

**Subject: The Municipal Managers "Performance Measures and Benchmarking Report" July 23-2002  
Tracking Number RCA 03830**

**Date:** Sat, 14 Sep 2002 10:01:06 -0700

**From:** "Ernie Crist" <ernie\_crist@dnv.org>

**To:** "FONVCA (E-mail)" <fonvca@fonvca.org>

A MESSAGE FROM ERNIE CRIST

On May 25 - 2001 I made a motion that we receive an update report on the above. This has now been done. I would recommend that you obtain A COPY and read it. The report has been provided to Council for information and follows a similar report dated May 25-2001 provided to Council with an update on various initiatives aimed at improving the effectiveness and efficiency of the District.

The present report among others attempts to compare the District's performance with other municipalities. It is the result of the KPMG report of January 2001 which was described as the preliminary Diagnostic Phase of a management control audit of the Parks and Engineering Department. In that report the consultants recommended that the District undertake a detailed assessment of the effectiveness of one or more of the four larger departments with the Parks and Engineering Division, as it existed at that time.

Following this exercise, the Value Analysis Task Force, in its July 2001 report to Council, recommended that management continue its efforts to develop a useful set of performance measures.


The latest report deals at length with various measures undertaken since then to improve efficiency throughout the organization. It also makes a comparison with other municipalities.

The report makes several claims that require a detailed analysis. My own initial reaction is that it fails in a number of crucial aspects. It does not mention the Heritage Fund and it glosses over the Reserve Fund fiasco both of which were heavily accessed to subsidize District operations. There is nothing in the report on the continued subsidy to the City. It does acknowledge that the District manpower is top management heavy, this would explain why despite more money and more manpower the appearance of the District is deteriorating.

In my opinion it is not a serious document as it has failed to address the serious issues besetting the District. You will undoubtedly draw your own conclusions.

It was a mistake to allow District management to analyze itself but that despite my objections is exactly what happened. The result is nothing more than a bureaucratic apology of the status quo more or less.

---

 <a href="#">winmail.dat</a>	<b>Name:</b> winmail.dat <b>Type:</b> application/ms-tnef <b>Encoding:</b> base64
--	---