MEMORANDUM

TO: Mayor and Council

FROM: Rudy Garza

DATE: October 2002

SUBJECT: Community Scorecard

I am pleased to present to you the fourth edition of the City’s Community Scorecard. Since the first edition was published in 1997, we have made significant progress in communicating the citizens’ priorities and levels of satisfaction with City Services. Since its inception, the Scorecard has been organized around the City Council’s priorities: Public Safety; Youth, Family and Neighborhood Vitality; Sustainable Community; and Affordability.

Through your leadership and the City’s efforts through Managing For Results, we are able to use this information to develop financial and operational plans, which are better aligned with the citizens’ needs.

While we recognize that the Community Scorecard is a vital tool for information, we also recognize the need to be flexible and continue to improve the communication, data and results reported in this report. As we move into the development of next year’s fifth edition of this report, we have begun a process to evaluate the compilation of the data including the survey format, the scope of respondents included in the survey, as well as improving the use of comparable benchmarks from other cities.

We have organized the report around the Council Priorities. Each section of the report utilizes a chart as shown below to illustrate the information from two customer surveys: the City of Austin 2002 Citizen Satisfaction Survey and the 2002 City of Austin Citizen Survey of City Priorities.
The charts will take one or two main concerns for each department and demonstrate their priority and satisfaction levels. The chart above illustrates two different types of priority and satisfaction. The chart indicates that Social Services to low income individuals indicate a priority rating of 72% and a satisfaction rating of 68%. This would indicate the citizens are satisfied with the level of services for low-income individuals. Environmental Health shows a priority rating of 80% and a satisfaction level of 92%. Environmental Health is an important subject to the citizens of Austin and the citizens feel a high satisfaction rating of the services provided. Each major section of the Scorecard will provide similar information of citizens’ perceptions of various services.

Highlights of this report include the following:

- Traffic flow and street repair are high priorities for our citizens (84% and 82%), however the satisfaction rates for these items are low (27% and 46%).
- Affordable housing is a moderate priority (68%) and availability of housing for low income has a low satisfaction (45%).
- Our crime rates and citizen perception of safety is staying level.
- Our spending for health care services is more than double of any other major Texas city and citizen satisfaction with health care for low-income individuals improved from 58% in 2001 to 75% in 2002.
- Since 1982, the percent of congested arterials has been increasing.
- Austin has the lowest property tax rate of the five major Texas cities.

While the most significant components of this report were presented to you during the Budget Work Sessions, this report provides you the comprehensive data and results.

Rudy Garza
Budget Officer
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Public Safety
FI RE SCORECARD

CUSTOMER P R I O R I T Y A N D S A T I S F A C T I O N

Level of Priority and Satisfaction with Fire Services

- Priority: Fire Protection Response
  - 91

- Satisfaction: Fire Protection Services Provided
  - 97

RESULTS

- The percent of fires contained to room of origin increased slightly from 79% to 80% between FY 2000 and FY 2002; the results for one- and two-family residences compare favorably to ICMA reporting cities POSITIVE

- Fire’s percent of calls with a response time under 5 minutes increased from 70.3% to 72.0% and exceeds the average of ICMA reporting cities POSITIVE

- The number of fire deaths per 100,000 in FY 2001 increased from FY 2000 NEGATIVE

INPUT

- Austin has the highest general fund budgeted expenditures per capita for fire and emergency medical services of the other four major Texas cities HIGH
Fire

Customer Priority: City of Austin 2002 Citizen Survey of City Priorities/ICMA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City Service Priority</th>
<th>Ratings Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fire Protection Response</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Prevention Services</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average Ratings Percentage</strong></td>
<td><strong>83%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respondents in the Citizen Survey of City Priorities rated all of the fire services as a high priority.

Customer Satisfaction: City of Austin 2002 Citizen Satisfaction Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City Service Satisfaction</th>
<th>Ratings Percentage (Satisfied or Very Satisfied)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fire Protection Services Provided by AFD</td>
<td>97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Hazardous Materials Response</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average Ratings Percentage</strong></td>
<td><strong>95%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Matching the high prioritization above, the city services above received very high satisfaction rates from the respondents in the Citizen survey. The percentage of customer service cards that came in with a favorable overall satisfaction rating in FY 2001 was 98%.
Fire

Fires Contained to the Room of Origin

A key indicator of fire protection services is the percent of fires confined to their room of origin. Factors that can reduce the likelihood of fire spread include effective fire prevention, quick response times, and efficient fireground operations. The first chart shows that the AFD estimate for all fires in the current year remains similar to previous years. The second chart shows that for single family homes and duplexes, the AFD performed better than six out of the seven other reporting ICMA comparison Fire Departments.

Source: City of Austin Fire Department
### Fire

#### Fire Response Time

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source: City of Austin Fire Department</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Active Fire Calls Where Extinguishing Agent is Applied Within Nine Minutes of Alarm Time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In FY 2001, AFD operations units arrived on scene within 5 minutes of dispatch on 72% of calls. This compares favorably with ICMA data; the average percent across reporting cities was 62%. Average response times dropped from 4.18 in FY 2000 to 3.99 in FY 2001, and the improved performance is being maintained in the current year. A new response time measure evaluates for active fire calls how often extinguishing agents are applied within 9 minutes of alarm time. The estimate for FY 2002 is slightly lower (92%) than the performance in FY 2001 (94%).

#### On Scene Within Five Minutes of Dispatch

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source: FY 2001 ICMA Comparative Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fairfax County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fire

Total Fire Deaths per 100,000

The fire death rate is showing a sharp upswing in the current year, after a more modest increase between FY00 and FY01. This increase is of grave concern to AFD.

Fire is currently analyzing data on fire deaths over the past 25 years to identify potential target groups or settings warranting further public education efforts. Responses to specific incidents resulting in fire deaths are also being reviewed.

![Number of Fire Deaths per 100,000 population](chart)

Source: City of Austin Fire Department

Total Fire Incidents

Austin is higher than most comparison jurisdictions in the rate of fire incidents by population. For Austin, the rate of fire incidents per 100,000 population was 341.

![Fire Incidents per 100,000 Population](chart)

Source: FY 2001 ICMA Comparative Data
EMERGENCY MEDICAL SERVICES SCORECARD

CUSTOMER PRIORITY AND SATISFACTION

Level of Priority and Satisfaction with EMS Services

- Austin is above the ICMA average in the percent of cardiac arrest patients with a pulse delivered to a medical center
  POSITIVE
- The percentage of EMS responses under 10 minutes is projected to increase over current year estimated levels through FY 2003
  POSITIVE

INPUT

- Austin has the highest General Fund budgeted expenditures per capita for fire and emergency medical services of the other four major Texas cities
  HIGH
Emergency Medical Services

Customer Priority: City of Austin 2002 Citizen Survey of City Priorities/ICMA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City Service Priority</th>
<th>Ratings Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Ambulance Services</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Average Ratings Percentage**

|                      | 90%                |

Respondents in the Citizen Survey of City Priorities rated emergency medical services as a high priority.

Customer Satisfaction: City of Austin 2002 Citizen Satisfaction Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City Service Satisfaction</th>
<th>Ratings Percentage (Satisfied or Very Satisfied)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Medical Services Provided by EMS</td>
<td>97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMS Response Time to Medical Emergencies</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Average Ratings Percentage**

|                      | 96%                                             |

Matching the high prioritization above, the city services above received very high satisfaction rate from respondents in the citizen survey. Citizens with actual contact with EMS rated their overall satisfaction at 90%.
Emergency Medical Services

EMS Response Time

For Fiscal Years 2001 and 2002, EMS has been reporting Priority One response percentages in under 11 minutes. For the FY 03 proposed budget, a 10-minute goal is proposed, which will provide data consistent with recently adopted National Fire Protection Association (NFPA) standards. The EMS industry does not currently have a single response time standard. EMS believes that an average compliance time of 85.00% for Priority One responses in under 10 minutes is achievable, especially with the implementation of the new computer aided dispatch system that should be operating by June 2003.

This chart compares the average time that it takes each city to receive an emergency call, process it, dispatch an ambulance to the scene, package the patient at the scene and deliver the patient to a medical facility. The transport time component of this measure is driven in part by the location and number of hospitals, which varies in each community. Austin is slightly slower than Phoenix with an average time of 36.43 minutes but over a minute faster than San Francisco.

Source: City of Austin/Travis County Emergency Medical Services

Source: 2001 ICMA Comparative Data
Emergency Medical Services

Percent of Cardiac Arrest Patients with a Pulse Delivered to Medical Center by EMS

Austin-Travis County EMS (A/TCEMS) has a relatively high success rate in delivering cardiac arrest patients to a medical facility with a pulse. This can be attributed to several factors. A/TCEMS operates an all Advanced Life Support (ALS) system. All frontline paramedics must maintain Advanced Cardiac Life Support (ACLS) certification. In addition, all ambulances are equipped with state of the art cardiac monitors and cardiac arrest medications. The Austin Fire Department carries Automated External Defibrillators (AED’s) on all of their first response units, which is also an important factor in reviving a pulse in cardiac arrest patients.

![Percent of Cardiac Arrest Patients Delivered to Medical Center with a Pulse - 2001](chart)

Source: FY 2001 ICMA Comparative Data

General Fund Budgeted Expenditures per Capita for Fire/EMS

Austin has separate Fire and Emergency Medical Services departments. The other cities shown in the chart combine these services. Therefore, for comparison purposes, this chart shows combined Fire and EMS budgeted expenditures per capita for each city.

![FY 2002 General Fund Budget per Capita - Fire/EMS](chart)

Source: City of Austin Financial Services Department
POLICE SERVICES SCORECARD

CUSTOMER PRIORITY AND SATISFACTION

Level of Priority and Satisfaction with APD

- The percentage of respondents feeling safe walking alone in Austin during the day has increased and is very high at 96% while the percentage of those feeling safe walking alone at night has decreased only slightly since FY 2001
  POSITIVE

- The violent crime rate per 1,000 increased slightly in FY 2001, but is below the ICMA average of reporting cities
  POSITIVE

- The property crime rate per 1,000 increased slightly in FY 2001, but is below the ICMA average for reporting cities
  POSITIVE

- Traffic fatalities decreased slightly in FY 2001 but remain above the ICMA average
  NEUTRAL

- Police response time increased slightly in FY 2001 and is above the ICMA average
  NEGATIVE

INPUT

- Austin ranked third in Police expenditures for the current fiscal year among the five major Texas cities
  NEUTRAL

- The number of sworn FTEs per 1,000 population is the second lowest among the five largest Texas cities
  NEUTRAL
Public Safety

Police Services

Customer Priority: City of Austin 2002 Citizen Survey of City Priorities/ICMA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City Service Priority</th>
<th>Ratings Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>911 Emergency Services</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Police Response</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community/Neighborhood Policing</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average Ratings Percentage</strong></td>
<td><strong>86%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the Citizen Survey of City Priorities, respondents made emergency response, 911 emergency service, and neighborhood policing high priorities.

Customer Satisfaction: City of Austin 2002 Citizen Satisfaction Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City Service Satisfaction</th>
<th>Ratings Percentage (Satisfied or Very Satisfied)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>911 Emergency Services</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Services Provided to the Public by APD</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge and skill of APD Officers and Staff</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperation of Police in Addressing Neighborhood Concerns</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average Ratings Percentage</strong></td>
<td><strong>86%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the Citizen Satisfaction Survey, respondents had high satisfaction with 911 emergency services, quality of services provided to the public and knowledge and skill of APD officers and with the cooperation of police in addressing neighborhood concerns.
Police Services

Citizen Fear of Crime

A citizen survey was conducted to determine citizens’ perception of safety. Respondents were asked how safe they felt walking alone in their neighborhood during the day and at night. In FY 2001, 94% of respondents indicated that they felt safe walking in their neighborhood during the day and 69% also felt safe walking alone in their neighborhood at night. In the 2002 Citizen Survey, 96% of respondents felt safe walking alone in their neighborhoods during the day, and 68% felt safe walking alone in their neighborhoods at night.

Source: City of Austin Citizen Surveys
Police Services

Violent Crime

The two charts on this page compare Austin’s violent crime rate per 1,000 population against other jurisdictions and over time.

Austin had the third lowest violent crime rate among the ten cities chosen for comparison at 5.0 per 1,000 population. The average violent crime rate of the ICMA reporting jurisdictions was 6.9 violent crimes per 1,000 population.

The preliminary crime report release from the Federal Bureau of Investigation indicates that violent crime nation-wide increased .3% in 2001. The highest increases in violent crime occurred in the southern and western states. Austin’s violent crime rate, which includes murder, rape, robbery, and aggravated assault, increased from 4.8 crimes per 1,000 population in FY2000 to 5.0 crimes per 1,000 population in FY2001. APD estimates a decrease to 4.5 violent crimes per 1,000 population for FY2002.

Source: FY 2001 ICMA Comparative Data

Source: City of Austin Police Department
Austin had the fifth lowest property crime rate among the ten cities chosen for comparison at 59.5 crimes per 1,000 population. Property crime includes the crimes of burglary, theft, and auto theft. Austin’s property crime rate is below the average of all ICMA reporting jurisdictions of 59.8 property crimes per 1,000.

The preliminary crime report release from the Federal Bureau of Investigation indicates that property crime nation-wide increased 2.2% in 2001. The highest increases in property crime occurred in the mid-west, southern and western states. Austin’s property crime rate has decreased since 1996 when the property crime rate was 74.7 property crimes per 1,000 population. The FY2002 estimate shows a slight increase over FY2001.

Source: FY 2001 ICMA Comparative Data

Source: City of Austin Police Department
**Police Services**

**Response Time**

ICMA requests information on the number of minutes from receipt of a top priority call to arrival on the scene. There is so much variation in methodology and classification of priority calls among the cities involved that comparisons result in distorted performance measurement. Taking this into consideration, however, Austin ranks third highest in response time for FY2001 at 8:34, or 8.6 minutes.

**Response Time History**

The chart below shows response times since FY1998. The data indicates that response time has decreased from 9:35 in FY1998 to 8:34 in FY2001. The estimate for FY2002 is slightly higher at 8:46. APD expects response time to decrease in FY2003 because full staffing will be achieved and most of the additional 60 positions will be commissioned in the first quarter of FY2003.
Traffic Fatalities per 100,000

Austin’s traffic fatality rate at 11.2 is fourth highest among the ten cities selected for comparison. Kansas City ranked highest with 19.0 and Phoenix ranked second highest with 14.1. The lowest number of traffic fatalities per 100,000 population was San Jose at 4.6. The traffic fatality rate is expected to increase to approximately 10.24 in FY2002.

Budgeted Expenditures per Capita for Police Services

Austin’s budgeted police expenditures per capita is fourth among the five major Texas cities selected for comparison. Fort Worth’s total budgeted expenditures is the highest per capita, and includes funding from the area’s Crime Control and Prevention District. Dallas is second with $250.13, followed by Houston at $220.36, Austin at $217.48, and San Antonio at $172.82. In all of the cities, Police expenditures per capita have been increasing over the last five years.
Sworn Police Officers per 1,000 Population

The data in the chart below indicates that Austin has the fourth lowest number of officers per 1,000 population as compared to other major Texas cities. Houston leads with 2.75 followed by Dallas at 2.50 and Fort Worth at 1.99. San Antonio has the lowest officer per resident ratio at 1.64 per thousand population. The FY2003 proposed budget includes funding for APD to reach a 2.0 officer per thousand population.

Source: City of Austin Police Department
MUNICIPAL COURT SERVICES SCORECARD

CUSTOMER PRIORITY AND SATISFACTION

Level of Priority and Satisfaction with Municipal Court

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority-Convenient payment sites</th>
<th>Satisfaction with Municipal Court Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prioritized: Convenient payment sites</td>
<td>Satisfied: Municipal Court Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RESULTS

- The satisfaction with municipal court services has increased from FY 2000 POSITIVE
- Austin has the second lowest “Budgeted Expenditure per Case Filed” after Houston POSITIVE
- Austin has the second highest “Gross Revenue per Dollar Budgeted” POSITIVE

INPUT

- Austin has the second highest general fund budgeted expenditures per capita for municipal court services of the five major Texas cities HIGH

- Note: Services provided by the other Courts do not include some or all of the following: Community Court, Marshal Services, civil parking program and/or support services such as information systems, financial and accounting services and human resources.
Municipal Court Services

Customer Priority: City of Austin 2002 Citizen Survey of City Priorities/ICMA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City Service Priority</th>
<th>Ratings Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Convenient payment sites</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average Ratings Percentage 43%

In the Citizen Survey of City Priorities, respondents rate convenient payment sites as a low priority.

Customer Satisfaction: City of Austin 2002 Citizen Satisfaction Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City Service Satisfaction</th>
<th>Ratings Percentage (Satisfied or Very Satisfied)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Municipal Court Services</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average Ratings Percentage 81%

Survey respondents' satisfaction with municipal court services is high.
Municipal Court Services

Trend for Citizen Satisfaction with Municipal Court Services

The data for this chart comes from the Citizen Satisfaction survey, conducted by the City of Austin annually. During the FY 2000 survey and on subsequent surveys, respondents were asked whether they felt “satisfied”, “neutral”, or “dissatisfied” about the Municipal Court's services and service quality. Satisfaction with Municipal Court services remained level for FY 2000 and FY 2001 at 76 percent and then increased to 81 percent for the current fiscal year.

General Fund Budgeted Expenditures per Capita for Municipal Court Services

Austin was second to Fort Worth in budgeted expenditures per capita for municipal court services in the current fiscal year. Austin’s General Fund Court budget increased 1.3 percent over FY 2001. In FY 2001, Austin’s Court General Fund budgeted expenditure per capita was $14.84 versus $14.89 in the current fiscal year. Dallas and San Antonio decreased their budgeted expenditures per capita for court services. Houston and Fort Worth increased their budgeted expenditures per capita for court services.
**Municipal Court Services**

**Budgeted Cost per Case Filed**

Austin has the second lowest "Budgeted Expenditure per Case Filed" after Houston.

![Cost per Case Filed Chart]

Source: City of Austin Municipal Court

**Gross Revenue per Dollar Budgeted**

Austin has the second highest "Gross Revenue per Dollar Budgeted" after Dallas.

![Gross Municipal Court Revenue per Dollar Budgeted Chart]

Source: City of Austin Municipal Court
Youth, Family and Neighborhood Vitality
HEALTH CARE SERVICES SCORECARD

CUSTOMER PRIORITY AND SATISFACTION

Level of Priority and Satisfaction with Health and Human Services

| Priority-Social Services to Low Income | 72 |
| Satisfaction-Social Services to Low Income | 68 |
| Priority-Environmental Health | 80 |
| Satisfaction-Safety of Restaurant Food | 92 |

RESULTS

- Austin has the lowest infant mortality rate of the major Texas cities, Portland, Phoenix and Charlotte
  POSITIVE
- Citizen satisfaction with health care available to low income individuals in our community increased in FY 2002 over FY 2000 levels, from 58% to 75%
  POSITIVE
- FY 2002 patient satisfaction measures for primary care services provided to MAP (Medical Assistance Program) and non-MAP patients in the City of Austin Community Health Centers (FQHC’s) showed 90% and 98% satisfaction, respectively
  POSITIVE

EFFICIENCY

- FY 2001 costs per medical and dental visit remained similar to FY 2000, and are projected to decrease in FY 2002
  HIGH

INPUT

- Austin has the highest General Fund budgeted expenditures per capita for health care of the five major Texas cities due to the high level of health services provided at the City level compared to the other cities which have separate hospital districts with taxing authority
  HIGH
Health Care Services

Customer Priority: City of Austin 2002 Citizen Survey of City Priorities/ ICMA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City Service Priority</th>
<th>Ratings Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social Services Available to Low Income Individuals</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicable Disease Prevention</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Health</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Assistance</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeless Services</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Average Ratings Percentage**: 75%

The results of the survey show that citizens rate social services for low income, communicable disease prevention, environmental health and medical assistance for low income individuals as high priorities. Services for the homeless were seen as lower priorities. The services with the highest priorities are those that reach the broadest number of people. Those with lower priorities are targeted to specific sub-populations.

Customer Satisfaction: City of Austin 2002 Citizen Satisfaction Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City Service Satisfaction</th>
<th>Ratings Percentage (Satisfied or Very Satisfied)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Safety of Restaurant Food</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Care Available to Low Income Individuals</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Services Available to Low Income Individuals</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeless Services</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Average Ratings Percentage**: 71%

While respondents are highly satisfied with the safety of restaurant food in Austin, their satisfaction with the social services and health care that are available to low income individuals is moderate. Respondents were less satisfied with homeless services, but those respondents were unlikely to have been users of the homeless services. A recent survey of actual users indicates that 91% of day shelter clients and 93% of night shelter clients were satisfied with the Austin Resource Center for the Homeless (ARCH) services.
Health Care Services

Infant Mortality

The FY 2000 infant mortality rate for Austin/Travis County is the lowest rate among the selected major cities and counties. The Travis County infant mortality rate of 4.8 is also lower than the 5.7 average for the State of Texas.

Satisfaction with Health Care

Respondents to the City-wide Citizen Satisfaction Survey were asked the following question: “Would you say you are Very Satisfied, Satisfied, Dissatisfied, or Very Dissatisfied with the health care available to low income individuals.” The graph represents the percentage of those providing either a very satisfied or satisfied response. In 2002, 75% of the survey respondents were satisfied with the available public health care, the highest satisfaction received in the history of the survey.

Source: City of Austin Citizen Satisfaction Survey
Health Care Services

Cost per Medical and Dental Visit

The two indicators to the right measure the efficiency of primary care services provided in the Federally-Qualified Health Clinic (FQHC) system. Since FY 1999, the cost per medical visit has declined.

![Fully Allocated Cost per Medical Visit](image)

Source: City of Austin Primary Care Department

Although the cost per dental visit increased slightly from FY 2000 to FY 2001, it is projected to decrease in fiscal years 2002 and 2003.

![Fully Allocated Cost per Dental Visit](image)

Source: City of Austin Primary Care Department

General Fund Budgeted Expenditures per Capita for Health and Human Services

Austin’s high health and human services budgeted expenditures per capita as compared to other Texas cities is somewhat deceptive. The gap occurs because either 1) the other cities have tax supported health or hospital districts or 2) the county government provide the services. The City of Austin delivers a much higher level of health and human services than the other cities shown.

![FY 2002 General Fund Budget per Capita](image)

Source: City of Austin Financial Services Department
Health Care Services

Cost per Prescription

Cost per prescription represents the trend in costs for drugs dispensed by the Primary Care Clinics over a 5 year period. The national trend over this 5 year period forecasted double digit increases in drug costs. Estimates ranged from 10% to 18% annually. Primary Care has been able to reverse that trend using three methods: (1) heavy utilization of free drug programs offered by major manufacturers to qualified organizations. The initial program — Share the Care from Pfizer — provided $650,000 in free drugs in FY 2001. Additional usage and development of other similar programs from other manufacturers is expected to increase that amount to over $2 million in FY 2003; (2) formulary management. By managing the drug formulary, Primary Care has been able to utilize lower cost and generic drugs without compromising patient care; (3) continually seeking the lowest prices through such organizations as TACHC (Texas Association of Community Health Centers). In addition, the number of prescriptions written are anticipated to be 25% higher in FY 2003 than in FY 1999, further reducing the cost per prescription by 138% from FY 1999 levels.

Primary Care Medical Encounters

The chart to the right represents the growth in billable medical patient visits over a 5 year period. Despite increasing community demand, the clinic facilities showed stagnant growth in FY 1999 and FY 2000. Late in FY 2001, the Clinic scheduling methodology was overhauled. An immediate increase of 6% was realized, and patient visits grew to 12% in FY 2002. Providers are now routinely at 100% of capacity or over.

Source: City of Austin Primary Care Department
Housing Services Scorecard

Customer Priority and Satisfaction

Level of Priority and Satisfaction with Housing

- Priority-Affordable Housing: 68
- Satisfaction-Availability of housing for low income: 45

Results

- After an increase of affordable housing units (single and multi-family) from 103 in FY 1999 to 135 in FY 2000, production further increased to 249 in FY 2001. FY 2002 production is estimated to increase to 267 units. POSITIVE

- Although the 249 units produced in Austin in FY 2001 were an increase over previous years, it is 20% below the ICMA average of 313 in the number of new low to moderate income housing units completed. NEUTRAL

- Although below the ICMA average in the total units of affordable housing completed as a percentage of the number of needed units, Austin increased its percentage from 5.78% to 10.04%. NEUTRAL
Affordable Housing

Customer Priority: City of Austin 2002 Citizen Survey of City Priorities/ ICMA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City Services Priority</th>
<th>Ratings Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affordable Housing for Low Income</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Ratings Percentage</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results of the survey show that citizens rate the issue of affordable housing as a moderate priority.

Customer Satisfaction: City of Austin 2002 Citizen Satisfaction Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City Service Satisfaction</th>
<th>Ratings Percentage (Satisfied or Very Satisfied)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Availability of Affordable Housing in Austin for</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Ratings Percentage</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The availability of affordable housing in Austin comes in at a low satisfaction level; although this represents an increase of 11 percentage points from FY 2001.
Affordable Housing

Number of Affordable New Housing Units

Housing Services represents a variety of activities to create and retain affordable housing in Austin. The data presented reflects only new construction of both single-family and multifamily housing units funded with federal housing monies. Other housing production programs include rehabilitation, land and property acquisition, down payment assistance for first-time homebuyers, the S.M.A.R.T. Housing initiative, and housing bond programs.

The chart to the right highlights new, affordable housing units that were constructed and occupied between FY 1998 and FY 2001 and those for which construction will be completed during FY 2002 and FY 2003.

Housing projects are not often funded and completed within the same fiscal year. Therefore, production can fluctuate over time. Due to market needs, the City has emphasized construction of rental housing in recent years. Several large developments opened in FY 2001, which accounts for the significant increase in units.

Low-Moderate Income Housing Units

The charts to the right and on the following page, from the FY 2001 ICMA Comparative Performance Measurement Data Report, show the number of new low to moderate income housing units completed in FY 2001 and the percentage of total housing units needed that the completed units represent.

Austin ranks seventh out of the reporting jurisdictions in number of units completed at 249 (up from 135 in FY 2000). The average of all reporting jurisdictions was 313.
Affordable Housing

Low-Moderate Income Housing Units—continued

This chart indicates the degree to which Austin is meeting the need for low to moderate-income housing. Austin met approximately 10.04% of its need in FY 2001, up from 5.78% in FY 2000. This is due mostly to more new rental units being completed. The average among all reporting jurisdictions was 60%.

Source: FY 2001 ICMA Comparative Data
LIBRARY SERVICES SCORECARD

CUSTOMER PRIORITY AND SATISFACTION

Level of Priority and Satisfaction with Library Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority-Library Services</th>
<th>Satisfaction-Quality of Library Services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RESULTS

- Citizen satisfaction with quality of public library services remained constant with the FY2000 satisfaction levels \( \text{POSITIVE} \)
- Both average daily circulation and average daily visits have been increasing since FY 2000 \( \text{POSITIVE} \)
- Austin is below the average of ICMA reporting cities in annual circulation per 1,000 population \( \text{NEGATIVE} \)

EFFICIENCY

- Austin is below the average of reporting cities in expenditures per registered borrower \( \text{HIGH} \)
- Austin’s total library cost per registered borrower has decreased since FY 2000 and is below the average of reporting cities \( \text{HIGH} \)
- Total library cost per capita has been increasing since FY 2000, and is above the average of reporting cities \( \text{LOW} \)

INPUT

- Austin is below the ICMA average of reporting cities in expenditures per 1,000 population \( \text{LOW} \)
- When compared to the other 4 major Texas cities, Austin’s General Fund budgeted expenditures per capita for library services is the highest \( \text{HIGH} \)
Youth, Family and Neighborhood Vitality

Library Services

**Customer Priority: City of Austin 2002 Citizen Survey of City Priorities/ ICMA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City Services Priority</th>
<th>Ratings Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Availability of books/ information at libraries</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Services</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Internet Stations</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History Center Services</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Average Ratings Percentage**: 63%

The results of the survey show that citizens rate the availability of books/ information at libraries as a moderately high priority, with general library services and the specialized services of library internet stations and the History Center receiving lower priority ratings.

**Customer Satisfaction: City of Austin 2002 Citizen Satisfaction Survey**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City Service Satisfaction</th>
<th>Ratings Percentage (Satisfied or Very Satisfied)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Public Library Services</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of Books and Other Information</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Average Ratings Percentage**: 88%

Respondents gave a high satisfaction rating to the quality of Austin’s public library services and to the availability of books and information. Of those respondents having visited a library in the last year, 82% were either satisfied or very satisfied with the availability of materials in the library.
Library Services

Citizen Satisfaction with Quality of Library Services

Through FY 1998, the Citizen satisfaction survey polled the citizens of Austin to determine the level of satisfaction with books and information provided by the Austin Public Libraries. An 89% satisfaction rating in FY 1998 was the highest rating received since the survey’s inception. In FY 2000, the survey replaced the books and information question with one on the quality of library services to incorporate the expanding services that the library system provides.

Average Daily Circulation

Average daily circulation has increased since FY 2000, but a 4% decrease is projected in FY 2003 due to the closure of the Carver Branch Library for construction. Although a temporary facility will be available, collection size will decrease and affect circulation figures.

Average Daily Visits

Average daily visits to the Austin Public libraries have been increasing since FY 2000. Visits are expected to remain fairly constant through FY 2003.
**Library Services**

**Annual Circulation per 1,000 Population**

A comparison of annual circulation per 1,000 population shows that Austin ranks fifth at 4,839. Of the cities in this comparison, Fairfax County has the highest circulation at 11,457 and San Antonio has the lowest at 3,136. Of these comparison cities, Austin ranks below the average of 6,169.

Circulation per 1,000 decreased from FY 2000 by 1%.

![Annual Circulation per 1,000 Population - 2001](image)

Source: FY 2001 ICMA Comparative Data

**Percent of Population who are Registered Borrowers**

The 2001 ICMA report enables Austin to compare key performance indicators to other library systems nationwide. This graph shows that Austin ranks in the middle of reporting cities in percent of population who are registered borrowers. Austin’s percent of population who are registered borrowers increased to 62.7% in 2001 from 58.5% in 2000.

![Percent of Population Who Are Registered Borrowers - 2001](image)

Source: FY 2001 ICMA Comparative Data
Library Services

Total Library Cost per Registered Borrower

The total library cost per registered borrower has decreased since FY 2000 and is expected to continue to decrease through FY 2003. The decrease is associated with decreased library expenditures and an increased number of registered borrowers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expenditures per Registered Borrower - 2001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phoenix</td>
<td>$25.20</td>
<td>$28.43</td>
<td>$36.68</td>
<td>$39.18</td>
<td>$42.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Antonio</td>
<td>$28.43</td>
<td>$39.18</td>
<td>$42.40</td>
<td>$49.01</td>
<td>$53.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austin</td>
<td>$36.68</td>
<td>$39.18</td>
<td>$42.40</td>
<td>$53.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: FY 2001 ICMA Comparative Data

Expenditures per Registered Borrower

Austin’s cost of $36.68 for expenditures per registered borrower is down approximately 3.0% from the FY 2000 cost of $37.77. This cost is below the average of the reporting cities. The methodology used to report this measure to ICMA does not include departmental “overhead” costs associated with fleet maintenance, facilities cost and support services.
Library Services

Total Library Cost per Capita

The total library cost per capita has steadily increased since FY 2000. The library experienced a 4.8% increase in FY 2001 while the population of Austin increased by 4.03%. Library cost per capita is not expected to change significantly through FY 2003.

Expenditures per 1,000 Population

Austin’s library expenditures per 1,000 population is the fourth highest at $22,998 as compared to the other reporting cities. Austin’s expenditures for FY 2001 were lower than the average of the reporting cities. Note that this reporting method for the International City/County Management Association (ICMA) does not include overhead and support services costs, while these costs are included in the cost per capita graphs above and below.

General Fund Budgeted Expenditures per Capita for Library Services

Since FY 1997, Austin has budgeted the most on library services per capita compared to the other large Texas cities.
PARKS AND RECREATION SERVICES SCORECARD

CUSTOMER PRIORITY AND SATISFACTION

Level of Priority and Satisfaction with Parks and Recreation Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority-Parks Maintenance</th>
<th>Satisfaction-Parks Maintenance</th>
<th>Priority-PARD Services and Programs</th>
<th>Satisfaction-PARD Services and Programs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RESULTS

- Since FY 1996, satisfaction with park services and programs has remained high  
  
  POSITIVE

- Austin ranks third highest in developed acres per 1,000 population  
  
  POSITIVE

EFFICIENCY

- Austin’s FY 2001 net operation and maintenance costs per capita decreased to below the FY 1997 level  
  
  HIGH

INPUT

- Austin’s general fund budgeted expenditures per capita for parks is the second highest among the five major Texas cities  
  
  HIGH

- The percentage of net operations and maintenance cost that is tax-supported has remained relatively constant over the past four years  
  
  NEUTRAL
Parks and Recreation

Customer Priority: City of Austin 2002 Citizen Survey of City Priorities/ ICMA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City Services Priority</th>
<th>Ratings Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Services for Youth</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks Maintenance</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parkland Acquisition</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Arts Services</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletic Facilities</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aquatics</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult Recreation Programs</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average Ratings Percentage</strong></td>
<td><strong>59%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respondents of the City Priorities survey placed a high level of priority on services for youth and parks maintenance programs. The other parks-related services garnered a lower prioritization.

Customer Satisfaction: City of Austin 2002 Citizen Satisfaction Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City Service Satisfaction</th>
<th>Ratings Percentage (Satisfied or Very Satisfied)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parks and Recreation Department Services and Programs</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks Maintenance</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation Facilities</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average Ratings Percentage</strong></td>
<td><strong>87%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Citizen Satisfaction survey yielded high satisfaction results with the Parks and Recreation Department’s services and programs, parks maintenance and recreation facilities.
Parks and Recreation

Trend for Citizen Satisfaction with Parks Services and Facilities

As indicated by the chart, citizen satisfaction with parks maintenance, recreation facilities and the overall services provided by the Parks and Recreation Department has remained high since 1996. Parks maintenance continues to reflect satisfaction rates of 90% or above in the last two years.

Developed Acres per 1,000 Population

The graph below compares the number of residents per acre of developed parkland. When compared to similar ICMA cities, Austin ranks among the top with 17.0 per capita of developed acres of parkland. The total number of developed acres maintained by PARD in FY 2001 was 11,089.
Parks and Recreation

Net Operating and Maintenance per Capita

This chart indicates the net dollars spent per 1,000 citizens on operating and maintenance expenditures.

The net operating and maintenance per capita has declined for FY 2001 to a level below the 1997 level. This is a result of an increasing population coupled with more efficient expenditures.

Net Operations and Maintenance: Tax Supported vs. Fee Supported

The ratio of net operations and maintenance expenditures that are tax supported vs. fee supported has remained constant since FY 2000. In FY 2003 for each dollar spent by the department, $0.74 will be tax supported and $0.26 will be fee supported.
Parks and Recreation

**General Fund Budgeted Expenditures per Capita for Parks and Recreation**

Austin has the second highest general fund budgeted expenditures per capita among the major park systems in the state of Texas. The average per capita budget of the five cities is $42.40. While Austin is above the average park costs per capita, it is the only city in this chart to reduce its cost per capita from the previous year.

![FY 2002 General Fund Budget per Capita - Parks and Recreation](image)

Source: City of Austin Financial Services Department
TRAFFIC AND ROAD MAINTENANCE SCORECARD

CUSTOMER PRIORITY AND SATISFACTION

Level of Priority and Satisfaction with Street Repair and Maintenance

RESULTS

- The percentage of lane miles in satisfactory condition has increased from 68% in FY 1997 to 73% in FY 2001, and Austin’s percentage is higher than the 69% average of the cities used in the ICMA comparison  
  POSITIVE

- Although Austin’s percent of congested arterials has increased by 30% since 1982 to 60% in 2000, its percentage is still comparable to the congestion of several similar-sized cities  
  NEUTRAL

- The percentage of lane miles in the street inventory that receive preventive maintenance is projected to decrease  
  NEGATIVE

- Although the cumulative percentage of 1998 bond capital transportation projects completed on-time is decreasing, the percentage of capital spending accomplished has slowly increased  
  NEUTRAL

INPUT

- Austin’s street operations and maintenance expenditures per paved lane mile is the highest of the cities used in the ICMA comparison  
  HIGH
Traffic and Road Maintenance

Customer Priority: City of Austin 2002 Citizen Survey of City Priorities/ICMA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City Service Priority</th>
<th>Ratings Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Flow and Signal Synchronization</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street Repair and Maintenance</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Options</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average Ratings Percentage: 77%

The results of the survey illustrate that citizens feel the above services provided by the City are important, with street maintenance services and traffic flow and signal synchronization receiving high priorities and transportation options receiving a lower priority among the three transportation survey questions.

Customer Satisfaction: City of Austin 2002 Citizen Satisfaction Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City Service Satisfaction</th>
<th>Ratings Percentage (Satisfied or Very Satisfied)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Signal Timing</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Flow on Major Streets</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street Repair and Maintenance</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Options</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average Ratings Percentage: 49%

The results of the 2002 Citizen Satisfaction Survey show that those surveyed expressed low satisfaction with traffic flow on the City’s streets, traffic signal timing, and street repair and maintenance. Transportation options scored moderately high on citizens’ satisfaction.
Traffic and Road Maintenance

Percent of Congested Arterials

The charts below come from the 2002 Urban Mobility Study of the Texas Transportation Institute. The information presented here is different from what has been presented in previous Community Scorecard documents, which was the percentage of congested intersections. This new measure allows comparisons of Austin’s street congestion with similar cities. A congested lane mile of an arterial street is one where traffic flow on that lane mile is slower than 35 miles per hour during the peak morning and evening hours.

Since 1982, the percentage of arterial streets in Austin that are congested during the peak travel periods has increased from 30% to 60%. However, as the chart below shows, Austin’s traffic congestion on its arterial streets — those streets primarily maintained by the City of Austin — is comparable to street congestion in other cities of similar size.

### Percent of Arterial Street Lane Miles that are Congested in the Peak Period

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>1982</th>
<th>1990</th>
<th>2000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Austin</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Percent of Arterial Streets that are Congested in the Peak Period - 2000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma City</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Antonio</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dallas-Fort Worth</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houston</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phoenix</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas City</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austin</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Las Vegas</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Jose</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tucson</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Lane Miles of Street Maintenance

The Public Works Street and Bridge Division maintains Austin’s street inventory using seal coat, overlay, and crack sealing. This graph shows the amount of seal coat and overlay applied in lane miles since FY 2000. The Transportation User fee approved by City Council in 1991 provides funds for these maintenance activities. The Department of Public Works’ goal is to maintain ten percent of its street inventory annually. Total lane miles of street preventive maintenance will continue to decrease in FY 2003 due to funding constraints.

### Lane Miles of Street Preventive Maintenance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002 Budget</th>
<th>2002 Estimate</th>
<th>2002 Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sealcoat</td>
<td>560.2</td>
<td>676</td>
<td>590</td>
<td>535</td>
<td>546</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crack Seal</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overlay</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>470</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>385</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: City of Austin Public Works Department

A lane mile is a section of roadway 10 feet wide and one mile long.
Traffic and Road Maintenance

Percent of Paved Lane Miles in Satisfactory Condition

This graph compares the percent of paved lane miles assessed to be in satisfactory condition. The percentages were calculated by dividing each jurisdiction’s satisfactory lane miles by its total number of paved lane miles (not including alleys).

Street Conditions

The condition class of lane miles is determined by a comprehensive evaluation of street pavement. The Pavement Management System database managed by the Street and Bridge Division of the Department of Public Works lists all of Austin’s streets and their conditions, which are sorted into five quality classes. This graph combines those classes into two overall conditions, “satisfactory” and “unsatisfactory.” As the graph shows, the street inventory has increased by 15% since Fiscal Year 1997. During the same time, the percentage of streets in “satisfactory” condition has improved from 68% in FY 1997 to 73% in FY 2001. The improvement is primarily the result of increased funding for preventive maintenance through the Transportation User fee and for street reconstruction through the 1998 Bond election capital funds.

The annual Citizen Survey includes the question, “How would you rate the conditions of streets and roads in Austin?” 59% of the citizens surveyed rated the roads as good or mostly good — an 11% improvement over the previous three years — while 40% said there were many bad spots.
Traffic and Road Maintenance

Public Works/ Transportation Planning and Sustainability CIP Spending Plans

The Department of Public Works and the Department of Transportation, Planning and Sustainability (TPSD) use Capital Improvement Program (CIP) funding to reconstruct streets that have degraded beyond the point of preventive maintenance strategies, to construct new streets, and to provide a wide range of other transportation improvements such as traffic signalization, sidewalks, and bikeways. Each fiscal year, the departments establish estimated spending plans for their capital projects. Public Works and TPSD have increased their accuracy in estimating spending plan accomplishments. Since FY 1998, the percentages have remained high between 80% and 90%.

1998 Bond Transportation CIP Projects

The graph to the right depicts the percentage of transportation projects using 1998 Bond capital funding that were completed within their original schedules. Unanticipated utility coordination, permitting and right-of-way acquisition issues have contributed to the projects not being completed on schedule. However, at this time, all transportation projects funded with 1998 bonds will be completed within the six-year time frame allotted.
Traffic and Road Maintenance

Operating and Maintenance Expenditures per Paved Lane Mile

The ICMA graphs below compare the street operating and maintenance expenditures per paved lane mile and per capita for several cities across the state and country. Austin has the highest operating and maintenance (O&M) cost per paved lane mile at $2,280. At $1,253 per paved lane mile, Tucson’s costs are the lowest. Austin has the third highest O&M cost per capita at $18. Oklahoma City’s per capita costs of $39 are the highest and Las Vegas’ are the lowest at $14. Operating and maintenance costs include street rehabilitation from contracted work but exclude street reconstruction costs paid from the CIP. These costs do not include new construction or expansion, traffic signals, bridge maintenance, debt service or overhead expenditures.

It is important to note that differences in expenditures and street condition from a city of one geographic region to another could be due in part to soil composition variations, geological features such as fault zones, and age differences between the cities’ street infrastructure.

Source: FY 2001 ICMA Comparative Performance Measures
AIR QUALITY SCORECARD

CUSTOMER PRIORITY AND SATISFACTION

Level of Priority and Satisfaction with Services to Improve Air Quality

RESULTS

- The number of days per year where the 8-hour ozone standard of 85 parts per billion is exceeded has decreased each year since 1999 and in FY 2001 reduced to one day. POSITIVE
Air Quality

Customer Priority: City of Austin 2002 Citizen Survey of City Priorities / ICMA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City Service Priority</th>
<th>Ratings Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Services to Improve Air Quality</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Average Ratings Percentage | 75% |

For 2002, 75 percent of the citizens surveyed rated the City services designed to improve air quality as a high or very high priority.

Customer Satisfaction: City of Austin 2002 Citizen Satisfaction Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City Service Satisfaction</th>
<th>Ratings Percentage (Satisfied or Very Satisfied)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Services to Improve Air Quality</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Average Ratings Percentage | 70% |

With 70% stating that they are either satisfied or very satisfied, Austin’s citizens are moderately satisfied overall with the City’s efforts to improve air quality.
Air Quality

Days per Year When the 8-hour Ozone Standard was Exceeded

One of the ways to track air quality is to count the number of days a region is above the Clean Air Act (CAA) ozone standard of 85 parts per billion (ppb). The CAA standard is applied to the average 8-hour ozone reading at each air quality monitor in the region. A region is in violation of the standard when its fourth-highest ozone reading for the year exceeds 85 ppb, three years in a row. It is important to remember that emissions alone do not determine the ozone reading at a particular air quality monitor. Emissions combined with certain weather conditions create high readings of 85 ppb or above. In 1999, the City had 20 high ozone days. This number was reduced to 14 in FY 2000. Due to continuation of programs and initiatives, plus favorable weather conditions during the summer, the Austin region had only one day of non-compliance in FY 2001.

The following table lists the number of days that other Texas cities have exceeded the 8-hour ozone standard:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Houston, TX</td>
<td>42 days</td>
<td>57 days</td>
<td>64 days</td>
<td>44 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galveston, TX</td>
<td>13 days</td>
<td>23 days</td>
<td>8 days</td>
<td>3 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dallas-Fort Worth, TX</td>
<td>39 days</td>
<td>37 days</td>
<td>35 days</td>
<td>31 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Antonio, TX</td>
<td>8 days</td>
<td>11 days</td>
<td>4 days</td>
<td>1 day</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Texas Natural Resources Conservation Commission
Note: This measure has been tracked by fiscal year since 1999-2000.
RECYCLING AND WASTE DIVERSION SCORECARD

CUSTOMER PRIORITY AND SATISFACTION

Level of Priority and Satisfaction with Recycling and Waste Diversion

RESULTS

- Since FY 2000, the waste diversion rate has not changed significantly  
  
  NEUTRAL

- Since FY 1998, pounds of weekly garbage per household has leveled off  
  
  NEUTRAL

- Although pounds of weekly garbage per household per week has stabilized, the average tons of refuse collected per residential account is the lowest among the ICMA comparison cities  
  
  POSITIVE

EFFICIENCY

- Austin’s garbage and recycling fees have not increased in more than 5 years  
  
  HIGH

- Austin is higher than the ICMA average for gross operations and maintenance expenditures per recycling account  
  
  LOW

- After increasing in FY 2000, the cost per household for direct residential refuse collection has been relatively steady for the past two years  
  
  NEUTRAL
Recycling and Waste Diversion

Customer Priority: City of Austin 2002 Citizen Survey of City Priorities/ ICMA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City Service Priority</th>
<th>Ratings Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recycling Services</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garbage Pickup Services</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brush &amp; Bulky Pickup Services</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street Sweeping</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average Ratings Percentage</strong></td>
<td><strong>63%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results of the survey show that citizens place a moderately high priority on recycling and garbage pickup services, while brush and bulky pickup and street sweeping are a lower priority.

Customer Satisfaction: City of Austin 2002 Citizen Satisfaction Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City Service Satisfaction</th>
<th>Very Good or Good Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recycling Services</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garbage Pickup</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street Sweeping Services</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average Ratings Percentage</strong></td>
<td><strong>75%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Citizens surveyed place high satisfaction with recycling and garbage pickup services and moderate satisfaction with street sweeping services of the City of Austin.
Recycling and Waste Diversion

**Gross Operations and Maintenance per Recycling Account**

Of the ICMA cities compared for FY 2001, Austin had the second highest operating and maintenance costs per recycling account. Virginia Beach had the highest with $43.02 per account, while Phoenix had the lowest per account-costs. The average gross operations and maintenance costs per recycling account for the selected jurisdictions was $22.86.

![Gross Operations and Maintenance per Recycling Account - 2001](image)

Source: FY 2001 ICMA Comparative Data
The graph shows reporting jurisdictions with a population over 400,000.

**Waste Diversion Rate**

The residential waste diversion rate decreased 0.47% from FY 2000 to FY 2001 but is anticipated to rebound to 28.77% in FY 2002. This fluctuation is primarily due to changes in the volume of yard trimmings collected, which is significantly affected by weather conditions. The diversion rate in FY 2003 is expected to remain similar to FY 2002 levels due to the small price differences between garbage cart sizes.

![Austin Residential Waste Diversion Rate](image)

Source: City of Austin Solid Waste Services Department
Recycling and Waste Diversion

Pounds of Garbage per Household per Week

Since the start of the Pay as You Throw Program (PAYT) in 1991, pounds of residential garbage collected per week has decreased from 44 pounds to 31 pounds in FY 1999. However, in FY 2000, pounds of weekly household garbage increased to 32 pounds and has remained at that level. This measure is expected to remain at 32 pounds for Fiscal Years 2002 and 2003.

Residential Refuse Collection City Comparison

In FY 2001, the City of Austin had the lowest average of the ten ICMA cities compared for tons of residential garbage collected per household. Phoenix had the highest average collection of 2.03 tons per household. The average tons per household for the comparison cities was 1.32.

Direct Cost per Household for Residential Refuse Collection

The increase experienced in FY 2000 for this measure was due to an increase in fleet maintenance expenditures and salary adjustments for collection employees to remain competitive within the Austin labor market. Over the last two years, this measure has remained fairly constant, increasing only slightly due to the effects of inflationary cost increases.
DRI NG WAT ER QUALI TY
SCORECARD

CUSTOMER PRI ORI TY AND SAT ISFACTION

Level of Priority and Satisfaction with Drinking Water Quality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Satisfaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RESULTS

- The City of Austin’s turbidity level of its drinking water has consistently been below the TNRCC permit level of 3.0 NTUs
  - POSITIVE

- Respondents to the City of Austin’s Citizen Satisfaction survey are highly satisfied with the City’s drinking water quality
  - POSITIVE

- Although well below the acceptable limit, the City of Austin’s turbidity level of its drinking water is second highest to the cities compared
  - NEUTRAL
Drinking Water Quality

Customer Priority: City of Austin 2002 Citizen Survey of City Priorities/ICMA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City Service Priority</th>
<th>Ratings Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Drinking Water Quality</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wastewater Treatment</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drinking Water Taste</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average Ratings Percentage</strong></td>
<td><strong>85%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Austin citizens consider drinking water quality, drinking water taste and wastewater treatment to be high priorities.

Customer Satisfaction: City of Austin 2002 Citizen Satisfaction Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City Service Satisfaction</th>
<th>Ratings Percentage (Satisfied or Very Satisfied)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Drinking Water Quality</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water and Wastewater Emergency Repairs and Response</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drinking Water Taste</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average Ratings Percentage</strong></td>
<td><strong>82%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The respondents in Citizen Satisfaction Survey were satisfied with Austin’s drinking water quality, emergency repairs and response made by Austin’s Water and Wastewater Utility, and the taste of Austin’s drinking water.
Drinking Water Quality

Drinking Water Quality—Turbidity

Austin’s drinking water has consistently been below the federal standard of 0.3 NTU’s. NTU stands for nephelometric turbidity units which indicate the amount of floating particles in a water sample. Cloudy river water would receive a higher number of NTU’s than clear drinking water. NTU’s of 1.0 or less generally are not detected by the naked eye. While its turbidity is slightly higher than most of the other comparable cities, it is still well within an acceptable limit.

![Drinking Water Quality - Turbidity (NTUs)](image)

Source: City of Austin Water and Wastewater Utility

Wastewater Overflows

This indicator reflects the relationship between the number of overflows compared to the number of miles of main in the collection system. “Total overflows” are all of the sewer spills that occurred from the sewer collection system operated and maintained by the City of Austin. A “repeat overflow” occurs when a sewer spill occurs at the same location within a 3 year period. The objective is to measure how well the collection system is operating. A lower number indicates better maintenance and condition of the collection system. Total overflows increased to 9.0 per 100 miles in FY 2001, which represents a 73% increase from FY 2000. It is anticipated that a decrease total overflows will occur in FY 2002.

![Wastewater Overflows](image)

Source: City of Austin Water and Wastewater Utility
**LAKE AND STREAM QUALITY AND WATER CONSERVATION SCORECARD**

**CUSTOMER PRIORITY AND SATISFACTION**

Level of Priority and Satisfaction with Lake and Stream Quality and Water Conservation

![Priority and Satisfaction Chart]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Satisfaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**RESULTS**

- The cumulative number of drainage area acres improved with publicly-funded structural controls has remained relatively constant since FY 2000  
  - **NEUTRAL**

- The millions of gallons of water reclaimed — or used for non-potable applications — per day has increased since FY 1997  
  - **POSITIVE**
Lake and Stream Quality and Water Conservation

**Customer Priority: City of Austin 2002 Citizen Survey of City Priorities/ ICMA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City Service Priority</th>
<th>Ratings Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lake and Stream Water Quality</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Conservation Programs</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average Ratings Percentage</strong></td>
<td><strong>82%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Citizen survey respondents prioritized lake and stream water quality services and water conservation programs as high priorities for the City of Austin.

**Customer Satisfaction: City of Austin 2002 Citizen Satisfaction Survey**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City Service Satisfaction</th>
<th>Ratings Percentage (Satisfied or Very Satisfied)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City’s Water Conservation Efforts</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City’s Flooding, Erosion and Water Quality Control Efforts</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average Ratings Percentage</strong></td>
<td><strong>81%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Austin residents have high satisfaction with the efforts of the City in regard to flooding, erosion and water quality control and water conservation.
Lake and Stream Quality and Water Conservation

Drainage Area with Improved Water Quality

Through the master planning process, the Water Quality program is developing and implementing the most appropriate, effective, and cost efficient pollutant control strategies for problem areas. The Storm Water Treatment activity manages design and construction of structural controls which reduce the discharge of pollutants to our creeks, rivers and lakes. The measure to the right reflects the total number of acres in the city with improved water quality from publicly-funded structural controls and is cumulative since the inception of the activity.

Source: City of Austin Watershed Protection and Development Review Department

Total Suspended Solids Removed per Amount Produced

The key indicator to the right reflects the effectiveness of the publicly-funded controls in removing total suspended solids (TSS) from stormwater. Total suspended solids and the resulting turbidity negatively impact water quality by impacting aquatic species, fouling habitat and reducing the growth of beneficial submerged aquatic plants.

Source: City of Austin Watershed Protection and Development Review Department
Lake and Stream Quality and Water Conservation

**Peak Day Reduction in Water Usage**

One goal of the water conservation program is to reduce the amount of water used during peak days in the summer. By reducing water use, the city will be able to substantially delay constructing additional water plant capacity. Several programs have been implemented to reduce daily consumption including irrigation audits, low flush toilets, efficient clothes washer and landscape incentives, public education, rainwater harvesting, rain barrels and commercial incentives. The large savings achieved in 1998 and 1999 resulted from these incentives, plus the completion of large water conservation projects, including a water recycling project at Advanced Micro Devices (AMD) in 1999. In 2001, the Water Conservation Program was able to exceed the peak day goal of 760,000 gallons per day (gpd) and achieved a 828,000 gallon reduction due to good participation in all programs. In addition, the completion of the Ramsey swimming pool repair added 44,000 gpd of peak day savings.

**Reclaimed Water**

In December of 1990, the City Council established a Sustainability Initiative to develop and implement a long-range water resource protection and conservation plan. The usefulness of reclaimed water was one of the programs included in that resolution. Reclaimed water is a new water supply created by reusing treated effluent which would normally be discharged to the Colorado River. Reclaimed water is an effective way to improve the City's ability to provide water for not-potable water purposes. Reclaimed water can be used for irrigation, cooling systems, and manufacturing and is especially useful and reliable during times of drought. The increase in 1999 was due to the Balcones and Davenport Golf Courses being irrigated from effluent from package treatment plants. The increase of 0.5 mgd from the FY 2002 estimate to Proposed FY 2003 is due to adding the Morris Williams Golf course and The First Tee 9 Golf course as customers.
ENERGY CONSERVATION SCORECARD

CUSTOMER PRIORITY AND SATISFACTION

Level of Priority and Satisfaction with Energy Conservation

RESULTS

- Megawatts saved in FY 2001 from the City of Austin’s energy conservation and efficiency program was at an all time high with 52.5 Megawatts (MWs) POSITIVE
- Citizen satisfaction with the City’s efforts in energy conservation is 90% POSITIVE
Energy Conservation

Customer Priority: City of Austin 2002 Citizen Survey City Priorities/ICMA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City Service Priority</th>
<th>Ratings Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Energy Conservation Programs</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Ratings Percentage</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results of the survey indicate that 75% of the citizens consider energy conservation programs a “high” or “very high” priority.

Customer Satisfaction: City of Austin 2002 Citizen Satisfaction Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City Service Satisfaction</th>
<th>Ratings Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Utility disconnect/ connect</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City’s Energy Conservation Efforts</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restoring Electricity after a Power Outage</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electric Line Maintenance (Tree Trimming)</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electric Utility Services (Amount Paid for Electric Service)</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Ratings Percentage</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The respondents in the Citizen Satisfaction Survey expressed high levels of satisfaction with the City’s energy conservation efforts, the restoration of electricity after an outage and utility service connection or disconnection. Satisfaction levels with line maintenance and the amount paid for electric service were 73% and 65%, respectively.
Energy Conservation

Megawatts Saved

In FY 2001, the City of Austin’s energy conservation and efficiency program achieved a total of 52.5 megawatts saved (MWs) of electric peak load reduction. These savings included residential and commercial energy conservation (42.2 MWs) as well as maintenance and upgrades in the areas of transmission, distribution and generation (10.3 MWs). The savings in energy conservation is primarily due to the Power Partner and Cycle Saver load management programs. Austin Energy is estimating a reduction of 43.4 MWs in FY 2002. In FY 2003, a net savings of 39.4 MWs is projected to be achieved through conservation and efficiency programs.

Source: Austin Energy
CUSTOMER PRIORITY AND SATISFACTION

Level of Priority and Satisfaction with Zoning Code Enforcement

- Priority-Zoning Code Enforcement
- Satisfaction-Zoning Code Enforcement

RESULTS

- The percentage of residential and commercial inspections performed within 24 hours of request has remained in the 90th percentile for the past several years  
  POSITIVE
Development Review

Customer Priority: City of Austin 2002 Citizen Survey of City Priorities/ICMA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City Service Priority</th>
<th>Ratings Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inspection of buildings/new construction</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issuing building permits for construction/remodeling</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviewing residential/commercial building plans and land development applications</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for compliance to codes and regulations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enforcing zoning code regulations</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average Ratings Percentage</strong></td>
<td><strong>59%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results of the survey illustrate that inspection and development services and plan reviews are moderate priorities.

Customer Satisfaction: City of Austin 2002 Citizen Satisfaction Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City Service Satisfaction</th>
<th>Ratings Percentage (Satisfied or Very Satisfied)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Review process for zoning changes</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoning code enforcement</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average Ratings Percentage</strong></td>
<td><strong>60%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sixty percent of the citizen survey respondents were either satisfied or very satisfied with the City of Austin’s review process for zoning changes and its zoning code enforcement.
Development Review

Reviews Completed within Mandated Deadlines

The indicator to the right tracks the on-time responsiveness of staff to complete reviews of site plans, subdivision plats, and residential zoning plans within code-mandated time limits. Success in this area assures the development community a reduced overall cycle time for plan/plat approvals. Although the FY 2003 target percentage for this measure is slightly lower than the FY 2001 actual and FY 2002 estimate percentages, it is higher than the percentage achieved in FY 2000.

![Percent of Reviews Completed within Code-Mandated Deadlines](image)

Source: City of Austin Watershed Protection & Development Review Department

Percent of Inspections Conducted within 24 hours of Request

The indicator to the right demonstrates the percentage of inspections conducted within 24 hours of the request for service. Residential and commercial inspections include energy, building, mechanical, plumbing, and electrical. The percentage of inspections conducted within 24 hours has remained high since FY 1998.

![Percent of Inspections Conducted within 24 hours of Request](image)

Source: City of Austin Watershed Protection & Development Review Department
AFFORDABILITY SCORECARD

CUSTOMER PRIORITY AND SATISFACTION

Level of Satisfaction with Affordability

Value of City Services: 74
Amount paid in Water and Wastewater: 68
Amount paid in electric: 65

RESULTS

• Austin has a very favorable “AA+” bond rating from Moody’s Standard and Poor’s and Fitch
  POSITIVE

• Although employee turnover rate for the City of Austin has decreased overall since FY 1998, it is still higher than the ICMA average of comparable cities
  NEUTRAL

• Although Austin has the highest median family income of comparable cities, its cost of living index is also higher than these cities
  NEUTRAL

INPUT

• The net debt per capita fluctuated in the 1990’s but is the second highest of the five major Texas cities
  HIGH

EFFICIENCY

• Austin has the lowest city property tax rate, the lowest overlapping tax rate and the second lowest average homeowner costs of the five major Texas cities
  HIGH

• Although Austin customers pay below average water bills, they pay higher than average wastewater bills
  NEUTRAL

• Austin has the second lowest electric service cost of the major Texas cities
  HIGH
Respondents to the 2002 Citizen Survey placed a moderately high priority on the amount they pay in electricity and water and wastewater services.

Customer Priority: City of Austin 2002 Citizen Survey of City Priorities/ICMA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City Service Priority</th>
<th>Ratings Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amount paid for W/WW</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount paid in electricity</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average Ratings Percentage</strong></td>
<td><strong>72%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On average, 69% of the respondents to the 2002 Citizen Satisfaction survey are either satisfied or very satisfied with the value of services they receive through their tax dollars or fees and with the amount they pay for utilities.

Customer Satisfaction: City of Austin 2002 Citizen Satisfaction Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City Service Satisfaction</th>
<th>Ratings Percentage (Satisfied or Very Satisfied)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Value of services received from the City (for taxes/fees)</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount paid in water and wastewater rates</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount paid in electric rates</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average Ratings Percentage</strong></td>
<td><strong>69%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Affordability

**Median Family Income in Austin**

The City of Austin’s median family income rose steadily from FY 1990 to FY 1996, and has risen at an increased rate since that time.

![City of Austin Median Family Income ($ Thousands)](chart1.png)

Source: City of Austin Finance and Administrative Services Department

**Median Family Income City Comparison**

The City of Austin’s median family income is the highest of the cities used in the comparison graph to the right.

![Median Family Income 2000-01](chart2.png)

Source: City of Austin Finance and Administrative Services Department

**Cost of Living City Comparison**

The ACCRA-Cost of Living Index measures the differences in the cost of several consumer goods and services among different cities, based on an average of 100. In 2001, Austin had the second highest cost of living index of the cities in this comparison. Compared to similar cities, Austin’s housing and miscellaneous costs are higher, while its grocery, utilities, healthcare and transportation costs are lower.

![ACCRA-Cost of Living Index 4th Quarter 2001](chart3.png)

Source: ACCRA via the Austin Chamber of Commerce
The property tax for the City of Austin is $0.4597 per $100 of assessed property value. This rate is lower than any of the other Texas cities in this comparison, and it has consistently been the lowest rate since the publication of the Community Scorecard in 1997. Since FY 1999, Fort Worth and Houston have also decreased their property tax rates.

In contrast, the County property tax for the Austin area is $0.4318 per $100, the highest among major Texas cities.

The average taxpayer in Austin pays property taxes to the Austin Independent School District, the Austin Community College special district, Travis County, and the City of Austin. In addition, citizens of other major Texas cities pay property taxes to their local public hospital district. The combined property tax rate for Austin is $2.50 per $100 of assessed valuation. This is the lowest overlapping tax rate among major Texas cities in this comparison.

Since the first Community Scorecard in 1997, Austin’s city and overlapping rates continue to be the lowest among major Texas cities each year.

The last graph shows all of the government services that the owner of a $158,193 home pays in each of the major Texas cities. These costs include property taxes, electric service, water and wastewater service, franchise fees, solid waste service, and other fees. Austin has the second lowest residential homeowner cost of the five major Texas cities.
Net General Obligation Debt per Capita Compared to Other Cities

In Fiscal Year 2001, Austin was second to Houston in net general obligation debt per capita, an improvement over FY 1996 levels where Austin had the highest per capita debt of major Texas cities shown. However, both Austin’s and Houston's per capita debt have increased since FY 1996. All cities except Fort Worth have decreased debt per capita levels from FY 2000. The average of the five cities is $703.

Net General Obligation Debt per Capita Trend

Over the last ten years, Austin’s general obligation net debt per capita has been relatively stable with minor fluctuations. In Fiscal Year 1993, the per capita net debt reached a high of $875. Since then, the net debt per capita has declined slightly and Austin's per capita debt for the last five years has averaged just under $836. The city's net general obligation debt per capita in FY 2001 was $826, lower than the last year as a result of higher population growth in the City.
**Average Monthly Bill Comparison—Water and Wastewater**

The two graphs compare Austin’s average monthly bill with major Texas cities and Portland, Oregon.

In looking at the average monthly water bill, Austin comes in with the third lowest bill, $0.41 above Dallas’ average monthly bill. San Antonio has the lowest monthly bill at $15.11. The average rate for these cities is $19.50.

![Average Monthly Residential Bill Comparison - Water (8,000 gallons)](image)

Source: City of Austin Water and Wastewater Utility

In comparing Austin with the other cities with regard to the average monthly bill for wastewater, Austin comes in with the second highest bill at $25.84. This is $13.20 less than Portland, with the highest rate, and $13.29 higher than San Antonio which has the lowest rate. The average rate for these cities is $22.56.

![Average Monthly Residential Bill Comparison - Wastewater (6,000 gallons)](image)

Source: City of Austin Water and Wastewater Utility

**Average Residential Electric Service**

A comparison of the electric service costs for 1,000 kwh/month for the 12 months ended June 2002 shows that Austin has the second lowest cost of the major Texas cities at $967.56. Houston has the highest electric costs at $1,115.66, and San Antonio has the lowest at $810.27.

![Annual Residential Electric Service Costs 2001-2002](image)

Source: Austin Energy
City of Austin Employee Turnover Rate Trend

Although employee turnover rate is affected by a variety of factors, a lack of clearly defined career progressions within the City and market competitiveness have been identified as problem areas. In Fiscal Year 2003, the turnover rate is expected to increase slightly. However, the rate has decreased from its peak of 14.8% in FY 1998.

Employee Turnover Rate Compared to Other Jurisdictions

The City of Austin's turnover rate for FY 2001 is the second highest among the cities shown. The average for jurisdictions compared was 8.6%.

Note that the comparison with other cities uses the ICMA definition, which is more restrictive and excludes part-time employees, separations due to retirement and employees leaving during the probationary periods.
Bond Rating Compared to Highest Rating AAA

Bond ratings factor in a government’s ability to pay its debt in an environment of competing service needs and expenditure requirements. Each bond rating agency uses its own unique system for rating bonds and all rating systems recognize a triple “A” in any format as the highest rating. Cities should be compared to each other within each rating agency only. Austin has very favorable double “A” ratings for Moody’s, Standard and Poor’s, and Fitch. In FY 2001 Standard and Poor’s changed Austin’s rating to a “AA+” from an “AA”. Dallas has the highest general obligation bond rating among major Texas cities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Moody’s Rating</th>
<th>Standard and Poor’s Rating</th>
<th>Fitch Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AUSTIN</td>
<td>“Aa2”</td>
<td>“AA+”</td>
<td>“AA+”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dallas</td>
<td>“Aaa”</td>
<td>“AAA”</td>
<td>“AAA”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Worth</td>
<td>“Aa1”</td>
<td>“AA+”</td>
<td>“AA+”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houston</td>
<td>“Aa3”</td>
<td>“AA-”</td>
<td>“AA”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Antonio</td>
<td>“Aa2”</td>
<td>“AA+”</td>
<td>“AA+”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ratings as of June 19, 2002

General Fund Budgeted Expenditures Per Capita Compared to Other Cities

The following graph illustrates how Austin’s Fiscal Year total General Fund budgeted expenditures compare to the other four major Texas cities of Dallas, Fort Worth, Houston, and San Antonio. Every effort was made to make the General Fund budgets comparable.

In FY 2002, Austin had the second lowest budgeted General Fund per capita expenditures of the five major Texas cities, with $684.93 budgeted per person. San Antonio’s budgeted per capita expenditures were the lowest at $480.04. Houston’s budgeted per capita expenditures were the highest at $742.32.

Source: City of Austin Financial and Administrative Services