

**LOVELAND POLICE DIVISION**

Measure	2007	2008	2009	2010 (Projected)	Forecasted 2011	Trend
Loveland Population	12,519	12,645	12,680	12,700	12,730	
Police Expenditures Per Capita	\$205.07	\$199.15	\$205.71	\$205.51	\$213.78	
ICMA CPM Mean Benchmark (2009)						
All Jurisdictions:			\$219			
Cities under 25,000:			\$243			
<b><i>Mayor's Court</i></b>						
Mayor's Court Revenue	\$ 127,055	\$119,080	\$102,218	\$144,000	\$144,000	
Mayor's Court Expenditure	\$ 114,504	\$130,138	\$119,603	\$113,847	\$120,747	
Court Cost Recovery Ratio	1.11	0.92	.85	1.26	1.19	
<b><i>Traffic Enforcement</i></b>						
Parking Citations	250	146	116	65	70	
Total Traffic Charges	1,730	1,789	1,446	1,500	1,700	
Traffic Warnings	494	693	920	800	800	
Operating Vehicle While Intoxicated (OVI)	37	41	38	32	37	
OVI per 1,000 Residents	2.96	3.24	2.99	2.5	2.9	
Auto Accidents	159	162	150	145	150	
Injury Auto Accidents		13	12	20	15	
Auto Accidents/Alcohol		4	7	8	6	
Fatal Auto Accidents		1	0	0	0	

Measuring Loveland's Performance Dividend - 2011

<i>Part I Crime</i>	2007	2008	2009	2010 (Projected)	Forecasted 2011	Trend
Murder	0	0	0	1	0	↔
Rape	6	3	4	4	4	↔
Robbery	3	2	3	1	2	↔
Aggravated Assault	3	0	3	3	3	↔
Burglary, Breaking and Entering	29	34	41	40	38	↔
Theft/Larceny	162	111	152	160	150	↔
Motor Vehicle Theft	4	2	1	4	3	↔
Arson	2	4	1	1	1	↔
Total Part I Crime	209	155	205	214	201	
Part I Crime / 1,000 residents	16.7	12.3	16.2	16.9	15.8	
ICMA CPM Mean Benchmark (2009) All Jurisdictions: Cities under 25,000:			36.66 31.17			
<b><i>Crime Response</i></b>						
Total Arrests	717	622	677	650	655	
Drug Related Arrests (All)		80	103	100	104	
Juvenile Arrests		94	76	70	71	
Juvenile Drug Related Arrests		18	17	18	18	↔
Arrests / 1,000 residents	57.3	49.19	53.4	51.2	51.5	
Use of Force Incidents	4	11	9	8	8	↔

Measuring Loveland's Performance Dividend - 2011

Average Response Time to Priority Calls in minutes (from dispatch to arrival)	4:25	4:58	4:58	4:50	↔	
ICMA CPM Mean Benchmark (2009)						
All Jurisdictions:		4:52				
Cities under 25,000:		3:65				
<b><i>LPD Employee Development</i></b>	<b>2007</b>	<b>2008</b>	<b>2009</b>	<b>2010 (Projected)</b>	<b>Forecasted 2011</b>	<b>Trend</b>
Total hours of training	2,925	1,972	1,464	1,662	2,400 <sup>1</sup>	↔
Off site training	1,960	1,432	1,277.5	891	1,200	↔
In-house training	965	540	186.5	771	1,200	↔
Average Hours Training per Police Officer	132	89	59.2	70	104	↔

***LPD Fleet Maintenance, 2010***

	<b>Maintenance Expenses</b>	<b>Total Mileage</b>	<b>Maintenance Costs Per Mile</b>
<b>Cars 1 year old or less</b>	\$169.99	6262	
<b>Cars 1-2 years old</b>	\$2,770.23	53,999	.05
<b>Cars 2-3 years old</b>	\$7,384.69	170,405	.04
<b>Cars 3 years old and more</b>	\$16,202.46	564,946	.03

<sup>1</sup> This figure includes daily roll-call training through Lexipol, a new tool the Loveland Police Division will use in 2011. Lexipol is a California-based corporation which develops case-tested law enforcement policies and procedures, and this new tool will be next year. Each work day, officers will log on and take a five to ten minute training seminar customized to the City's policies and procedures, and thus the total number of training hours will increase significantly in 2011. Thus, everyday becomes a training day, and risk is greatly reduced.

**LOVELAND SYMMES FIRE DEPARTMENT<sup>2</sup>**

Measure	2007	2008	2009	2010 (Projected)	Forecasted 2011	Trend
<b>Total Property Losses to Fires, LSF District</b>	\$113,700	\$1,583,600	\$1,306,545	\$380,000	\$400,000	↔
<b>Population Served</b>	28,317	28,482	28,549	28,607	28,675	↔
City of Loveland	12,519	12,680	12,680	12,700	12,730	↔
Symmes Township	15,798	15,837	15,869	15,907	15,945	↔
<b>Average Response Time</b>						
Fire	4:40	4:12	4:56	4:29	4:15	↔
EMS	4:17	5:40	4:42	4:53	4:23	↔
Fractal Response for Cardiac Arrest	90.9%<4min 100%<5min	80.6%<4min 100%<5min	80.0%<4min 100%<5min	92.0%<4min 100%<5min	93.0%<4min 100%<5min	
<b>Total Fire Incidents</b>	1,063	1,234	1,100	1,139	1,200	
Structure Fires	13	18	11	8	10	↔
Total Fire Incidents per 1,000 Population Served	37.54	46.33	37.13	39.77	38.00	
Structure Fire per 1,000 Population Served	0.46	0.63	0.29	0.30	0.33	
ICMA CPM Mean Benchmark (2009) All Jurisdictions: Cities 25-100,000			0.90 0.95			
Firefighters on Scene, Structure Fire <sup>3</sup>	14	35	39.33	39.25	39.00	
Inspectable Properties/ Commercial Fires	891/ 0	943/ 2	991/ 3	1,043/ 3	1,100/ 3	↔

<sup>2</sup> Data for Loveland Symmes Fire Department includes the entire fire district and is not limited to just the corporate limits of the City of Loveland.

<sup>3</sup> The increase in firefighters on the scene in 2008 and beyond is a direct result of the development of the award-winning Northeast Firefighters Collaborative.

Measuring Loveland's Performance Dividend - 2011

Measure	2007	2008	2009	2010 (Projected)	Forecasted 2011	Trend
<b>EMS Incidents</b>						
Total EMS Responses	2,237	2,495	2,348	2,469	2,500	↔
Cardiac Arrests	22	18	27	23	25	↔
<b>Productivity</b>						
Hydrants Serviced	3,223	3,486	3,486	3,500	3,550	↔
Fire Inspections	989	1,007	1,097	1,100	1,100	↔
<b>Total Training Hours</b>						
Total Training Hours	4,831	7,783	7,000	7,100	7,500	
Hours per Employee	93.4	135.8	114.5	140.0	160.0	
<b>Total LSF D Budget</b>						
Total LSF D Budget	\$3,609,683	\$4,051,037	\$3,869,929	\$3,982,218	\$4,181,329	
Expenditures per Capita	\$127.47	\$142.23	\$140.89	\$139.23	145.58	
<b>ICMA CPM Mean Benchmark (2009)</b>						
All Jurisdictions:			\$192.30			
25,000-100,000:			\$146.60			
Under 25,000:			\$379.90 <sup>4</sup>			

<sup>4</sup> Please note that the City of Loveland would be best served comparing itself to communities under 25,000 even though performance data for LSF D is appropriately reported on a district basis because LSF D serves two communities with a combined population greater than 25,000. One can see clearly that both Loveland and Symmes Township have achieved tremendous economy of scale and benefit through the unique way in which LSF D serves the two communities. If both Loveland and Symmes tried to fund and staff a fire department on its own, costs would be close to double what each community is paying today if costs were at the ICMA CPM mean for communities under 25,000.

### BUILDING AND ZONING DIVISION

Measure	2007	2008	2009	2010 (Projected)	Forecasted 2011	Trend
Tall Grass	40	55	75	80	100	
Debris	60	29	54	40	50	
Exterior Structure	-	11	38	35	40	
Other	50	25	53	45	60	
Total Code Violations	155	120	220	200	250	
Violations Complied With	-	120	193	152	190	
Abated by Contractor	-	20	27	48	60	
Cited to Mayors Court	-	2	11	8	10	
Total assessed for clean up	\$6,000	\$8,959	\$18,950	\$24,000	\$25,000	

Measure	2007	2008	2009	2010 (Projected)	Forecasted 2011	Trend
Residential Permits	175	124	114	90	90	
Commercial Permits	47	71	48	50	50	
Residential Inspections	418	274	205	140	140	
Commercial Inspections	98	240	54	70	70	
New Housing Starts	26	28	10	12	12	
Commercial Investment Valuation	\$2,500,000	\$6,118,988	\$1,808,771	\$2,000,000	\$2,000,000	
Residential Investment Valuation	\$9,600,000	\$8,098,355	\$4,575,818	\$4,000,000	\$4,000,000	
Total Property Investment	\$12,100,000	\$14,217,343	\$6,384,589	\$6,000,000	\$6,000,000	

Measuring Loveland's Performance Dividend - 2011

Measure	2007	2008	2009	2010 (Projected)	Forecasted 2011	Trend
Building and Zoning Expenditure	\$200,821	\$204,600	\$215,257	\$210,000	\$210,000	↔
Building and Zoning Revenue <sup>5</sup>	\$100,258	\$92,605	\$57,371	\$100,000	\$85,000	
Building & Zoning Cost Recovery Ratio	0.4992	0.4526	0.2665	0.4762	0.4048	↔

**PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION**

Measure	2007	2008	2009	2010 (Projected)	Forecasted 2011	Trend
Performance Bond Reductions	2	2	0	0	1	↔
Site Plan Reviews	7	2	3	1	2	↔
Conditional Uses	0	5	5	5	5	↔
Zoning Code Text Change	1	1	0	1	1	↔
Loveland Madeira Overlay*	7	7	8	5	7	↔
Lot Splits	2	1	1	2	2	↔
Final Plats	0	0	0	0	1	↔
Substitution, Non-Conforming Use	0	1	0	0	0	↔
Zone Map Change	0	0	0	0	0	↔
Total Cases	19	19	17	14	19	↔

\*Loveland Madeira Overlay (e.g. Signage, Building Color, Substantial Expansion, Outdoor Sales, etc.)

<sup>5</sup> Property tax revenue through the placement of property tax assessments for property maintenance activity is now counted as a Building and Zoning Administration revenue in 2010 and 2011. This means a comparison of total revenue to 2007-2009 is not valid. However, the new method of viewing this as a revenue associated with the Building and Zoning function is a better reflection of Building and Zoning activity, and this is therefore a better methodology than in 2007-2009.

**BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS**

<b>Measure</b>	<b>2007</b>	<b>2008</b>	<b>2009</b>	<b>2010 (Projected)</b>	<b>Forecasted 2011</b>	<b>Trend</b>
Appeals Requested	2	0	1	0	1	↔
Variances Requested	2	1	0	1	1	↔
Total Cases	4	1	1	1	2	↔
Cases Denied	0	0	1	0	0	↔

**FINANCE DEPARTMENT**

<b>Measure</b>	<b>2007</b>	<b>2008</b>	<b>2009</b>	<b>2010 (Projected)</b>	<b>Forecasted 2011</b>	<b>Trend</b>
Number of Utility Billing Accounts	5,820	5,860	5,855	5,839	5,860	↔
Sewer Delinquency Revenue as % of All Sewer Revenue	1.75%	1.80%	1.80%	1.80%	1.80%	↔
Total Utility Bill Collections	\$4,953,606	\$5,073,219	\$5,221,452	\$5,603,500	\$5,884,000	
The Average Monthly Utility Bill for City Residents	\$ 80.85	\$ 87.23	\$95.45	\$103.14	\$106.65	
All Debt Outstanding Principle (includes SCIP)	\$9,450,962	\$10,978,867	\$11,858,133	\$11,968,366	\$12,199,749	↔
Total Debt Principle as a % of Assessed Value <sup>6</sup>	3.2%	3.7%	3.8%	3.8%	3.82%	↔
Number of Outstanding Debt Issues	31	33	35	28	29	↔
Year-end, Weighted Average Interest Rate	3.29%	3.26%	3.08%	3.08%	3.01%	
Total General Obligation (GO) Debt <sup>7</sup>		\$5,942,563	\$5,165,572	\$7,005,572	\$8,115,803	↔
GO Debt as a % of Assessed Valuation		2.10%	1.80%	2.30%	2.70%	↔

<sup>6</sup> Includes all debt, not just general obligation debt, which is more commonly benchmarked against property values.

<sup>7</sup> 2011 General Obligation debt assumes \$283,000 for City Hall HVAC and 1\$1,400,000 for downtown TIF bonds (as opposed to notes in prior years).

Measuring Loveland's Performance Dividend - 2011

Measure	2007	2008	2009	2010 (Projected)	Forecasted 2011	Trend
Treasury & Cash Reserve Management	\$6,820,892	\$5,629,990	\$5,400,000	\$5,300,000	\$5,050,000	
Interest Income	\$389,401	\$284,018	\$135,000	\$57,000	\$45,000	
City Annual Yield on Treasury	5.71%	4.26%	2.50%	1.08%	0.89%	
STAR Ohio Yield	4.95%	2.26%	0.12%	0.14%	0.15%	
Basis Points Above/Below LoveDEX <sup>8</sup>				72.5	52.25	

**INCOME TAX**

Measure	2007	2008	2009	2010* (Projected)	Forecasted 2011	Trend
Income Tax Collections (after refunds)	\$2,954,097	\$2,974,562	\$3,085,000	\$2,870,000	\$2,950,000	
Tax Collection Costs	\$316,501	\$314,280	\$317,613	\$215,736	\$209,000	
Tax Collection costs as a Percent of Net Collections	10.7%	9.465%	9.29%	7.52%	7.08%	

\* Year the City converted to the Regional Income Tax Agency (RITA)

<sup>8</sup> The LoveDEX is a customized benchmark to monitor outside investment services overtime. It consists of Star Ohio, multiplied by 125%, plus 18 basis points. This accounts for the notion that the City of Loveland has historically beaten Start Ohio by 125%, and the City is paying a total of 18 basis points to Fort Washington and US Bank (the custodian). If the LoveDEX is not outperformed over time, than the City would be better either to invest for itself rather than use Fort Washington or hire another firm.

**CITY MANAGER'S OFFICE**

Measure	2007	2008	2009	2010 (Projected)	Forecasted 2011	Trend
Total City of Loveland Assessed Valuation, \$ (Excludes Tangible Personal Property)	270,250,000	282,170,000	286,170,000	302,631,000	300,397,000	↔
% Change in Assessed Valuation	16.05%	4.41%	1.42%	5.75%	(0.74%)	↔
Press Releases	40	40	42	44	45	↔
Annexations	2	0	2	1	0	
Acreage Annexed	35.48	0	61.805	27.5013	0	↔
City Limits, Square Miles	5.12	5.12	5.26	5.30	5.30	↔
City Population <sup>9</sup>	12,519	12,645	12,680	12,700	12,730	↔
Residents per Square Mile	2,445	2,470	2,410	2,396	2,402	↔
Legislative items approved by Council	92	88	84	75	75	
Council Memos	135	115	117	96	90	
L-NAT Meetings <sup>10</sup>	4	3	5	5	4	↔
Adult Participants at all Neighborhood Meetings			150	76	60	

<sup>9</sup> City of Loveland population is estimated annually by multiplying the number of new housing starts by 2.5 residents per household, and adding that new resident calculation to the prior year figure.

<sup>10</sup> The 2010 figure includes the Neighborhood Leadership Summit (May 24, 2010) and the National Night Out Event (August 3, 2010), neither of which are traditional neighborhood meetings but which are included here because both relate to the Loveland Neighborhood Action Team activity.

## HUMAN RESOURCE & PERSONNEL

Measure	2007	2008	2009	2010 (Projected)	Forecasted 2011	Trend
Total City Salary and Wages	\$3,062,923	\$3,218,713	\$3,451,651 <sup>11</sup>	\$2,947,448	\$3,079,525	
Total City Paid Hours	104,236	110,633	128,377	119,000	119,000	
Average Hourly Rate per Labor Hour	\$28.59	\$29.09	\$26.89	\$24.77	\$25.68	
Open Recruitments <sup>12</sup>	3	5	0	2	1	
Total Applications	133	503	NA	156	80	
Applicants per Job	44.3	100.6	NA	78	80	
Average Tenure of Full time City Employees (Years)	9.34	8.57	7.86	8.48	9.40	
City Health Insurance Expenditures <sup>13</sup>	\$ 394,878	\$ 537,971	\$ 519,761	\$ 533,600	\$ 631,824	
Percent Change in Health Insurance Expenditures	10.5%	36.24%	(3.39%)	2.66%	18.41%	

<sup>11</sup> This year's figures include a 27<sup>th</sup> pay period, a fact inflating total salary and wages by 3.7% over the year prior.

<sup>12</sup> This figure does not include internal promotions, only recruitments which are open to the general public.

<sup>13</sup> Includes total premiums and Health Savings Account and Health Reimbursement Account contributions made by the City to employees to cover a portion of the maximum out-of-pocket expenditures.

## RISK MANAGEMENT & WORKERS COMPENSATION

Measure	2007	2008	2009	2010 (Projected)	Forecasted 2011	Trend
Total Property Loss, Premiums, and Expenditures per \$1,000	\$ 1.65	\$ 0.95	\$ 1.39	\$ 0.63	\$1.00	↔
ICMA CPM Mean Benchmark (2009) All Jurisdictions: Cities under 25,000:			\$ 3.75 \$ 3.10			
Expenditures for Liability Claims Per Capita	\$ 3.07	\$ 1.93	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	
ICMA CPM Mean Benchmark (2009)			\$5.33			
Workers Comp Claims per 100 FTEs		8	6	3	5	↔
ICMA CPM Mean Benchmark (2009)			12.5			
Expenditures for Workers Comp per \$100 of Total Wages and Benefits <sup>14</sup>	\$ 0.53	\$ 0.62	\$ 0.89	\$ 0.78	\$0.88	
ICMA CPM Mean Benchmark	\$ 2.36	\$ 2.03	\$ 1.62			
Number of Work Days Lost to Injury Per Claim		5.5	0	1	2	
ICMA CPM Mean Benchmark (2009)			5.06			

<sup>14</sup> Workers Compensation premiums have been increasing not because of the City of Loveland's experience, which has been excellent, but because the State of Ohio's Workers Compensation fund is increasing premiums statewide.

**HOUSING, PROPERTY TAX & CITY OR  
COMMUNITY IMPROVEMENT CORPORATION REAL  
ESTATE ACTIVITY STATISTICS**

Measure	2007	2008	2009	2010 (Projected)	Forecasted 2011	Trend
Average Sales Price of Loveland Homes Sold <sup>15</sup>	\$232,872	\$188,965	\$177,581	\$187,460	\$182,000	
Total City of Loveland Assessed Valuation in dollars (Excludes Tangible Personal Property)	270,250,000	282,170,000	302,911,000	300,397,000	290,000,000	
% Increase in Assessed Valuation	16.05%	4.41%	7.35%	(0.83%)	(3.46%)	
Available <b>Detached</b> Single Family Housing <b>Lots (Units)</b> in Platted Subdivisions	-	136	127	121	110	
Available <b>Attached</b> Single Family Housing <b>Units</b> in Platted Subdivisions (White Pillars)	-	108	99	98	86	
Foreclosures	42	15	16	17	17	
Community Reinvestment Area (CRA) Tax Abatements	1	4	2	1	1	
New Jobs from CRAs	10	46	84	40	25	
Properties sold, purchased or leased by the City	1	1	3	1	1	

<sup>15</sup> Average sales price includes all homes which were sold inside the corporate limits in a given year, including new and existing homes. The change in average sales price since 2007 is in part a reflection of fewer new home starts in 2009-2011, not necessarily a decline in the value of existing homes in the community. Home sale prices are projected to go down in 2011 largely because staff believes sales in 2010 were increased because of federal programs which have expired.

Measuring Loveland's Performance Dividend - 2011

Properties sold, purchased or leased by the Loveland CIC	0	4	1	1	1	↔
--	---	---	---	---	---	---

**WATER SYSTEM**

Measure	2007	2008	2009	2010 (Projected)	Forecasted 2011	Trend
Millions of Gallons of Water Pumped Per Year	586.66	535.12	626.81	625	625	
Millions of Gallons of Water Billed Per Year		477.54	425.30	493.17	495	
Unaccounted For Water (UW)	11.8%	10.8%	32.1% <sup>16</sup>	26.73%	26.25%	
AWWA Best Practice Benchmark For Unaccounted for Water			10%			
Linear Feet of Water Distribution System Replaced	7,367	0	0	3,371	2,100	
% of Water System Replaced	2.01%	0 %	0%	0.85%	0.53%	
Linear Feet of 4" Diameter Water Line in System		16,685	16,685	13,065	10,975	
Average Remaining Useful Life, Water Distribution System		32.85 years	31.85 years	31.82 years	31.36 years	

<sup>16</sup> In 2009, the City replaced its SCADA and telemetry systems, and this project included installing two meters at the water plant. These meters actually measure water generation, as opposed to the prior method which estimated water generation based on pumping data. This apparent sharp increase in unaccounted for water is still under review; staff is incredulous that the City's water system is losing 25% or more of the City's water generation. Nevertheless, the data regarding water generation is accurate.

**PARKS & RECREATION**

<b>Measure</b>	<b>2007</b>	<b>2008</b>	<b>2009</b>	<b>2010 (Projected)</b>	<b>Forecasted 2011</b>	<b>Trend</b>
Loveland Youth Recreation Participants		4,250	3,796	3,900	3,900	↔
Percentage of All Rec. Participants from City		30.8%	31.7%	31.7%	31.5%	↔
Acres of Parkland per 1,000 residents (developed and undeveloped) <sup>17</sup>	25.03	24.78	25.34	25.30	25.24	
ICMA CPM Mean Benchmark (2009)			24.2			

<sup>17</sup> The increases in parks land represent the acquisition of the Christman Farm in 2007 and the acquisition of the Donnie Gay property in 2009. Average park land per capita goes down slightly as the City's estimate of the City's population increases annually.

### STREET MAINTENANCE

Measure	2007	2008	2009	2010 (Projected)	Forecasted 2011	Trend
Loveland Population	12,519	12,645	12,680	12,700	12,730	↔
Road Rehabilitation Expenditures	\$437,534	\$440,203	\$390,183	\$322,000	\$327,086	
Per Capita Road Rehabilitation Expenditures	\$34.95	\$34.81	\$30.28	\$25.35	\$26.69	
ICMA CPM Mean Benchmark (2009)				\$34.60		
Lane-Mile of Roadways Rehabilitated		5.69	9.20	4.06	TBD	↔
Road Rehabilitation Expenditures per Lane-Mile		\$92,144	\$41,734	\$94,828	TBD	
Tons of Road Salt Used		1,200	1,082	1,050	1,050	
Hours of Street Sweeping		292	261	352	350	
Total Loveland Lane Miles of Roadway (Accepted/Dedicated)		100.4	101.2	101.6	101.6	↔

\*Includes contracted sweeping in 2010 and 2011. This will be three sweeps of the residential neighborhoods by a contracted sweeping company, plus the City's own sweeping.

### PUBLIC WORKS

Measure	2007	2008	2009	2010 (Projected)	Forecasted 2011	Trend
Catch Basins Cleaned	227	222	210	210	220	↔
Emergency Callout Events			87	90	0	↔
Fire Hydrants Repaired				22	10	↔
Fire Hydrants Replaced				7	5	↔
Annual SCIP Funding Level	\$284,000	\$0	\$564,600	\$0	\$467,600	↔
Annual SCIP Ranking	33 <sup>rd</sup>	47 <sup>th</sup>	72 <sup>nd</sup>	N/A	50 <sup>th</sup>	
Cumulative SCIP Funding Rank of 48 communities in Hamilton County	3	3	3	4	4	

### RECYCLING & REFUSE

Measure	2007	2008	2009	2010 (Projected)	Forecasted 2011	Trend
Total Tons of Recycling Collected	856.67	973.08	1,039.61	1,150	1,250	
Recycling as a % of Waste Stream	15.0%	16.12%	16.85%	18.5%	20%	
ICMA CPM Mean Benchmark (2009)			17%			
Loveland's Rank in Hamilton County for Recycling %	11 <sup>th</sup>	9 <sup>th</sup>	10 <sup>th</sup>	10 <sup>th</sup>	9 <sup>th</sup>	↔