people can change them if needed; Schnetzer inquired if Renner had gone through this process with the County; is this a good way to approach; Renner noted yes, piling into logical buckets cross divisional and evaluate the data; inquired the fidelity of the codes at the bottom of the evaluation; example all timesheets and all labels may require similar task, but would be charged to a different code; Teal noted the opposite is more likely true, where the same code is charged, but a different action is done; noted doesn't do project accounting for timesheets; example: person charged to Recreation duties, may do Camps work and then Concert work; noted limitations on what we can report out; revenue covers that, but if always doing Camps work, may not work on Concerts; no fidelity in Finance's case; Larick inquired if Renner's question was focused on Finance or "in general"; Renner clarified "in general"; noted biggest lesson learned at County is what items are not captured so that the budget can be more appropriate; Renner noted City of Boston metrics development; segregated into categorical buckets for evaluation; Larick noted an improved example from Boston's data would be "days to fill potholes"; asks whatever those number are, and what is worthy of discussion; hope is we can focus on things that are most important first, as long as they are easy to provide; would swing toward less impactful things if they permits quicker data gathering; by doing this we can get actions on the process, gain comfort with the process, and better understand where the information is headed; noted a good starting point through Finance's system to understand what work is being done; Larick inquired if that approach works at the higher levels; Teal replied generally, but there are more possible layers below in some areas; Larick expressed concern with multiple levels below the highest in the existing structure; inquired if initial thoughts on items to discuss, if Teal can utilize data within administration; noted it is critical that the data is functional and useful; Schnetzer inquired at the end of

the day what is the deliverable; is it internal as well as external; what will we compare of time, 2015', 16', 17'; Larick replied more to understand what are we doing today with what we have; noted information from Anthony Jones, Director of Development's report on permitting a bit ago; one type of data reported was "from receipt to being able to review the item" average is two days and completion is 20 days; type of information would demonstrate how long and what the process is to do something; other questions from data: is something on track or ahead of track, what is it that could cause the data outlier, and what can be fixed with that timeframe; how can we get the 40 day turnover for Commercial Property Change down to 10 days; may provide a good picture for how City is doing; Schnetzer inquired if the information could be integrated into the coffer and be effective; Teal stated it would; we have just scratched the surface on the development of meaningful coffer reporting; Schnetzer noted the Boston website is data overload; noted how many potholes are filled seems like unnecessary information; noted it is more important to view gaps in deficits or multi-year trends; Larick noted how long it takes to fill a potholes is probably more important than how many potholes are filled; questions like "is 10 days too long for potholes to be filled" to be asked; why does it take that long; what can we do to make it faster; is that timeframe acceptable to our residents; also compared additionally with what it costs to have the pothole filled; struggles with how much it should cost; do we have the ability to see this is what it's taking and how can we fix the process; we need a resource to view the cost and why; evaluation is missing the "why does it cost x, y, & z"; noted if the information isn't functional for the City it's just information and will simply burden the data collectors; but if useful can take a lot of unknowns out of the picture; Schnetzer inquired if with this information can we find outliers for comparison to other communities; Larick noted the data is more focused on internal tracking and maneuverability; wants a good database of information that shows how we do x, y, & z; secondary step is how we compare elsewhere; Renner inquired how this fits into the sustainable operating model; Larick replied the sustainable operation model is revolved around what can the City do with budget; this data will show our capacity, if we are overstretched it will show up in data; demonstrates our capacity within the standard operating model; could answer how we make it more possible to achieve tasks within the constraints.

Adjournment

Larick adjourned the Metrics Committee at 7:03 p.m.

