

## *City of Brownsville Comprehensive Plan*



### **Sub-Objectives and Indicators**

**Economic, Infrastructure, Social, Civic, and Environment Dimensions**

**Draft Final**



## *City of Brownsville Comprehensive Plan*

# ***ECONOMIC DIMENSION***

## **Sub-Objectives and Indicators**

**Households, Public and Private Sectors**

|                                 |   |   |               |                |
|---------------------------------|---|---|---------------|----------------|
| <b>DIMENSION GOAL:</b>          | Economic - A community with a vibrant, robust, diverse, productive and growing economy that provides the economic resources, through the open and unfettered participation of the private, public and household sectors, needed to support the community's quality of life through the 10-yr planning period in a sustainable manner. |   |               |                |
| <b>SUB-DIMENSION OBJECTIVE:</b> | N/A   |   |               |                |
| <b>SECTOR OBJECTIVE:</b>        | Households - A community with an active, employed, productive labor force, characterized by good paying jobs and high income/purchasing power.  |   |               |                |
| <b>SOURCE</b>                   | <b>SUB OBJECTIVES</b>   | <b>OUTCOME INDICATORS</b>   | <b>Vote %</b> | <b>RANKING</b> |
| Draft Final                     | Want consistent net growth in formal quality jobs with benefits created from sustainable and growing industrial sectors to accommodate population growth and be uniformly distributed throughout the community (consistent reduction in unemployment) by district and demographics  |   | 33%           | 1              |
|                                 |   | Overall ratio of annual net growth in jobs to net growth in labor force; and by city district   |               |                |
|                                 |   | Overall ratio of net growth in jobs in sustainable and growing industrial sectors to net growth in jobs (shift/share); and by city district |               |                |
|                                 |   | Overall unemployment rate; and by city district   |               |                |
|                                 |   | Overall % of workforce earning above state median wage; by sector and by city district  |               |                |
| Draft Final                     | Want a better educated, bilingual and biliterate workforce with more diverse skills   |   | 27%           | 2              |
|                                 |   | Overall % of workforce with at least HS/GED degree  |               |                |
|                                 |   | Overall % of workforce with at least Technical degree   |               |                |
|                                 |   | Overall % workforce with at least University degree   |               |                |
|                                 |   | Overall % workforce with at least Post University degree  |               |                |
| Draft Final                     | Want to minimize "Brain Drain"  |   | 13%           | 3              |
|                                 |   | Overall % workforce with at least university degree that graduated from local HS  |               |                |
|                                 |   | Overall % of workforce that graduated from UTB/TSC and no longer resides in Brownsville   |               |                |
| Draft Final                     | Want consistent reduction in number of discouraged unemployed individuals (Labor Participation)   |   | 8%            | 4/5            |
|                                 |   | % of labor participation (source: Cameron Works)  |               |                |
| Draft Final                     | Want consistent growth in labor productivity (output per unit cost)   |   | 8%            | 4/5            |
|                                 |   | Labor productivity (output/wages) by industrial sector.   |               |                |
| Draft Final                     | Want consistent net growth and distribution in formal household disposable income   |   | 4%            | 6/7            |
|                                 |   | Per capita disposable income  |               |                |
| Draft Final                     | Want consistent reduction in time and effort needed to find employment  |   | 4%            | 6/7            |
|                                 |   | Average time required to find a job   |               |                |
| Draft Final                     | Want affordable cost of living conditions (housing, utilities, taxes, etc.)   |   | 2%            | 8              |
|                                 |   | Ratio of Cost of Living Index to Per capita Income  |               |                |

|                                 |   |  |               |                |
|---------------------------------|---|--|---------------|----------------|
| <b>DIMENSION GOAL:</b>          | Economic - A community with a vibrant, robust, diverse, productive and growing economy that provides the economic resources, through the open and unfettered participation of the private, public and household sectors, needed to support the community's quality of life through the 10-yr planning period in a sustainable manner. |  |               |                |
| <b>SUB-DIMENSION OBJECTIVE:</b> | N/A   |  |               |                |
| <b>SECTOR OBJECTIVE:</b>        | Public - A community with a public sector working in partnership with the private sector and households to provide the social overhead capital and public sector services needed to promote economic development and sustainable growth   |  |               |                |
| <b>SOURCE</b>                   | <b>SUB OBJECTIVES</b>   | <b>OUTCOME INDICATORS</b>  | <b>Vote %</b> | <b>RANKING</b> |
| Draft Final                     | Want positive and increasing net tax transfers with state and federal governments (e.g., increase federal and state funding)  | Ratio of tax outflows to Fed/State Governments to local transfers (grants, entitlements etc)   | 22%           | 1              |
| Draft Final                     | Want a public sector that creates and utilizes local resources and conditions conducive to the strengthening of existing firms, and the recruitment of new employers for new local job creation   | Ratio of local to total factor inputs employed by the public sector<br>Number of local jobs created by the purchase of local factors by the public sector<br>Number of local jobs created per business incentive expenditures                                    | 18%           | 2              |
| Draft Final                     | Want all public sector services and capital improvements to be delivered and maintained in a sustainable, reliable and cost effective manner, and distributed fairly and equitably  | Productivity Indices for each public sector service/department (cost per unit product) (e.g. cost per mile streets paved)<br>Reliability indices for each public sector service (% downtime)<br>Maintenance indices for each public sector service               | 12%           | 3              |
| Draft Final                     | Want tax rate for all local taxing entities to be equitable, affordable and competitive   | Ratio of average total local taxes to average per capita income<br>Total local taxes per capita<br>Distribution of total taxes paid by income group  | 10%           | 4              |
| Draft Final                     | Want to maximize public sector investment capacity (PUB, City, BISD, UTB, Port, BCIC, GBIC, drainage districts, etc.) and access capital at competitive rates   | Total available bonding capacity per capita<br>Ratio of available to total bonding capacity<br>Average acquisition and servicing costs per million dollars of debt<br>Years of available bonding capacity (available bonding capacity / bonding absorption rate) | 8%            | 5/6/7/8        |
| Draft Final                     | Want all public sector entities (PUB, City, BISD, UTB, Port, BCIC, GBIC, drainage districts etc.) to be financially sound and sustainable   | Standard and Poor's Financial rating for each public entity (annual debt service coverage, accounts receivable to operating income, debt to plant ratio, short term debt/long term debt, etc).   | 8%            | 5/6/7/8        |
| Draft Final                     | Want all public sector service fees to be equitable, affordable and competitive   | Ratio of service user fees to per capita income (e.g water/sewer, garbage)<br>Distribution of total service costs by income group  | 8%            | 5/6/7/8        |
| Draft Final                     | Want public sector operations that recover, conserve and reuse natural resources and comply with environmental regulations  | Scored within Environment Dimension  | 8%            | 5/6/7/8        |
| Draft Final                     | Want to increase and diversify public sector income sources   | Local income source diversity index  | 6%            | 9              |

|                                 |   |  |               |                |
|---------------------------------|---|--|---------------|----------------|
| <b>DIMENSION GOAL:</b>          | Economic - A community with a vibrant, robust, diverse, productive and growing economy that provides the economic resources, through the open and unfettered participation of the private, public and household sectors, needed to support the community's quality of life through the 10-yr planning period in a sustainable manner. |  |               |                |
| <b>SUB-DIMENSION OBJECTIVE:</b> | N/A   |  |               |                |
| <b>SECTOR OBJECTIVE:</b>        | Private - A community with a vibrant, diverse, productive and growing private sector with the capacity of creating employment, and sustaining and growing the local economy   |  |               |                |
| <b>SOURCE</b>                   | <b>SUB OBJECTIVES</b>   | <b>OUTCOME INDICATORS</b>  | <b>Vote %</b> | <b>RANKING</b> |
| Draft Final                     | Want affordable and competitive commercial utility rates, local taxes, and lower production costs (having "shovel-ready" sites-moved from #2)   |  | 21%           | 1              |
|                                 |   | Overall ratio of production (utilities, labor, local taxes) costs to output; and by industrial sector.                               |               |                |
|                                 |   | Overall ratio of utility costs to output; and by industrial sector   |               |                |
|                                 |   | Overall ratio of local taxes to output; and by industrial sector   |               |                |
|                                 |   | Overall ratio of local labor costs to output; and by industrial sector   |               |                |
|                                 |   | Ratio of industrial (shovel-ready) sites to industrial site demand (in acres).   |               |                |
|                                 |   | Years of available (shovel-ready) site capacity (excess capacity / capacity absorption rate)   |               |                |
|                                 |   | Ratio of industrial (shovel-ready) sites to industrial land use sites (in acres)   |               |                |
| Draft Final                     | Want to minimize turnover of firms due to non-competitive local factors   |  | 18%           | 2              |
|                                 |   | Index of cost of doing business (compare to other cities)  |               |                |
|                                 |   | Ratio of businesses that are created to businesses that stay in business   |               |                |
| Draft Final                     | Want consistent growth in number of high productivity/value firms in growing and sustainable sectors and in integrated and emerging industrial clusters that produce and export diversified products and services   |  | 13%           | 3/4            |
|                                 |   | % growth in high productivity firms  |               |                |
|                                 |   | Ratio of output of high productivity firms to total output   |               |                |
|                                 |   | Ratio of output of firms in high productivity clusters to total output   |               |                |
| Draft Final                     | Want firms to reinvest in the community (e.g., workforce training, general education, infrastructure, arts, environment, sports, etc.)  |  | 13%           | 3/4            |
|                                 |   | Ratio of total amount reinvested to total output (RGDP)  |               |                |
|                                 |   | Ratio of total amount reinvested in charitable and cultural causes (e.g., arts, education, etc) to output                            |               |                |
|                                 |   | Ratio of total amount reinvested in workforce training to output   |               |                |
|                                 |   | Ratio of total amount reinvested in public infrastructure to output  |               |                |
| Draft Final                     | Want readily available access to affordable capital and Research and Development  |  | 12%           | 5              |
|                                 |   | Ratio of Total (private & public) Capital Financing (Venture Capital plus conventional financing including bank financing) to output |               |                |
|                                 |   | Ratio of Venture Capital Financing to Total Capital Financing  |               |                |
|                                 |   | Ratio of R & D expenditures to total output  |               |                |
| Draft Final                     | Want to create a culture of local entrepreneurship  |  | 11%           | 6              |
|                                 |   | Ratio of number of locally owned startups to total new firms; and by high productivity firms.  |               |                |
|                                 |   | Ratio of jobs created by locally owned startups to total jobs created; and by high productivity firms.                               |               |                |
|                                 |   | Ratio of output by locally owned startups to total output; and by high productivity firms.   |               |                |
| Draft Final                     | Want to create incentive for existing and new firms to utilize local resources  |  | 8%            | 7              |
|                                 |   | Ratio of local factor inputs (suppliers?) to total factor inputs   |               |                |
|                                 |   | Ratio of local DBE/WOE factor inputs to total factor inputs  |               |                |
| Draft Final                     | Want consistent increases in local economic production (RGDP) - (creation of new firms and growth of existing firms)  |  | 5%            | 8              |
|                                 |   | Growth in Regional Gross Domestic Product per capita; by new firms; by existing firms.   |               |                |
| Draft Final                     | Want a positive net regional export trade balance   |  | 1%            | 9              |
|                                 |   | Overall ratio of export output to total output   |               |                |
|                                 |   | Overall ratio of import consumption to total output  |               |                |



## *City of Brownsville Comprehensive Plan*

# ***INFRASTRUCTURE DIMENSION***

## **Sub-Objectives and Indicators**

**Transportation, Drainage, Utilities and Telecommunications**

| DIMENSION GOAL:          | INFRASTRUCTURE - A community with quality delivery of infrastructure (utility, transportation, drainage, telecommunications) levels of service in a cost efficient, reliable, equitable, affordable and effective manner, that provide a foundation for the community's sustainable quality of life and economic development through the 10-year planning horizon. |   |        |         |
|--------------------------|--|---|--------|---------|
| SUB-DIMENSION OBJECTIVE: | Transportation: A community with quality delivery of multimodal transportation system levels of service in sufficient quantity to meet user demands  |   |        |         |
| SECTOR OBJECTIVE:        | Rail Transportation: A community with quality delivery of rail transportation sector levels of service   |   |        |         |
| SOURCE                   | SUB OBJECTIVES   | OUTCOME INDICATORS  | Vote % | RANKING |
| Preliminary Draft Final  | Want sufficient, well maintained rail cargo transportation service system capacity to facilitate the flow of high volumes and concentration of goods to, from and through our community and to all major Texas, US and Mexican trade centers   |   | 40%    | 1       |
|                          |  | Local demand for (liquid) rail cars per month as a percentage of available capacity |        |         |
|                          |  | Local demand for (bulk) rail cars per month as a percentage of available capacity   |        |         |
|                          |  | Index of local rail system maintenance level  |        |         |
|                          |  | Percent of local rail staging capacity (linear feet) that is occupied               |        |         |
| Preliminary Draft Final  | Want rail cargo transportation system that offers safe (clearly marked crossings), predictable, reliable, convenient and expedited service routes, hardened against disaster related service interruptions, throughout our community and to all major Texas, US and Mexican trade centers  |   | 25%    | 2/3     |
|                          |  | Average transit time to/from major trade centers per mile per commodity class       |        |         |
|                          |  | Incidence of service/delivery delays  |        |         |
|                          |  | Average local transit time to rail facility   |        |         |
|                          |  | Incidence of derailments  |        |         |
|                          |  | Incidence of train/vehicle accidents  |        |         |
| Preliminary Draft Final  | Want rail shipping fees that are competitive   |   | 25%    | 2/3     |
|                          |  | Average transit fee per mile per commodity class to major trade centers             |        |         |
| Preliminary Draft Final  | Want improved cooperation and collaboration between private rail transportation sector and public sector entities to ensure that rail services are integrated into an efficient regional/international multi-modal transportation and logistics framework  |   | 10%    | 4       |
|                          |  | Index of local rail transportation system inter-connectivity                        |        |         |
| Preliminary Draft Final  | Want private sector rail service providers to recover and reuse natural resources and comply with environmental regulations in a sustainable manner  |   | 0%     | 5       |
|                          |  |   |        |         |

| DIMENSION GOAL:          | INFRASTRUCTURE - A community with quality delivery of infrastructure (utility, transportation, drainage, telecommunications) levels of service in a cost efficient, reliable, equitable, affordable and effective manner, that provide a foundation for the community's sustainable quality of life and economic development through the 10-year planning horizon. |  |        |         |
|--------------------------|--|--|--------|---------|
| SUB-DIMENSION OBJECTIVE: | Transportation: A community with quality delivery of multimodal transportation system levels of service in sufficient quantity to meet user demands  |  |        |         |
| SECTOR OBJECTIVE:        | Surface Transportation: A community with quality delivery of surface transportation sector levels of service   |  |        |         |
| SOURCE                   | SUB OBJECTIVES   | OUTCOME INDICATORS   | Vote % | RANKING |
| Preliminary Draft Final  | Want sufficient regional/international, multi-modal surface transportation system capacity with adequate personnel and resources to obtain needed roadway ROW for expansion of the roadway network and to address congestion problems  |  | 30%    | 1       |
|                          |  | Years of available ROW capacity by Roadway Class and by City District (Ratio of Available Excess ROW Capacity to ROW Capacity Absorption Rate)                 |        |         |
|                          |  | Ratio of NEEDED ROW to AVAILABLE ROW over the planning horizon by Roadway Class and by City District   |        |         |
|                          |  | Level of Service classification by roadway class and by city district (Lower Threshold: Level C)   |        |         |
|                          |  | Percent of Roadway miles that are below Level of Service "C" by Roadway Class and by City District   |        |         |
|                          |  | Years before Level of Service classification reaches critical levels (below Level C) by roadway class and by city district                                     |        |         |
|                          |  | Public Transportation System demand as percentage of available capacity (no. of buses/1000 daily ridership count)  |        |         |
|                          |  | Years of available public transportation capacity (Ratio of Available Excess Public Transportation Capacity to Public Transportation Capacity Absorption Rate) |        |         |
|                          |  | Bikeability Demand/capacity Index - Ratio of bike trail miles to Street miles by City District   |        |         |
|                          |  | WalkabilityDemand/Capacity Index - Ratio of walking trails/sidewalk miles to Street miles by City District   |        |         |
| Preliminary Draft Final  | Want a well maintained and reliable regional/international, multi-modal surface transportation service system that is hardened against disaster related service interruptions uniformly throughout the community   |  | 25%    | 2       |
|                          |  | Surface Pavement Rating (maintenance) Index by Roadway Class and by City District  |        |         |
|                          |  | Public bus stops maintenence index by City District  |        |         |
|                          |  | Percent roadway downtime due to repairs (Ratio of Annual Street Mile-Days under repair to Total Mile-Days) by Road Classification and by City District         |        |         |
|                          |  | % of bus route that are delayed by more than xx minutes  |        |         |
| Preliminary Draft Final  | Want a multi-modal surface transportation service that is safe and convenient uniformly throughout the community   |  | 20%    | 3       |
|                          |  | Percent of population within walking distance of public transportation   |        |         |
|                          |  | Number of vehicle traffic accidents per capita per year by City District   |        |         |
|                          |  | Walkability Convenience Index - number of Connected walking trails/sidewalks miles per square mile by City District  |        |         |
|                          |  | Bikability Convenience Index - Number of Connecting Bike trail miles per square mile by City District  |        |         |
|                          |  | Number of Vehicle/bike traffic accidents per capita per year by City District  |        |         |
|                          |  | Number of Vehicle/Pedestrian traffic accidents per capita per year by City District  |        |         |
| Preliminary Draft Final  | Want a cost-efficient, financially sustainable, multi-modal surface transportation system that maximizes external funding sources, preserves the existing system's mobility, minimizes the need for new transportation investments and distributes life cycle costs among public and private sectors in an equitable manner  |  | 10%    | 4/5     |
|                          |  | Scored within Economics/Public Sector  |        |         |
|                          |  | Surface transportation system life cycle cost per street mile  |        |         |
|                          |  | Public transportation system life cycle cost per passenger per mile  |        |         |
|                          |  | Ratio of public transportation system service life (in years) to financing amortization period (in years)  |        |         |
|                          |  | Ratio of surface transportation system service life (in years) to financing amortization period (in years)   |        |         |



| SOURCE                     | SUB OBJECTIVES  | OUTCOME INDICATORS                                      | Vote % | RANKING |
|----------------------------|---|---|--------|---------|
| Preliminary<br>Draft Final | Want a surface transportation service system that is an integrated part of an efficient and comprehensive regional/international multi-modal transportation and logistics system that promotes improved regional economic development and quality of life |   | 10%    | 4/5     |
|                            |   | Index of transportation system inter-connectivity Index |        |         |
| Preliminary<br>Draft Final | Want high consumer satisfaction with overall level of surface transportation service  |   | 5%     | 6       |
|                            |   | Survey measure of consumer satisfaction                 |        |         |
| Preliminary<br>Draft Final | Want transportation user fees (including toll road and public transit fees) to be competitive, equitable, stable and affordable   |   | 0%     | 7       |
|                            |   | Scored within Economics/Public Sector                   |        |         |
|                            |   | Public transportation user fees/mile                    |        |         |
|                            |   | Surface transportation user fee (tolls)/mile            |        |         |

| DIMENSION GOAL:          | INFRASTRUCTURE - A community with quality delivery of infrastructure (utility, transportation, drainage, telecommunications) levels of service in a cost efficient, reliable, equitable, affordable and effective manner, that provide a foundation for the community's sustainable quality of life and economic development through the 10-year planning horizon. |  |        |         |
|--------------------------|--|--|--------|---------|
| SUB-DIMENSION OBJECTIVE: | Transportation: A community with quality delivery of multimodal transportation system levels of service in sufficient quantity to meet user demands  |  |        |         |
| SECTOR OBJECTIVE:        | Port Transportation: A community with quality delivery of ports/waterways sector levels of service   |  |        |         |
| SOURCE                   | SUB OBJECTIVES   | OUTCOME INDICATORS   | Vote % | RANKING |
| Preliminary Draft Final  | Want sufficient and well maintained national/international, multi-modal (liquid, bulk, container, barge, etc.) port system capacity (channel depth/volume, facilities, land, etc.) to meet current and future world market demands   |  | 30%    | 1       |
|                          |  | Local port transportation system service demand as a percentage of available channel depth tonnage capacity by commodity   |        |         |
|                          |  | Years of available port transportation channel depth tonnage capacity by commodity   |        |         |
|                          |  | Local port transportation system service demand as a percentage of available docking space capacity by commodity   |        |         |
|                          |  | Years of available port transportation system docking space capacity (Available excess capacity/capacity absorption rate) by commodity   |        |         |
|                          |  | Local port transportation system service demand as a percentage of available loading/offloading capacity by commodity  |        |         |
|                          |  | Years of available port transportation system loading/offloading capacity (Available excess capacity/capacity absorption rate) by commodity                                    |        |         |
|                          |  | Overall local port transportation system demand as a percentage of system capacity (minimum of depth, docking and lading/offloading capacities) by commodity                   |        |         |
|                          |  | Overall years of available port transportation system capacity (minimum of depth, docking and lading/offloading capacities) by commodity                                       |        |         |
|                          |  | Index of port system maintenance level (transportation, utilities)   |        |         |
| Preliminary Draft Final  | Want a port transportation system with expedited service routes to all major regional/national/international trade centers to be safe, hardened against disaster related service interruptions, predictable, reliable and convenient   |  | 25%    | 2       |
|                          |  | Average transit time to/from major trade centers per commodity class   |        |         |
|                          |  | Incidence of transit time delays per commodity class   |        |         |
|                          |  | Average local transit time to port per commodity class   |        |         |
|                          |  | Incidence of shipping accidents per ton  |        |         |
| Preliminary Draft Final  | Want a port transportation service system that is an integrated part of an efficient and comprehensive regional/international, multi-modal transportation and logistics system that promotes improved regional economic development and quality of life  |  | 20%    | 3       |
|                          |  | Index of Port transportation system inter-connectivity index   |        |         |
| Preliminary Draft Final  | Want a financially sustainable port system with efficient and competitive life cycle costs that maximizes external funding sources, has shipping and land lease fees that are competitive and equitable, and produces a suitable return on investment while distributing life cycle costs among public and private sectors in an equitable manner                  |  | 15%    | 4       |
|                          |  | Aggregate port systems' life cycle cost per ton  |        |         |
|                          |  | Average shipping user fees per ton by commodity class and for major transportation centers   |        |         |
|                          |  | Port's Standard and Poor's Financial rating (annual debt service coverage, accounts receivable to operating income, debt to plant ratio, short term debt/long term debt, etc). |        |         |
| Preliminary Draft Final  | Want a navigation district tax rate that is competitive, affordable and equitable  |  | 5%     | 5/6     |
|                          |  | Scored within Economic/Public Sector   |        |         |
|                          |  | Port tax rates per capita /average per capita income   |        |         |
| Preliminary Draft Final  | Want a port system that recovers and reuses natural resources and complies with environmental regulations in a sustainable manner  |  | 5%     | 5/6     |
|                          |  | Number of environmental violations per year  |        |         |

| DIMENSION GOAL:          | INFRASTRUCTURE - A community with quality delivery of infrastructure (utility, transportation, drainage, telecommunications) levels of service in a cost efficient, reliable, equitable, affordable and effective manner, that provide a foundation for the community's sustainable quality of life and economic development through the 10-year planning horizon. |  |        |         |
|--------------------------|--|--|--------|---------|
| SUB-DIMENSION OBJECTIVE: | Transportation: A community with quality delivery of multimodal transportation system levels of service in sufficient quantity to meet user demands  |  |        |         |
| SECTOR OBJECTIVE:        | Airport Transportation: A community with quality delivery of aviation transportation sector levels of service  |  |        |         |
| SOURCE                   | SUB OBJECTIVES   | OUTCOME INDICATORS   | Vote % | RANKING |
| Preliminary Draft Final  | Want sufficient and well maintained regional/international, passenger/cargo/general aviation air transportation and commercial leasing service systems capacity (e.g., protected airspace and approaches, parking, customs, baggage handling, runways, land, etc.) that meets community's current and future demands   |  | 30%    | 1       |
|                          |  | Airport transportation system service demand as a percentage of available capacity (min passenger, cargo, private aviation)  |        |         |
|                          |  | Years of available airport system capacity (Available excess capacity/capacity absorption rate)  |        |         |
|                          |  | Airport maintenance index  |        |         |
| Preliminary Draft Final  | Want a conveniently located airport that provides sufficient and redundant flights/carriers to all major regional/national/international destinations safely, hardened against disaster related service interruptions, reliably and conveniently with competitive, expedited and predictable travel times  |  | 25%    | 2       |
|                          |  | Average travel times to/from major Cities/Trade Centers  |        |         |
|                          |  | Average number of available flights per day to/from major Cities/Trade Centers   |        |         |
|                          |  | Average number of available seats per day to/from major Cities/Trade Centers   |        |         |
|                          |  | Incidence of service/delivery delays   |        |         |
|                          |  | Average local travel time to airport   |        |         |
|                          |  | Number of local airport accidents per year   |        |         |
|                          |  | Average number of Cargo (pounds) per day that can be shipped to/from major Cities/Trade Centers  |        |         |
|                          |  | Average number of Cargo Revenue per day that can be shipped to/from major Cities/Trade Centers   |        |         |
| Preliminary Draft Final  | Want an airport transportation service system that is an integrated part of an efficient regional/international, multi-modal transportation and logistics system that promotes improved economic development and quality of life   |  | 20%    | 3       |
|                          |  | Index of Airport system Inter-connectivity Index   |        |         |
| Preliminary Draft Final  | Want a financially sustainable airport system with efficient and competitive life cycle costs, with sufficient and reliable capital capacity that maximizes external funding sources, with growing passenger/cargo/general aviation revenues and rents that are competitive and equitable, and that produces a suitable return on investment                       |  | 15%    | 4       |
|                          |  | Scored within Economic/Public Sector/Private Sector  |        |         |
|                          |  | Life Cycle Costs per passenger; per cargo ton; and per private aviation flight - Scored within Economic/Public Sector/Private Sector   |        |         |
|                          |  | Index of Airport's Financial Condition (annual debt service coverage, accounts receivable to operating income, debt to plant ratio, short term debt/long term debt, annual city subsidy, etc) - Scored within Economic/Public Sector |        |         |
| Preliminary Draft Final  | Want high consumer satisfaction with overall level of airport transportation service   |  | 6%     | 5       |
|                          |  | Survey measure of consumer satisfaction  |        |         |
| Preliminary Draft Final  | Want an airport system that recovers and reuses natural resources and complies with environmental and other applicable (FAA) regulations in a sustainable manner   |  | 4%     | 6       |
|                          |  | Number of environmental violations per year  |        |         |

| DIMENSION GOAL:          | INFRASTRUCTURE - A community with quality delivery of infrastructure (utility, transportation, drainage, telecommunications) levels of service in a cost efficient, reliable, equitable, affordable and effective manner, that provide a foundation for the community's sustainable quality of life and economic development through the 10-year planning horizon. |  |        |         |
|--------------------------|--|--|--------|---------|
| SUB-DIMENSION OBJECTIVE: | Drainage: A community with proper design and quality delivery of drainage system levels of service in sufficient quantity to meet user demands   |  |        |         |
| SECTOR OBJECTIVE:        | N/A  |  |        |         |
| SOURCE                   | SUB OBJECTIVES   | OUTCOME INDICATORS   | Vote % | RANKING |
| Preliminary Draft Final  | Want a financially sustainable operation with efficient and competitive life cycle costs that maximizes external funding sources, has competitive, affordable user fees/tax rates dedicated to drainage, and distributes life cycle costs among private and public sectors in an equitable manner  |  | 35%    | 1       |
|                          | Equipment use per mile basis   | Index of system maintenance level  |        |         |
|                          |  | Distribution of index of system maintenance level throughout community   |        |         |
|                          |  | Indicators scored within economic/private sector workgroup:  |        |         |
|                          |  | Aggregate drainage systems' life cycle cost per capita   |        |         |
|                          |  | Drainage user fees per capita/average per capita income  |        |         |
|                          |  | Drainage tax rates per capita /average per capita income   |        |         |
|                          |  | Standard and Poor's Financial rating of drainage entity (annual debt service coverage, accounts receivable to operating income, debt to plant ratio, short term debt/long term debt, etc).                 |        |         |
|                          |  | % distribution of drainage life cycle costs between public sector and private sector   |        |         |
| Preliminary Draft Final  | Want a comprehensive drainage management system that encourages collaborative and consistent approaches among different service providers, and promotes and supports the community's overall quality of life and economic development  |  | 25%    | 2       |
|                          |  | Consistency in drainage policies among different providers   |        |         |
|                          |  | % capital improvements that involve multiple drainage entities   |        |         |
| Preliminary Draft Final  | Want drainage management approaches that incorporates structural and non-structural measures that produce multiple benefits (e.g. drainage, environmental, aesthetic and recreational)   |  | 20%    | 3       |
|                          |  | % total capital drainage investments that produce multiple benefits (e.g., water quality, recreational, aesthetic)   |        |         |
|                          |  | % of drainage improvements that incorporate both structural and nonstructural measures   |        |         |
|                          |  | % of ditches and/or resacas with trails  |        |         |
| Preliminary Draft Final  | Want a sufficient, reliable, and well-maintained drainage capacity that reduces the net present value of current and future flood risk/damages up to the extent that the net benefits are maximized  |  | 15%    | 4       |
|                          |  | Flood risk index: percentage of critical facilities and infrastructure (e.g., hospitals, utilities, airport, police etc) and percentage of residential/commercial areas that are located within floodplain |        |         |
| Preliminary Draft Final  | Want a drainage system that recovers and reuses natural resources and complies with environmental regulations in a sustainable manner  |  | 4%     | 5       |
|                          |  | Number of annual incidents of environmental non-compliance   |        |         |
| Preliminary Draft Final  | Want high consumer satisfaction with overall level of service  |  | 1%     | 6       |
|                          |  | Survey measure of consumer satisfaction  |        |         |

| DIMENSION GOAL:          | INFRASTRUCTURE - A community with quality delivery of infrastructure (utility, transportation, drainage, telecommunications) levels of service in a cost efficient, reliable, equitable, affordable and effective manner, that provide a foundation for the community's sustainable quality of life and economic development through the 10-year planning horizon. |   |        |         |
|--------------------------|--|---|--------|---------|
| SUB-DIMENSION OBJECTIVE: | N/A  |   |        |         |
| SECTOR OBJECTIVE:        | Water: A community with reliable delivery of water system levels of service in safe, clean, and sufficient quantities to meet user demands   |   |        |         |
| SOURCE                   | SUB OBJECTIVES   | OUTCOME INDICATORS  | Vote % | RANKING |
| Preliminary Draft Final  | Want a reliable water system, hardened against service interruptions due to natural and manmade disasters, that delivers environmentally safe water at sufficient pressures with acceptable sector characteristics uniformly throughout the community  |   | 27%    | 1       |
|                          |  | Number of annual incidents of noncompliance with regulatory drinking water standards  |        |         |
|                          |  | Number of annual incidents of inadequate pressure/users   |        |         |
|                          |  | Number of annual incidents of odor/taste/visual nuisance complaints/users   |        |         |
|                          |  | Distribution of annual incidents of noncompliance with regulatory drinking standards throughout community   |        |         |
|                          |  | Distribution of number of annual incidents of inadequate pressure/users throughout community  |        |         |
|                          |  | Distribution of number of annual incidents of odor/taste/visual nuisance complaints/users throughout community  |        |         |
|                          |  | Number of service interruptions per year  |        |         |
|                          |  | Distribution of number of service interruptions per year throughout community   |        |         |
| Preliminary Draft Final  | Want a financially sustainable operation with efficient and competitive life cycle costs that maximizes external funding sources, and with competitive, affordable user fees/tax rates that distribute life cycle costs among private and public sectors in an equitable manner  |   | 23%    | 2/3     |
|                          |  | Indicators scored within economic/private sector workgroup:   |        |         |
|                          |  | Aggregate water system life cycle cost per user (or per 1000 gallons produced)  |        |         |
|                          |  | Average annual residential user fee/average per capita income   |        |         |
|                          |  | Standard and Poor's Financial rating of water entity (annual debt service coverage, accounts receivable to operating income, debt to plant ratio, short term debt/long term debt, etc). |        |         |
|                          |  | % distribution of water utility life cycle costs between public sector and private sector   |        |         |
| Preliminary Draft Final  | Want a water system that encourages efficient consumer use, uses alternative sources of water, recovers and reuses natural resources and complies with environmental regulations in a sustainable manner   |   | 23%    | 2/3     |
|                          |  | Average monthly water consumption per user  |        |         |
|                          |  | Percent distribution among raw water sources (e.g., fresh surface, groundwater, recycled surface, etc)  |        |         |
|                          |  | Percent of water sludge that is recycled (applicable?)  |        |         |
| Preliminary Draft Final  | Want sufficient and well maintained water service system capacity that meets current and future consumer demands uniformly throughout the community  |   | 20%    | 4       |
|                          |  | Water system service demand as a percentage of available capacity per capita (minimum of storage, treatment, and distribution capacities)   |        |         |
|                          |  | Years of available water system capacity (minimum of storage, treatment and distribution capacities) (Available excess capacity/capacity absorption rate)                               |        |         |
|                          |  | Index of system maintenance level   |        |         |
|                          |  | Distribution of index of system maintenance level throughout community  |        |         |
| Preliminary Draft Final  | Want high consumer satisfaction with overall level of service  |   | 7%     | 5       |
|                          |  | Survey measure of consumer satisfaction   |        |         |
| Preliminary Draft Final  | Want a comprehensive water management system that encourages collaborative and consistent approaches among different service providers, and promotes and supports the community's overall quality of life and economic development   |   | 0%     | 6       |
|                          |  | % capital improvements that involve regional water facilities involving multiple utilities  |        |         |

|                                 |   |  |               |                |
|---------------------------------|---|--|---------------|----------------|
| <b>DIMENSION GOAL:</b>          | <b>INFRASTRUCTURE - A community with quality delivery of infrastructure (utility, transportation, drainage, telecommunications) levels of service in a cost efficient, reliable, equitable, affordable and effective manner, that provide a foundation for the community's sustainable quality of life and economic development through the 10-year planning horizon.</b> |  |               |                |
| <b>SUB-DIMENSION OBJECTIVE:</b> | N/A   |  |               |                |
| <b>SECTOR OBJECTIVE:</b>        | <b>Wastewater: A community with reliable delivery of wastewater system levels of service in sufficient capacity to meet user demands</b>  |  |               |                |
| <b>SOURCE</b>                   | <b>SUB OBJECTIVES</b>   | <b>OUTCOME INDICATORS</b>  | <b>Vote %</b> | <b>RANKING</b> |
| Preliminary Draft Final         | Want a reliable wastewater treatment system, hardened against service interruptions due to natural and manmade disasters, that discharges environmentally safe wastewater and sludge uniformly throughout the community   |  | 27%           | 1              |
|                                 |   | Number of annual incidents of odor/overflow nuisance complaints/users  |               |                |
|                                 |   | Distribution of annual incidents of noncompliance with environmental (water/sludge) discharge standards throughout community   |               |                |
|                                 |   | Number of service interruptions per year   |               |                |
|                                 |   | Distribution of number of service interruptions per year throughout community  |               |                |
| Preliminary Draft Final         | Want a financially sustainable operation with efficient and competitive life cycle costs that maximizes external funding sources, and with competitive, affordable user fees that distribute life cycle costs among private and public sectors in an equitable manner   |  | 23%           | 2/3            |
|                                 |   | Indicators scored within economic/private sector workgroup:  |               |                |
|                                 |   | Aggregate wastewater system life cycle cost per user (or per 1000 gallons produced)  |               |                |
|                                 |   | Average annual residential user fee/average per capita income  |               |                |
|                                 |   | Standard and Poor's Financial rating of wastewater entity (annual debt service coverage, accounts receivable to operating income, debt to plant ratio, short term debt/long term debt, etc). |               |                |
|                                 |   | % distribution of wastewater utility life cycle costs between public sector and private sector   |               |                |
| Preliminary Draft Final         | Want a wastewater system that recovers and reuses wastewater, residuals and natural resources, and complies with environmental regulations including the compliance of commercial and industrial user discharges in a sustainable manner  |  | 23%           | 2/3            |
|                                 |   | Average monthly wastewater discharge per user  |               |                |
|                                 |   | Average monthly inflow/infiltration rate per user  |               |                |
|                                 |   | Number of annual incidents of noncompliance with environmental (water/sludge) discharge standards  |               |                |
|                                 |   | Percent of wastewater that is recycled   |               |                |
|                                 |   | Percent of wastewater sludge that is recycled  |               |                |
| Preliminary Draft Final         | Want sufficient and well maintained wastewater service system capacity that meets current and future demands uniformly throughout the community   |  | 20%           | 4              |
|                                 |   | Wastewater system service demand as a percentage of available capacity per capita (minimum of collection, treatment and disposal capacities)   |               |                |
|                                 |   | Years of available wastewater system capacity (minimum of collection, treatment and disposal capacities) (Available excess capacity/capacity absorption rate)                                |               |                |
|                                 |   | Index of system maintenance level  |               |                |
|                                 |   | Distribution of index of system maintenance level throughout community   |               |                |
| Preliminary Draft Final         | Want high consumer satisfaction with overall level of service   |  | 7%            | 5              |
|                                 |   | Survey measure of consumer satisfaction  |               |                |
| Preliminary Draft Final         | Want a comprehensive wastewater management system that encourages collaborative and consistent approaches among different service providers, and promotes and supports the community's overall quality of life and economic development   |  | 0%            | 6              |
|                                 |   | % capital improvements that involve regional wastewater facilities involving multiple utilities  |               |                |
|                                 |   |  |               |                |

|                                 |   |   |               |                |
|---------------------------------|---|---|---------------|----------------|
| <b>DIMENSION GOAL:</b>          | <b>INFRASTRUCTURE - A community with quality delivery of infrastructure (utility, transportation, drainage, telecommunications) levels of service in a cost efficient, reliable, equitable, affordable and effective manner, that provide a foundation for the community's sustainable quality of life and economic development through the 10-year planning horizon.</b> |   |               |                |
| <b>SUB-DIMENSION OBJECTIVE:</b> | N/A   |   |               |                |
| <b>SECTOR OBJECTIVE:</b>        | <b>Electrical: A community with reliable delivery of electrical system levels of service in sufficient quantity to meet user demands</b>  |   |               |                |
| <b>SOURCE</b>                   | <b>SUB OBJECTIVES</b>   | <b>OUTCOME INDICATORS</b>   | <b>Vote %</b> | <b>RANKING</b> |
| Preliminary Draft Final         | Want a reliable electrical system, hardened against service interruptions due to natural and manmade disasters, that delivers environmentally safe electricity with acceptable sector characteristics (stable voltage and frequency) uniformly throughout the community   |   | 27%           | 1              |
|                                 |   | Number of service interruptions per year  |               |                |
|                                 |   | Distribution of number of service interruptions per year throughout community   |               |                |
| Preliminary Draft Final         | Want a financially sustainable operation with efficient and competitive life cycle costs and maximizes external funding sources, and with competitive, affordable user fees that distribute life cycle costs among private and public sectors in an equitable manner  |   | 23%           | 2/3            |
|                                 |   | Indicators scored within economic/private sector workgroup  |               |                |
|                                 |   | Aggregate electrical system life cycle cost per user  |               |                |
|                                 |   | Average annual residential user fee/average per capita income   |               |                |
|                                 |   | Standard and Poor's Financial rating of electrical entity (annual debt service coverage, accounts receivable to operating income, debt to plant ratio, short term debt/long term debt, etc) |               |                |
|                                 |   | % distribution of electrical utility life cycle costs between public sector and private sector  |               |                |
| Preliminary Draft Final         | Want an electrical system that encourages efficient consumer use, uses alternative sources of energy, recovers and reuses natural resources and complies with environmental regulations in a sustainable manner   |   | 23%           | 2/3            |
|                                 |   | Average monthly electrical consumption per user   |               |                |
|                                 |   | Number of annual incidents of noncompliance with environmental standards  |               |                |
|                                 |   | Percent of electrical power generated by renewable/alternative sources  |               |                |
| Preliminary Draft Final         | Want sufficient and well maintained electrical capacity that meets current and future demand uniformly throughout the community   |   | 20%           | 4              |
|                                 |   | Electrical system service demand as a percentage of available capacity per capita (minimum of collection, treatment and disposal capacities)  |               |                |
|                                 |   | Years of available electrical system capacity (minimum of collection, treatment and disposal capacities) (Available excess capacity/capacity absorption rate)                               |               |                |
|                                 |   | Index of system maintenance level   |               |                |
|                                 |   | Distribution of index of system maintenance throughout community  |               |                |
| Preliminary Draft Final         | Want high consumer satisfaction with overall level of service   |   | 7%            | 5              |
|                                 |   | Survey measure of consumer satisfaction   |               |                |
| Preliminary Draft Final         | Want a comprehensive electrical management system that encourages collaborative and consistent approaches among different service providers, and promotes and supports the community's overall quality of life and economic development   |   | 0%            | 6              |
|                                 |   | % capital improvements that involve regional electrical facilities involving multiple utilities   |               |                |
|                                 |   |   |               |                |

|                                 |   |  |               |                |
|---------------------------------|---|--|---------------|----------------|
| <b>DIMENSION GOAL:</b>          | <b>INFRASTRUCTURE - A community with quality delivery of infrastructure (utility, transportation, drainage, telecommunications) levels of service in a cost efficient, reliable, equitable, affordable and effective manner, that provide a foundation for the community's sustainable quality of life and economic development through the 10-year planning horizon.</b> |  |               |                |
| <b>SUB-DIMENSION OBJECTIVE:</b> | <b>Telecommunications: A community with quality delivery of telecommunication system levels of cost efficient and affordable service in sufficient quantity to meet user demands.</b>   |  |               |                |
| <b>SECTOR OBJECTIVE:</b>        | <b>N/A</b>  |  |               |                |
| <b>SOURCE</b>                   | <b>SUB OBJECTIVES</b>   | <b>OUTCOME INDICATORS</b>  | <b>Vote %</b> | <b>RANKING</b> |
| Draft Final                     | Want diverse providers which provide sufficient and well-maintained telecommunication services capable of meeting current and future consumer demands throughout the community  |  | 33%           | 1              |
|                                 |   | Number of different telecommunication providers per 1000 population                                |               |                |
|                                 |   | Percent of city and ETJ that has telecommunication services available                              |               |                |
| Draft Final                     | Want a reliable telecommunications system, hardened against service interruptions due to natural and manmade disasters, that has acceptable sector characteristics (sufficient bandwidth, clarity, minimal dropped signals, etc.) distributed throughout the community  |  | 30%           | 2              |
|                                 |   | Telecommunication system service demand as a percentage of available capacity (bandwidth, clarity) |               |                |
|                                 |   | Years of available telecommunication system capacity (excess capacity/capacity absorption rate)    |               |                |
|                                 |   | System reliability Index - percent system downtime   |               |                |
| Draft Final                     | Want a comprehensive telecommunication management entity that encourages collaborative and consistent approaches among different service providers, and promotes and supports the community's overall quality of life and economic development.   |  | 17%           | 3              |
|                                 |   | % of project capital improvements involving more than one provider                                 |               |                |
|                                 |   | Number of public and private entities involved   |               |                |
| Draft Final                     | Want financially sustainable public and private sector providers with efficient and competitive life cycle costs, which maximize external funding sources and distribute life cycle costs equitably among public and private sectors  |  | 11%           | 4              |
|                                 |   | Scored within Economic/PrivateSector/Public Sector   |               |                |
|                                 |   | Life cycle costs/unit service  |               |                |
|                                 |   | Percentage distribution of life cycle costs between private and public sectors                     |               |                |
| Draft Final                     | Want high consumer satisfaction with overall levels of service and have user fees/tax rates competitive and affordable  |  | 5%            | 5              |
|                                 |   | Survey measure of consumer satisfaction  |               |                |
| Draft Final                     | Want public and regulated telecom providers to comply with environmental and other applicable regulations in a sustainable manner (e.g. enforcement)  |  | 4%            | 6              |
|                                 |   | Number of annual incidents of environmental and infrastructure noncompliance                       |               |                |
|                                 |   |  |               |                |





## *City of Brownsville Comprehensive Plan*

# ***SOCIAL DIMENSION***

## **Sub-Objectives and Indicators**

**Equity, Public Safety, Healthcare, Education, Land Use and Downtown**

| DIMENSION GOAL:          | SOCIAL - A healthy, educated, safe and well planned community whose residents enjoy a quality delivery of social (public health, education, public safety, parks/open space, housing, arts and entertainment) quality of life elements in a cost efficient, reliable, equitable, affordable, effective and sustainable manner through the 10-year planning horizon. |  |        |         |
|--------------------------|---|--|--------|---------|
| SUB-DIMENSION OBJECTIVE: | Equity- A community whose residents enjoy equitable and non-discriminatory access to quality of life and economic development benefits uniformly throughout the City.   |  |        |         |
| SECTOR OBJECTIVE:        | N/A   |  |        |         |
| SOURCE                   | SUB OBJECTIVES  | OUTCOME INDICATORS   | Vote % | RANKING |
| Draft Final              | Want sustainable increases in the number of individuals and families earning a living wage.   |  | 40%    | 1       |
|                          |   | % of households with equivalent annual income above the living wage.   |        |         |
|                          |   | A more easily interpreted version of Ginni Index   |        |         |
| Draft Final              | Want equal access to affordable housing   |  | 22%    | 2       |
|                          |   | % of households whose housing costs are greater than 30% of their income   |        |         |
|                          |   | Ratio of median family income to family income required to qualify for the median priced single family home                          |        |         |
|                          |   | Ratio of median family housing costs to median household income  |        |         |
|                          |   | % of renters whose rental costs are greater than 35% of their income   |        |         |
|                          |   | Ratio of median family rental costs to median household income   |        |         |
|                          |   | Variance in crowding index among city districts  |        |         |
| Draft Final              | Want equal access to low cost banking/financial services  |  | 18%    | 3       |
|                          |   | Percent of households with bank (checking and/or savings) accounts   |        |         |
|                          |   | Ratio of alternative financing options (pawn shops, finance companies) per 1000 residents  |        |         |
| Draft Final              | Want sustainable reduction in the number of individuals and families below the poverty line   | Eliminated this objective and combined %vote with the top objective  | 15%    | 4       |
|                          |   | % of households with incomes below the poverty line. - deleted   |        |         |
| Draft Final              | Want sustainable increases in household net worth (e.g. reduce debt and increase savings)   |  | 10%    | 5       |
|                          |   | % of households with net worth greater than 50% of the median income.  |        |         |
|                          |   | % of households with debt to Income ratios less than 1   |        |         |
|                          |   | % of households with savings to Income ratios greater than 1   |        |         |
| Draft Final              | Want equal access to quality health care services, public sector services and infrastructure, (private and public) education.   |  | 5%     | 6/7     |
|                          |   | Variance in no. of primary care physicians per 1000 residents among city districts   |        |         |
|                          |   | Variance in % of households without water/sewer connections among city districts   |        |         |
|                          |   | Variance in % of households without paved streets among city districts   |        |         |
|                          |   | Variance in % of households without access to public transportation (nearest bus stop is greater than 1/4 mile) among city districts |        |         |
|                          |   | Variance in % of students attending schools with student to teacher ratios greater than the standard among city districts            |        |         |
|                          |   | Variance in % of households with Fire/EMS response times greater than standard response time (10 minutes) among city districts       |        |         |
|                          |   | Variance in % of households with police per capita ratios lower than the standard among city districts                               |        |         |
|                          |   | Variance in the response time to utility/street repair service interruptions among city districts                                    |        |         |
| Draft Final              | Want equal access to political process and legal assistance, including immigration issues   |  | 5%     | 6/7     |
|                          |   | Number of free or subsidized legal resources (paralegals and attorneys) available per 1000 population.                               |        |         |
|                          |   | Ratio of % registered voters with incomes below the poverty line to the total % of registered voters.                                |        |         |
|                          |   | Ratio of % voters with incomes below the poverty line to the total % of voters.  |        |         |
|                          |   |  |        |         |

|                                 |  |  |               |                |
|---------------------------------|--|--|---------------|----------------|
| <b>DIMENSION GOAL:</b>          | <b>SOCIAL - A healthy, educated, safe and well planned community whose residents enjoy a quality delivery of social (public health, education, public safety, parks/open space, housing, arts and entertainment) quality of life elements in a cost efficient, reliable, equitable, affordable, effective and sustainable manner through the 10-year planning horizon.</b> |  |               |                |
| <b>SUB-DIMENSION OBJECTIVE:</b> | <b>Public Safety - A safe community whose residents enjoy a quality delivery of public safety levels of service</b>  |  |               |                |
| <b>SECTOR OBJECTIVE:</b>        | <b>Fire / EMS- Want to prevent fire/EMS related loss of life and property damage by increasing public's awareness of safety and building codes, and by conducting fire inspections, fire investigations and enforcing fire codes.</b>  |  |               |                |
| <b>SOURCE</b>                   | <b>SUB OBJECTIVES</b>  | <b>OUTCOME INDICATORS</b>  | <b>Vote %</b> | <b>RANKING</b> |
| <b>Draft Final</b>              | <b>Want sufficient, reliable, rapid-response Fire/EMS resource capacity (e.g., ambulances, fire trucks, dual facilities, etc.) to reduce related loss of life and property damage uniformly throughout the City</b>  |  | <b>40%</b>    | <b>1/2</b>     |
|                                 | (currently ~ 7 min - ideal is 3-5)   | Average EMS response time per district   |               |                |
|                                 | (currently ~ 5 min - ideal is 3-5)   | Average Fire response time per district  |               |                |
|                                 | dept. has data   | % of cardiac patients delivered to a hospital with a pulse   |               |                |
|                                 | dept. has data   | % all structure fires confined to room of origin.  |               |                |
| <b>Draft Final</b>              | <b>Want a safe, stable (minimal employee turnover), qualified (trained and certified), sufficient workforce to provide adequate response times throughout all areas of the City, to match facility requirements and to provide high consumer satisfaction with overall level of Fire/EMS department services uniformly throughout the City</b>                             |  | <b>40%</b>    | <b>1/2</b>     |
|                                 |  | Consumer Survey level of satisfaction  |               |                |
|                                 |  | Ratio % employee turnover in Fire/EMS department to overall employee turnover rate                                       |               |                |
|                                 |  | Ratio of existing Fire/EMS employees that are certified to the number required to meet response requirements by district |               |                |
|                                 |  | Ratio of existing Fire/EMS facilities to the number required to meet response requirements by district                   |               |                |
|                                 |  | Ratio of % Fire/EMS annual work related accidents to overall work related accidents/deaths                               |               |                |
|                                 |  | Measure of burnout/stress per employee - need to get wording from David Hinojosa   |               |                |
| <b>Draft Final</b>              | <b>Want to prevent fire/EMS related loss of life and property damage by increasing public's awareness of safety and building codes, and by conducting fire inspections, fire investigations and enforcing fire codes.</b>  |  | <b>16%</b>    | <b>3</b>       |
|                                 |  | Annual number of unnecessary/non-emergency calls   |               |                |
|                                 |  | Annual number of fire incidents per number of buildings  |               |                |
|                                 |  | % of annual department budget dedicated to public awareness programs   |               |                |
| <b>Draft Final</b>              | <b>Want a Fire/EMS department that uses, reuses and recycles natural resources in a sustainable way and complies with applicable environmental regulations</b>   |  | <b>2%</b>     | <b>4/5</b>     |
|                                 |  | Average fleet fuel efficiency  |               |                |
|                                 |  | Number of environmental violations for the Fire/EMS department   |               |                |
| <b>Draft Final</b>              | <b>Want Fire/EMS services to be cost-efficient and with user fees/tax rates that are affordable and equitable</b>  |  | <b>2%</b>     | <b>4/5</b>     |
|                                 |  | Fire/EMS budget as % of total budget   |               |                |
|                                 |  | Fire/EMS budget per capita   |               |                |

|                                 |   |  |               |                |
|---------------------------------|---|--|---------------|----------------|
| <b>DIMENSION GOAL:</b>          | <b>SOCIAL - A healthy, educated, safe and well planned community whose residents enjoy a quality delivery of social (public health, education, public safety, parks/open space, housing, arts and entertainment) quality of life elements in a cost efficient, reliable, equitable, affordable, effective and sustainable manner through the 10-year planning horizon.</b>  |  |               |                |
| <b>SUB-DIMENSION OBJECTIVE:</b> | <b>Public Safety - A safe community whose residents enjoy a quality delivery of public safety levels of service</b>   |  |               |                |
| <b>SECTOR OBJECTIVE:</b>        | <b>Police Protection - A community with low preventable property crime and traffic accident rates and that operates a police department that delivers quality levels of service uniformly throughout the City.</b>  |  |               |                |
| <b>SOURCE</b>                   | <b>SUB OBJECTIVES</b>   | <b>OUTCOME INDICATORS</b>  | <b>Vote %</b> | <b>RANKING</b> |
| Draft Final                     | Want sufficient police per capita and a safe, stable (minimal employee turnover), qualified (trained and certified), sufficient workforce per capita to match facility requirements.  |  | 54%           | 1              |
|                                 |   | Consumer Survey level of satisfaction  |               |                |
|                                 |   | Ratio % employee turnover in Police department to overall employee turnover rate   |               |                |
|                                 |   | Ratio of existing Police employees that are certified to the number required to meet per capita requirements by zone   |               |                |
|                                 |   | Ratio of existing Police facilities to the number required to meet facility requirements per capita by zone  |               |                |
|                                 |   | Ratio of % Police annual work related accidents to overall work related accidents/deaths   |               |                |
| Draft Final                     | Want sufficient, reliable, rapid-response Police department resource capacity (e.g., central facilities, community network centers, equipment, etc.) to reduce violent and property crime rates (e.g., car thefts, sexual assault, crimes against children, family violence assaults, juvenile delinquency, robberies) uniformly throughout the City, but especially in high priority areas (e.g., schools, large commercial centers) to meet current and future demand |  | 33%           | 2              |
|                                 |   | Average Police response time per zone  |               |                |
|                                 |   | Annual rate of crime incidents overall, by zone and in high priority areas (e.g. car thefts, sexual assault, crimes against children, family violence assaults, juvenile delinquency, robberies, etc.) |               |                |
|                                 |   | Traffic fatalities per 1,000 per zone  |               |                |
| Draft Final                     | Want to prevent crimes by increasing public's awareness of police department resources and capabilities and prevention techniques.  |  | 6%            | 3              |
|                                 |   | Reduction in the number of unnecessary/non-emergency calls   |               |                |
|                                 |   | % of annual department budget dedicated to public awareness programs   |               |                |
| Draft Final                     | Want high consumer satisfaction with overall level of police department services uniformly throughout the City  |  | 4%            | 4              |
|                                 |   | Consumer Survey level of satisfaction  |               |                |
| Draft Final                     | Want Police department services to be cost-efficient and with user fees/tax rates that are affordable and equitable   |  | 3%            | 5              |
|                                 |   | Police budget as % of total budget   |               |                |
|                                 |   | Police budget per capita   |               |                |
| Draft Final                     | Want a Police department that uses, reuses and recycles natural resources in a sustainable way and complies with applicable environmental regulations   |  | 0%            | 6              |
|                                 |   | Average fleet fuel efficiency  |               |                |
|                                 |   | Number of environmental violations for the Police department   |               |                |
|                                 |   |  |               |                |

|                                 |  |  |               |                |
|---------------------------------|--|--|---------------|----------------|
| <b>DIMENSION GOAL:</b>          | <b>SOCIAL - A healthy, educated, safe and well planned community whose residents enjoy a quality delivery of social (public health, education, public safety, parks/open space, housing, arts and entertainment) quality of life elements in a cost efficient, reliable, equitable, affordable, effective and sustainable manner through the 10-year planning horizon.</b> |  |               |                |
| <b>SUB-DIMENSION OBJECTIVE:</b> | <b>Healthcare - A healthy community whose residents have accessible, quality, comprehensive, affordable, cost effective healthcare and support services that are integrated, convenient, and culturally sensitive.</b>   |  |               |                |
| <b>SECTOR OBJECTIVE:</b>        | <b>N/A</b>   |  |               |                |
| <b>SOURCE</b>                   | <b>SUB OBJECTIVES</b>  | <b>OUTCOME INDICATORS</b>  | <b>Vote %</b> | <b>RANKING</b> |
| <b>Draft Final</b>              | <b>Want sustainable improvements in preventable health conditions (i.e., mental health, substance abuse and addiction, diabetes, obesity, high risk O.B. care, cancer (i.e., breast, liver, cervical, colon and prostate)) to be distributed uniformly and equitably to all residents.</b>   |  | <b>31%</b>    | <b>1</b>       |
|                                 |  | Prevalence of obesity per 1000 residents, by district  |               |                |
|                                 |  | Prevalence of substance abuse/addiction per 1000 residents, by district  |               |                |
|                                 |  | Prevalence of diabetes per 1000 residents, by district   |               |                |
|                                 |  | Incidence of infant morbidity and mortality per 1000 residents, by district  |               |                |
|                                 |  | Incidence and prevalence of cancer per 1000 residents, by district   |               |                |
|                                 |  | Prevalence of mental health conditions (depression, anxiety and cognitive impairment) per 1000 residents   |               |                |
| <b>Draft Final</b>              | <b>Want to increase access to health services for all by increasing the insured population and increasing access to health services of the uninsured.</b>  |  | <b>36%</b>    | <b>2</b>       |
|                                 |  | % of households with medical insurance   |               |                |
|                                 |  | % of uninsured residents with access to subsidized primary care services   |               |                |
|                                 |  | % of households without a medical home   |               |                |
|                                 |  | % of household income spend on health services   |               |                |
| <b>Draft Final</b>              | <b>Want sufficient primary and preventative, secondary and tertiary health personnel and support services to meet current and future demand in an appropriate, convenient and reasonable setting.</b>  |  | <b>33%</b>    | <b>3</b>       |
|                                 |  | Number of primary care providers per 1000 residents  |               |                |
|                                 |  | Number allied health professionals (i.e., nurses, physical therapists, pharmacists, psychologists, radiology technicians etc) per 1000 residents |               |                |
|                                 |  | Number secondary care providers (i.e., subspecialty (psychiatric, orthopedics, neurologists, cardiologists etc) providers per 1000 residents     |               |                |
|                                 |  | Number of hospital beds per 1000 residents   |               |                |
|                                 |  | Number of Level I (II, III and IV) trauma centers per 1000 residents   |               |                |
|                                 |  | % inappropriate emergency room utilization   |               |                |
|                                 |  | % of urgent care providers per 1000 residents  |               |                |
|                                 | Contacts for information: Susan P. Fisher-Hoch, MD - susan.p.fisher-hoch@uth.tmc.edu 882-5187, Joseph B. McCormick, MD -joseph.b.mccormick@uth.tmc.edu 882-5165  | % of City Budget allocated to Health services  |               |                |

|                                 |  |   |               |                |
|---------------------------------|--|---|---------------|----------------|
| <b>DIMENSION GOAL:</b>          | <b>SOCIAL - A healthy, educated, safe and well planned community whose residents enjoy a quality delivery of social (public health, education, public safety, parks/open space, housing, arts and entertainment) quality of life elements in a cost efficient, reliable, equitable, affordable, effective and sustainable manner through the 10-year planning horizon.</b>   |   |               |                |
| <b>SUB-DIMENSION OBJECTIVE:</b> | <b>Education - Want an outcome based and accountable local educational system that is ranked among the best in the country, and is committed to providing its residents with quality delivery of education services from pre-K through post-graduate levels as well as vocational training, throughout the community, and provides them with the knowledge, skills, competencies and attitudes to become civic, cultured, productive and engaged members of the community.</b> |   |               |                |
| <b>SECTOR OBJECTIVE:</b>        | <b>N/A</b>   |   |               |                |
| <b>SOURCE</b>                   | <b>SUB OBJECTIVES</b>  | <b>OUTCOME INDICATORS</b>   | <b>Vote %</b> | <b>RANKING</b> |
| Draft Final                     | Want every high school student to graduate.  | % High School graduation rates<br>% High School dropout rates   | 15%           | 1              |
| Draft Final                     | Want every high school student who graduates to have the necessary skills and attributes to begin a career or to pursue post secondary education.  | % of local HS graduates who do not attend college but are employed.<br>% of HS graduates who graduate from college within six years of graduation<br>% of HS graduates who graduate from technical institutions/2-yr colleges within 3 years of graduation<br>% of high school graduates who attend college<br>% of local high school graduates required to take remedial courses in the first year of college<br>% of local high school students who pass standardized educational and/or workforce skills benchmark tests   | 12%           | 2              |
| Draft Final                     | Want every high school graduate to be bilingual, biliterate, civically engaged and an employable life-long learner.  | % of local HS graduates who are bilingual and biliterate<br>% of registered voters between the ages of 18 and 21 - Scored in the Civic Engagement Sub-Committee<br>Employable covered in objective 2.   | 19%           | 3              |
| Draft Final                     | Want sustainable increases in the percentage of our Brownsville residents to enter college and graduate.   | Covered in Objective 2.   | 15%           | 4              |
| Draft Final                     | Want every elementary / middle school student academically prepared for high school.   | % students complete elementary school who do not complete middle school on time<br>% students complete middle school who do not graduate from high school on time<br>% of middle school students who pass grade level standardized educational tests  | 12%           | 5              |
| Draft Final                     | Want a local educational system that is committed to achieving the best educational and workforce skill levels anywhere in collaboration with the private and public sectors of our community.   | Rank of local high schools relative to national standards<br>% of middle school students passing at the level of national standards<br>% of high school students passing at the level of national standards<br>% of graduating high school students who attend "top tier" universities<br>% of high school graduates who do not attend college and pass workforce skills national standards<br>Level of participation by the private sector in the development and implementation of education goals (5 point qualitative scale developed by survey)<br>Level of participation by the private sector in the development and implementation of workforce skill goals (5 point qualitative scale developed by survey) | 9%            | 6              |
| Draft Final                     | Want all families actively participating and have their participation welcomed through the secondary level of our education system.  | Average parent participation rate in scheduled events<br>Number of parent participation opportunities scheduled per year by school district<br>Number of parents on approved volunteer list   | 7%            | 7              |

| SOURCE      | SUB OBJECTIVES  | OUTCOME INDICATORS   | Vote % | RANKING |
|-------------|---|--|--------|---------|
| Draft Final | Want quality schools that are safe, well-maintained and orderly with professional, trained and certified teachers utilizing the latest technologies to meet current and future educational demands. |  | 7%     | 8       |
|             |   | Number of certified teachers per 1000 students                             |        |         |
|             |   | Number of teachers with advanced degrees per 1000 students                 |        |         |
|             |   | Incidence of criminal or disruptive behavior in schools per 1000 students  |        |         |
|             |   | School maintenance index (5 point qualitative survey)                      |        |         |
|             |   | Consumer survey level of satisfaction                                      |        |         |
|             |   | Number of updated working computers with internet access per 1000 students |        |         |
| Draft Final | Want cost efficient and affordable delivery of quality local pre K-12 and post secondary education (as compared to peer groups).  |  | 4%     | 9       |
|             |   | Education System taxes per capita  |        |         |
|             |   | Total life cycle system costs per High School graduate                     |        |         |
|             |   | Total life cycle system costs per student                                  |        |         |
|             |   | Direct (educational) costs per student                                     |        |         |
|             |   | Administrative costs per student   |        |         |
|             |   | Facility life cycle costs per student                                      |        |         |
|             |   | # of taxpayers with or without children in public schools                  |        |         |
|             |   | # of families with children in private schools                             |        |         |

|                                 |  |  |               |                |
|---------------------------------|--|--|---------------|----------------|
| <b>DIMENSION GOAL:</b>          | <b>SOCIAL - A healthy, educated, safe and well planned community whose residents enjoy a quality delivery of social (public health, education, public safety, parks/open space, housing, arts and entertainment) quality of life elements in a cost efficient, reliable, equitable, affordable, effective and sustainable manner through the 10-year planning horizon.</b> |  |               |                |
| <b>SUB-DIMENSION OBJECTIVE:</b> | <b>Land Use - A well planned community with livable neighborhoods; with an ample, equitable and affordable housing supply with connected compatible land uses that provide a foundation for sustainable quality of life and economic development.</b>  |  |               |                |
| <b>SECTOR OBJECTIVE:</b>        | <b>Neighborhoods - A community with available livable neighborhoods consisting of a balanced mix of uses, accessible via pedestrian friendly and livable streets and boulevards, connected with other compatible land uses, with preserved, linked open/green spaces that provide multiple recreational, environmental and drainage benefits.</b>                          |  |               |                |
| <b>SOURCE</b>                   | <b>SUB OBJECTIVES</b>  | <b>OUTCOME INDICATORS</b>  | <b>Vote %</b> | <b>RANKING</b> |
| Draft Final                     | Want to increase the supply of livable, master planned, neighborhoods uniformly throughout the City that have a balanced mix of compatible land uses connected within accessible (i.e., walking or biking) distances by clean, safe, pedestrian-friendly streets and boulevards.   |  | 29%           | 1              |
|                                 |  | Ratio of total master planned (mixed use) residential land use acres to total residential land use by district             |               |                |
|                                 |  | Average travel distance to assigned schools by district  |               |                |
|                                 |  | Ratio of pedestrian-friendly streets to total streets  |               |                |
|                                 |  | Incidence of pedestrian-vehicle accidents by district  |               |                |
|                                 |  | Frequency of street sweeping by district   |               |                |
|                                 |  | % instead of #? Same as indicator 3  |               |                |
|                                 |  | # of neighborhood streets with sidewalks   |               |                |
|                                 |  | Bike Trail metric (consider proper location)   |               |                |
|                                 |  | # of speed bumps per linear distance of neighborhood roads   |               |                |
|                                 |  | Proximity of pedestrian-centric, neighborhood-serving retail (w/in 0.25 miles)   |               |                |
| Draft Final                     | Want to preserve and protect the character of existing neighborhoods by having well maintained public infrastructure and enforcing planning and zoning regulations as well as city ordinances.   |  | 28%           | 2              |
|                                 |  | Scored under Housing subcommittee  |               |                |
| Draft Final                     | Want to preserve and protect existing green spaces and waterways especially resacas  |  | 15%           | 3              |
|                                 |  | Scored under Environmental subcommittee  |               |                |
| Draft Final                     | Want sufficient and linked parks/trails/open space to meet community demand  |  | 14%           | 4              |
|                                 |  | Number of acres of parks/open spaces/trails per 1000 residents   |               |                |
|                                 |  | Connectivity Index of parks/open spaces/trails.  |               |                |
| Draft Final                     | Want a parks department that is cost efficient, maintains its natural and man-made infrastructure, and provides a high level of consumer satisfaction with affordable and equitable fees.  |  | 7%            | 5              |
|                                 |  | Life cycle costs per acre of managed park space - Scored under Economic/public sector                                      |               |                |
|                                 |  | Survey satisfaction measure  |               |                |
|                                 |  | Fee per visit  |               |                |
|                                 |  | Survey based maintenance indicator   |               |                |
|                                 |  | Maintenance budget per acre of managed park space  |               |                |
| Draft Final                     | Want to manage residential growth so that the life cycle costs of public infrastructure, are cost efficient, equitably distributed within the community, and do not penalize or favor either existing neighborhoods, new in-fill development or new outside development unfairly.  |  | 4%            | 6              |
|                                 |  | Life cycle cost of infrastructure are scored in the Infrastructure subcommittee  |               |                |
|                                 |  | Proportion of life cycle costs of new infrastructure assigned to new developments/users versus existing developments/users |               |                |
|                                 |  | Cluster index (utility small lots to improve efficiency?)  |               |                |
| Draft Final                     | Want property tax revenues to be sufficient to cover the cost of providing (non-user fee based) city services and maintaining public and internal (non-user fee based) infrastructure improvements.  |  | 3%            | 7              |
|                                 |  | % of city service costs provided to residential landuses that are covered by property taxes                                |               |                |



|                                 |  |  |               |                |
|---------------------------------|--|--|---------------|----------------|
| <b>DIMENSION GOAL:</b>          | <b>SOCIAL - A healthy, educated, safe and well planned community whose residents enjoy a quality delivery of social (public health, education, public safety, parks/open space, housing, arts and entertainment) quality of life elements in a cost efficient, reliable, equitable, affordable, effective and sustainable manner through the 10-year planning horizon.</b> |  |               |                |
| <b>SUB-DIMENSION OBJECTIVE:</b> | <b>Land Use - A well planned community with livable neighborhoods; with an ample, equitable and affordable housing supply with connected compatible land uses that provide a foundation for sustainable quality of life and economic development.</b>  |  |               |                |
| <b>SECTOR OBJECTIVE:</b>        | <b>Commercial/Industrial - A community with available commercial and industrial land use areas sufficient to support the production/sale of goods and services and the community's economic development in a manner compatible with other land uses.</b>   |  |               |                |
| <b>SOURCE</b>                   | <b>SUB OBJECTIVES</b>  | <b>OUTCOME INDICATORS</b>  | <b>Vote %</b> | <b>RANKING</b> |
| <b>Draft Final</b>              | <b>Want industrial uses that are clustered with other compatible land uses and integrated with supporting utility and transportation infrastructure, and that do not negatively affect incompatible land uses.</b>   |  | <b>50%</b>    | <b>1</b>       |
|                                 |  | Ratio of Acres of master planned clustered industrial uses to total industrial use acres   |               |                |
|                                 |  | "Shovel Ready" sites scored under Economic/Private Sector Subcommittee   |               |                |
|                                 |  | % total residential/commercial land use acres within total industrial buffer zone acres  |               |                |
| <b>Draft Final</b>              | <b>Want sufficient commercial/industrial zoned land with well maintained infrastructure to meet current and future demand as specified in a land use plan that is consistent with and implemented in coordination with City's economic and infrastructure development strategies.</b>  |  | <b>33%</b>    | <b>2</b>       |
|                                 |  | Years of available master planned industrial land use area capacity (Excess industrial (shovel ready) land use area divided by industrial land use absorption rate). |               |                |
| <b>Draft Final</b>              | <b>Want property tax revenues to be sufficient to cover the cost of providing (non-user fee based) city services and maintaining public and internal (non-user fee based) infrastructure improvements.</b>   |  | <b>17%</b>    | <b>3</b>       |
|                                 |  | % of city service costs provided to industrial landuses that are covered by property taxes   |               |                |
|                                 |  |  |               |                |
|                                 |  |  |               |                |

|                                 |  |  |               |                |
|---------------------------------|--|--|---------------|----------------|
| <b>DIMENSION GOAL:</b>          | <b>SOCIAL - A healthy, educated, safe and well planned community whose residents enjoy a quality delivery of social (public health, education, public safety, parks/open space, housing, arts and entertainment) quality of life elements in a cost efficient, reliable, equitable, affordable, effective and sustainable manner through the 10-year planning horizon.</b> |  |               |                |
| <b>SUB-DIMENSION OBJECTIVE:</b> | <b>Land Use - A well planned community with livable neighborhoods; with an ample, equitable and affordable housing supply with connected compatible land uses that provide a foundation for sustainable quality of life and economic development.</b>  |  |               |                |
| <b>SECTOR OBJECTIVE:</b>        | <b>Housing - A community with an ample, adequate and affordable supply of quality rental and non-rental housing.</b>   |  |               |                |
| <b>SOURCE</b>                   | <b>SUB OBJECTIVES</b>  | <b>OUTCOME INDICATORS</b>  | <b>Vote %</b> | <b>RANKING</b> |
| <b>Draft Final</b>              | <b>Want to preserve and protect the character of existing neighborhoods by increasing well-maintained owner occupied housing uniformly throughout City, but especially downtown</b>  |  | <b>38%</b>    | <b>1</b>       |
|                                 |  | % owner occupied housing within residential neighborhoods by district and downtown                       |               |                |
|                                 |  | Number of code enforcement violations within residential neighborhoods per year by district and downtown |               |                |
|                                 |  | Number of unoccupied houses within residential neighborhoods by district and downtown.                   |               |                |
| <b>Draft Final</b>              | <b>Want housing to meet at least minimal standards, including applicable city codes, and minimal lot and livable space requirements uniformly throughout the City</b>  |  | <b>37%</b>    | <b>2</b>       |
|                                 |  | % of housing that is "crowded" (Defn: More than 2 people per bedroom) by district.                       |               |                |
|                                 |  | % of single family housing in lots smaller than 5000 square feet by district                             |               |                |
|                                 |  | Number of condemned houses within residential neighborhoods by district.                                 |               |                |
|                                 |  | Setback Metric ( ____ of lot development to reduce visual clutter and ____)                              |               |                |
| <b>Draft Final</b>              | <b>Want sufficient and dependable supply of housing units to meet community's demand throughout the City's residential zones</b>   |  | <b>13%</b>    | <b>3</b>       |
|                                 |  | Years of available housing capacity (Housing inventory divided by housing absorption rate).              |               |                |
| <b>Draft Final</b>              | <b>Want government sponsored housing organizations to be operated in a cost efficient manner with proper oversight and accountability and with housing distributed throughout the city in an equitable manner</b>  |  | <b>12%</b>    | <b>4</b>       |
|                                 |  | Total operating costs per square foot of housing produced by district.                                   |               |                |
|                                 |  | Compliance with applicable federal/state housing program regulations                                     |               |                |
|                                 |  |  |               |                |

|                                 |  |  |               |                |
|---------------------------------|--|--|---------------|----------------|
| <b>DIMENSION GOAL:</b>          | <b>SOCIAL - A healthy, educated, safe and well planned community whose residents enjoy a quality delivery of social (public health, education, public safety, parks/open space, housing, arts and entertainment) quality of life elements in a cost efficient, reliable, equitable, affordable, effective and sustainable manner through the 10-year planning horizon.</b> |  |               |                |
| <b>SUB-DIMENSION OBJECTIVE:</b> | <b>Downtown - A community that capitalizes on its unique heritage and cultural resources to generate a thriving creative economy that enhances the quality of life of its residents and attracts visitors year round.</b>  |  |               |                |
| <b>SECTOR OBJECTIVE:</b>        | <b>N/A</b>   |  |               |                |
| <b>SOURCE</b>                   | <b>SUB OBJECTIVES</b>  | <b>OUTCOME INDICATORS</b>  | <b>Vote %</b> | <b>RANKING</b> |
| <b>Draft Final</b>              | <b>(Downtown revitalization) Want a revitalized downtown consisting of an economically thriving and creative cultural district recognized as an international attraction and the preeminent historic and entertainment destination of the Rio Grande Valley.</b>   |  | <b>33%</b>    | <b>1/2/3</b>   |
|                                 |  | % sales tax revenues produced downtown   |               |                |
|                                 |  | sales tax revenues produced downtown   |               |                |
|                                 |  | % of property tax revenues produced downtown and absolute values   |               |                |
|                                 |  | property tax revenues produced downtown and absolute values  |               |                |
|                                 |  | Survey measures of awareness of City's downtown assets by Brownsville and non-Brownsville residents                  |               |                |
|                                 |  | % of economic activity produced as a result of historic/cultural venues downtown.                                    |               |                |
|                                 |  | % of employment produced downtown  |               |                |
|                                 |  | Average rental rate (\$/sq ft/yr) by rental class and by availability (sq ft)  |               |                |
| <b>Draft Final</b>              | <b>(Historic Preservation) Want to capitalize on Brownsville's significant history, recognize it as our most valuable cultural asset, promote its appreciation, and protect, restore and conserve all of Brownsville's historic locations, structures and neighborhoods.</b>   |  | <b>33%</b>    | <b>1/2/3</b>   |
|                                 |  | % of historic building/neighborhood/sites inventory at maintenance level   |               |                |
|                                 |  | Survey measures of awareness of City's historic assets by Brownsville and non-Brownsville residents                  |               |                |
|                                 |  | % GSF (Gross Square Feet) of historic building inventory at maintenance level (see notes 1 & 2)                      |               |                |
|                                 |  | % GSF of historic building inventory that is occupied and not tax exempt (see note 1)                                |               |                |
|                                 |  | % GSF of historic building inventory that is granted ad valorem abatement (see note 1)                               |               |                |
|                                 |  | % GSF of historic building inventory that is certified rehabilitation by the US Dept. of Interior (see note 1)       |               |                |
|                                 |  | % of total construction permits for work on historic buildings   |               |                |
|                                 |  | % of total demolition permits for downtown   |               |                |
|                                 |  | Inclusion on the annual list of the "Dozen Distinctive Destinations" by the National Trust for Historic Preservation |               |                |
|                                 |  | Indicator of quality of historical character (note 1: GSF of historic building inventory has to be established)      |               |                |
|                                 |  | (note 2: current inventory does not document the condition of the building)  |               |                |
| <b>Draft Final</b>              | <b>(Arts and Entertainment) Want to expand the quantity, diversity and quality of cultural offerings, fine arts education, support for entertainment-based jobs and enterprises, and develop sustainable venues and programs that showcase our cultural wealth worldwide.</b>  |  | <b>33%</b>    | <b>1/2/3</b>   |
|                                 |  | Annual attendance at arts/cultural venues per 1000 residents   |               |                |
|                                 |  | % of arts/cultural organizations' annual operating budget that comes from private and public sources                 |               |                |
|                                 |  | Survey measures of awareness of City's cultural assets by Brownsville and non-Brownsville residents                  |               |                |
|                                 |  | Number of entertainment venues per 1000 residents  |               |                |
|                                 |  | Number of arts/cultural venues per 1000 residents  |               |                |
|                                 |  | Number of local University Fine Arts programs  |               |                |
|                                 |  | Number of local Fine Arts program graduates  |               |                |
|                                 |  | Diversity of entertainment venues  |               |                |
|                                 |  | % of non-fast-food and ethnic (non-Mexican) restaurants to fast-food restaurants                                     |               |                |
|                                 |  | Diversity of arts/cultural venues  |               |                |
|                                 |  | Annual operating budget per visitor  |               |                |
|                                 |  | % of arts/cultural organizations' funding that comes from long term (> 5yrs)/funding commitments                     |               |                |
|                                 |  | Number of non-profit cultural organizations  |               |                |



## *City of Brownsville Comprehensive Plan*

### ***CIVIC DIMENSION***

#### **Sub-Objectives and Indicators**

**Individuals, Institutions and Leadership**

|                                 |   |   |               |                |
|---------------------------------|---|---|---------------|----------------|
| <b>DIMENSION GOAL:</b>          | CIVIC - An engaged, civically responsible and informed community that actively participates in civic affairs characterized by open and effective cooperation among public and private sector entities guided by effective appointed or elected leadership, all committed to the community's sustainable development through the 10-yr planning horizon. |   |               |                |
| <b>SUB-DIMENSION OBJECTIVE:</b> | Individuals - An engaged, informed and civically responsible community whose residents volunteer and participate effectively in civic affairs working toward a shared vision of the community's sustainable development.  |   |               |                |
| <b>SECTOR OBJECTIVE:</b>        | N/A   |   |               |                |
| <b>SOURCE</b>                   | <b>SUB OBJECTIVES</b>   | <b>OUTCOME INDICATORS</b>   | <b>Vote %</b> | <b>RANKING</b> |
| Draft Final                     | Improve and sustain the number, quality and diversity of effectively engaged individuals working together to improve the quality of life and economic development of the community  |   | 38%           | 1              |
|                                 |   | % of the population who reported volunteering for a community activity in the last year, by gender, age and by district |               |                |
|                                 |   | % of the population that is registered to vote, by gender, age and by district  |               |                |
| Draft Final                     | Engage well-informed individuals (e.g., voters, volunteers) committed to participation and action, who are empowered with a sense of ownership, accountability and responsibility in the community  |   | 33%           | 2              |
|                                 |   | Average number of hours spent in volunteer activities per year.   |               |                |
|                                 |   | % of the registered voters that voted in the last election.   |               |                |
|                                 |   | % of the community with newspaper subscription  |               |                |
|                                 |   | % of population attending candidate and public issue forums per event   |               |                |
|                                 |   | Funds spent in the promotion of voting registration/participation   |               |                |
|                                 |   | Number of websites devoted to community engagement per 1000 population  |               |                |
|                                 |   | % of community with internet access   |               |                |
| Draft Final                     | Increase the number, frequency and awareness of opportunities for engagement while reducing the cost, time and effort to develop and retain engaged individuals   |   | 29%           | 3              |
|                                 |   | Number of candidate/public issue forums per year.   |               |                |
|                                 |   | Cost spent on voting registration programs per registered voter.  |               |                |
|                                 |   | Cost spent on voting registration programs per voter.   |               |                |
|                                 |   | Cost spent on the volunteering programs per volunteer hours.  |               |                |
|                                 |   | Number of websites for nonprofits   |               |                |
|                                 |   | Number of new volunteers  |               |                |

**CIVIC - INSTITUTIONS INDICATORS**

|                                 |   |   |               |                |
|---------------------------------|---|---|---------------|----------------|
| <b>DIMENSION GOAL:</b>          | CIVIC - An engaged, civically responsible and informed community that actively participates in civic affairs characterized by open and effective cooperation among public and private sector entities guided by effective appointed or elected leadership, all committed to the community's sustainable development through the 10-yr planning horizon. |   |               |                |
| <b>SUB-DIMENSION OBJECTIVE:</b> | Institutions - To enhance the value and benefits of public services and improve productivity and utility of public-serving entities in Brownsville by causing high order inter-entity cooperation and collaboration among all 'public' institutions.  |   |               |                |
| <b>SECTOR OBJECTIVE:</b>        | N/A   |   |               |                |
| <b>SOURCE</b>                   | <b>SUB OBJECTIVES</b>   | <b>OUTCOME INDICATORS</b>   | <b>Vote %</b> | <b>RANKING</b> |
| <b>Draft Final</b>              | To enhance the value and benefits of public services and improve productivity and utility of public-serving entities in Brownsville by causing high order inter-entity cooperation and collaboration among all 'public' institutions  |   | <b>100%</b>   | <b>1</b>       |
|                                 |   | Existence of Inter-agency planning peer group   |               |                |
|                                 |   | Percent of entities participating in peer group   |               |                |
|                                 |   | Percent of peer group managers participating in training  |               |                |
|                                 |   | Percent budget allocated to inter-agency planning group   |               |                |
|                                 |   | Ratio of capital investments spent on collaboration projects to total capital investment projects |               |                |
|                                 |   | Number of successful incidents of collaboration/time  |               |                |
|                                 |   | Net benefit dollars per incident of collaboration/time  |               |                |
|                                 |   |   |               |                |

|                                 |   |   |               |                |
|---------------------------------|---|---|---------------|----------------|
| <b>DIMENSION GOAL:</b>          | CIVIC - An engaged, civically responsible and informed community that actively participates in civic affairs characterized by open and effective cooperation among public and private sector entities guided by effective appointed or elected leadership, all committed to the community's sustainable development through the 10-yr planning horizon. |   |               |                |
| <b>SUB-DIMENSION OBJECTIVE:</b> | Leaders - A community with committed leaders that empower and inspire individuals, institutions and governmental entities, working toward a shared vision.  |   |               |                |
| <b>SECTOR OBJECTIVE:</b>        | N/A   |   |               |                |
| <b>SOURCE</b>                   | <b>SUB OBJECTIVES</b>   | <b>OUTCOME INDICATORS</b>   | <b>Vote %</b> | <b>RANKING</b> |
| <b>Draft Final</b>              | <b>Develop and retain quality and effective leadership.</b>   |   | <b>34%</b>    | <b>1</b>       |
|                                 |   | Budget allocated to community leadership programs   |               |                |
|                                 |   | Percent of budget allocated to community leadership programs from external funding sources                        |               |                |
|                                 |   | Percent of individuals that complete leadership development programs and training                                 |               |                |
|                                 |   | Number of leadership programs, workshops and seminars offered to community  |               |                |
|                                 | (Note Parking Lot item -- define the age of youth)  | Number of leadership programs, workshops and seminars offered to youth  |               |                |
|                                 |   | % of youth that completed leadership development programs   |               |                |
|                                 |   | Number of websites and publications developed for leadership training   |               |                |
|                                 |   | Average number of years of service in leadership positions  |               |                |
|                                 |   | Number of local leadership organizations  |               |                |
|                                 |   | # of individuals participating in local leadership organizations  |               |                |
| <b>Draft Final</b>              | <b>Have knowledgeable, ethical, open minded, cooperative and accountable elected and volunteer leaders.</b>   |   | <b>32%</b>    | <b>2</b>       |
|                                 | (Note Parking Lot item -- develop a community wide leadership creed)  | Number of people who rated community leadership as high quality   |               |                |
|                                 |   | % of leadership that have taken leadership training   |               |                |
|                                 |   | % of leadership that have taken ethics training   |               |                |
| <b>Draft Final</b>              | <b>Engage the community to support and encourage our leaders.</b>   |   | <b>20%</b>    | <b>3</b>       |
|                                 |   | % of community that respects and trusts leadership  |               |                |
|                                 |   | % of community that trusts elected leadership   |               |                |
|                                 |   | % of community that understands the role of leadership in building and sustaining communities                     |               |                |
|                                 |   | # of outreach events held by community leaders with the public  |               |                |
|                                 | Scored within Individuals (Civic Engagement subcommittee)   | # of community events supported (attended and funded) by the public   |               |                |
|                                 | (Note Parking Lot item -- marketing strategy needed)  | Number of events where leadership is recognized and acknowledged  |               |                |
|                                 |   | Number of service incentives offered to promote leadership  |               |                |
|                                 |   | Number of candidates for elected offices  |               |                |
|                                 |   | Number of uncontested political races   |               |                |
| <b>Draft Final</b>              | <b>Increase diverse community participation in leadership roles.</b>  |   | <b>14%</b>    | <b>4</b>       |
|                                 |   | % distribution of elected officials based on gender, race, age, income, industry and district                     |               |                |
|                                 |   | % distribution of volunteers taking on leadership roles based on gender, race, age, income, industry and district |               |                |
|                                 |   | Number of youth involved in leadership roles  |               |                |



## *City of Brownsville Comprehensive Plan*

# ***ENVIRONMENT DIMENSION***

## **Sub-Objectives and Indicators**

**Natural Resources (Air/Water/Groundwater, Soils), Habitat Aquatic/Terrestrial),  
Aesthetics, Solid Waste/Recycling and Emergency Management**



|                                 |  |  |               |                |
|---------------------------------|--|--|---------------|----------------|
| <b>DIMENSION GOAL:</b>          | <b>ENVIRONMENT - An environmentally conscious community with quality management and protection of environmental resources in a cost, effective, reliable, equitable, affordable and effective manner to support the community's infrastructure, quality of life and economic development through the 10-yr planning horizon in a sustainable manner.</b> |  |               |                |
| <b>SUB-DIMENSION OBJECTIVE:</b> | <b>Air - A community with safe, clean, breathable air, that handles the impact of human activities within economic and environmental limits and offers attractive places for the enjoyment of residents.</b>   |  |               |                |
| <b>SECTOR OBJECTIVE:</b>        | <b>Outdoor and Indoor Air (Combined)</b>   |  |               |                |
| <b>SOURCE</b>                   | <b>SUB OBJECTIVES</b>  | <b>OUTCOME INDICATORS</b>  | <b>Vote %</b> | <b>RANKING</b> |
| Preliminary Draft<br>Final      | Want air with minimal odor, visual haziness and other nuisance conditions including ambient noise levels   |  | 33%           | 1              |
|                                 |  | Noise Index - % of areas within City that exceed threshold noise levels  |               |                |
|                                 |  | No. of Incidences of air quality/noise/nuisance condition complaints per capita per year   |               |                |
|                                 |  | Distribution of Incidences of air quality/noise/nuisance condition complaints within the community   |               |                |
| Preliminary Draft<br>Final      | Want safe, clean, breathable air that meets air quality standards consistently and uniformly throughout the community  |  | 30%           | 2              |
|                                 |  | Average Air Quality Index Value (PM 2.5, PM 10, CO, Nox, VOCs, Ozone, Pb, SO2)   |               |                |
|                                 |  | % days within years Air Quality Index Value is Unhealthy   |               |                |
| Preliminary Draft<br>Final      | Want to protect existing air quality levels and air quality carrying capacity to meet future demands   |  | 23%           | 3              |
|                                 |  | Years of available air quality capacity (Average Air Quality Index) (Available excess capacity/capacity absorption rate) = (Capacity - Demand) / (rate of decrease in capacity + rate of increase in demand) |               |                |
| Preliminary Draft<br>Final      | Want a well informed public with respect to air issues   |  | 15%           | 4              |
|                                 |  | Survey measures of air resource management awareness and public involvement  |               |                |
| Preliminary Draft<br>Final      | Want an air quality management program that is cost-effective  | Indicator Scored within Economics/Public Sector workgroup  | 0%            | 5              |
|                                 |  |  |               |                |

|                                 |  |  |               |                |
|---------------------------------|--|--|---------------|----------------|
| <b>DIMENSION GOAL:</b>          | <b>ENVIRONMENT - An environmentally conscious community with quality management and protection of environmental resources in a cost, effective, reliable, equitable, affordable and effective manner to support the community's infrastructure, quality of life and economic development through the 10-yr planning horizon in a sustainable manner.</b> |  |               |                |
| <b>SUB-DIMENSION OBJECTIVE:</b> | <b>Water - A community with safe, clean water, that handles the impact of human activities within economic and environmental limits and offers attractive places for the enjoyment of residents.</b>   |  |               |                |
| <b>SECTOR OBJECTIVE:</b>        | <b>Surface Water - A community with safe, clean surface water that supports multiple beneficial uses including aesthetic, recreational, aquatic and terrestrial habitat, water supply and drainage.</b>  |  |               |                |
| <b>SOURCE</b>                   | <b>SUB OBJECTIVES</b>  | <b>OUTCOME INDICATORS</b>  | <b>Vote %</b> | <b>RANKING</b> |
| Preliminary Draft<br>Final      | Want aesthetically pleasing surface water with minimal odor and other nuisance conditions  | No. of Incidences of water quality/nuisance condition complaints per capita<br><br>Distribution of Incidences of water quality/nuisance condition complaints within the community  | 18%           | 1              |
| Preliminary Draft<br>Final      | Want surface water to meet fishable and swimmable water quality standards consistently and uniformly throughout the city   | Average Water Quality Index (Dissolved Oxygen, Fecal Coliform, pH, BOD, Temperature, Total Phosphate, Nitrates, Turbidity, Total Solids, Depth, Color, Salinity)   | 17%           | 2/3            |
| Preliminary Draft<br>Final      | Want a well-informed public with respect to surface water issues   | Survey measures of water resource management awareness   | 17%           | 2/3            |
| Preliminary Draft<br>Final      | Want available drainage carrying capacity to meet present and future demands on system   | Indicator Scored within Infrastructure/Drainage and Environmental Strategy workgroups<br><br>Years of available drainage carrying capacity (10 and 100y events) (Available capacity/capacity absorption rate)              | 14%           | 4              |
| Preliminary Draft<br>Final      | Want a surface water management program that is cost efficient   | Indicator Scored within Economics/Public Sector workgroup<br><br>Cost per unit improvement in Water Quality Index  | 13%           | 5              |
| Preliminary Draft<br>Final      | Want to protect and continuously improve the quality carrying capacity of the existing inventory of surface waters to meet future demands  | Years of available water quality capacity (Available excess capacity/capacity absorption rate) = (Capacity - Demand) / (rate of decrease in capacity + rate of increase in demand)   | 8%            | 6              |
| Preliminary Draft<br>Final      | Want a consistent, suitable supply of surface water to be available and accessible to support the community's present and future water supply demands  | Indicator Scored within Environment/Aquatic habitat workgroup  | 7%            | 7              |
| Preliminary Draft<br>Final      | Want a well maintained surface water system  | Indicator Scored within Economics/Public Sector workgroup<br><br>Maintenance plan budget per surface water area<br><br>% of annual department budget allocated to maintenance<br><br>Quality of System Maintenance (audit) | 6%            | 8              |
| Preliminary Draft<br>Final      | Want community's access to surface water to be equitable   | Indicator (% of riparian zone perimeter that has public access) Scored within Social/Equity workgroup  | 1%            | 9              |

|                                 |  |  |               |                |
|---------------------------------|--|--|---------------|----------------|
| <b>DIMENSION GOAL:</b>          | <b>ENVIRONMENT - An environmentally conscious community with quality management and protection of environmental resources in a cost, effective, reliable, equitable, affordable and effective manner to support the community's infrastructure, quality of life and economic development through the 10-yr planning horizon in a sustainable manner.</b> |  |               |                |
| <b>SUB-DIMENSION OBJECTIVE:</b> | <b>Water - A community with safe, clean water, that handles the impact of human activities within economic and environmental limits and offers attractive places for the enjoyment of residents.</b>   |  |               |                |
| <b>SECTOR OBJECTIVE:</b>        | <b>Ground Water - A community with safe, clean, sustainable groundwater resources that support multiple beneficial environmental and water supply uses.</b>  |  |               |                |
| <b>SOURCE</b>                   | <b>SUB OBJECTIVES</b>  | <b>OUTCOME INDICATORS</b>  | <b>Vote %</b> | <b>RANKING</b> |
| Preliminary Draft<br>Final      | Want a consistent, suitable supply of groundwater to be available and accessible to support the community's and environment's present and future water supply demands  | Community supply indicator moved to Infrastructure/Utilities<br><br>Annual groundwater withdrawals as percentage of Safe Yield<br><br>Number of public/private wells               | 27%           | 1              |
| Preliminary Draft<br>Final      | Want well informed public with respect to groundwater  | Survey measures of groundwater resource management awareness   | 20%           | 2              |
| Preliminary Draft<br>Final      | Want groundwater to meet environmental standards consistently and uniformly throughout the city  | Distribution of average Groundwater Quality Index throughout community   | 18%           | 3              |
| Preliminary Draft<br>Final      | Want to protect and continuously improve the quality of the existing inventory of groundwater  | Average Groundwater Quality Index (Salinity, Arsenic, Petroleum Hydrocarbons, TDS)   | 14%           | 4              |
| Preliminary Draft<br>Final      | Want a groundwater management program that is cost efficient   | Indicator Scored within Economics/Public Sector workgroup  | 9%            | 5/6            |
| Preliminary Draft<br>Final      | Want available water quality carrying capacity to meet the future demands on system  | Years of available water quality capacity (Available excess capacity/capacity absorption rate) = (Capacity - Demand) / (rate of decrease in capacity + rate of increase in demand) | 9%            | 5/6            |
| Preliminary Draft<br>Final      | Want community's access to groundwater to be equitable   | Moved to Social/Equity workgroup   | 4%            | 7              |

|                                 |  |   |               |                |
|---------------------------------|--|---|---------------|----------------|
| <b>DIMENSION GOAL:</b>          | <b>ENVIRONMENT - An environmentally conscious community with quality management and protection of environmental resources in a cost, effective, reliable, equitable, affordable and effective manner to support the community's infrastructure, quality of life and economic development through the 10-yr planning horizon in a sustainable manner.</b> |   |               |                |
| <b>SUB-DIMENSION OBJECTIVE:</b> | <b>Soils - A community with safe, clean soil, that handles the impact of human activities within economic and environmental limits and supports the agricultural, domestic, and industrial demands of its citizens.</b>  |   |               |                |
| <b>SECTOR OBJECTIVE:</b>        | <b>Surface and Subsurface Soils (Combined)</b>   |   |               |                |
| <b>SOURCE</b>                   | <b>SUB OBJECTIVES</b>  | <b>OUTCOME INDICATORS</b>   | <b>Vote %</b> | <b>RANKING</b> |
| Preliminary Draft<br>Final      | Want a well informed public with regards to soil   |   | 32%           | 1              |
|                                 |  | Survey measures of soil resource management awareness   |               |                |
| Preliminary Draft<br>Final      | Want soil quality that meets environmental standards consistently and uniformly throughout the community   |   | 29%           | 2/3            |
|                                 |  | Average Soil Quality Index - Percent of contaminated/stressed land area (RCRA, PST, Salinity, Disturbed/Stressed Soils)   |               |                |
|                                 |  | Distribution of Average Soil Quality Index throughout community   |               |                |
| Preliminary Draft<br>Final      | Want to protect and continuously improve existing inventory of soil quality levels   |   | 29%           | 2/3            |
|                                 |  | Years of available soil quality capacity (Available excess capacity/capacity absorption rate) = (Capacity - Demand) / (rate of decrease in capacity + rate of increase in demand) |               |                |
| Preliminary Draft<br>Final      | Want a soils management program that is cost efficient   | Indicator Scored within Economics/Public Sector workgroup   | 7%            | 4              |
|                                 |  |   |               |                |
| Preliminary Draft<br>Final      | Want to protect and continuously improve existing soil inventory and drainage/open space carrying capacity levels  | Indicator Scored within Infrastructure/Drainage and Social/Land Use/Open Space  | 4%            | 5              |
|                                 |  | Erosion Risk Index  |               |                |
|                                 |  |   |               |                |

|                                 |   |  |               |                |
|---------------------------------|---|--|---------------|----------------|
| <b>DIMENSION GOAL:</b>          | ENVIRONMENT - An environmentally conscious community with quality management and protection of environmental resources in a cost, effective, reliable, equitable, affordable and effective manner to support the community's infrastructure, quality of life and economic development through the 10-yr planning horizon in a sustainable manner. |  |               |                |
| <b>SUB-DIMENSION OBJECTIVE:</b> | Habitat - A community with abundant natural habitat that supports a diversity of native species.  |  |               |                |
| <b>SECTOR OBJECTIVE:</b>        | Aquatic Habitat - A community with abundant native, aquatic habitat that supports a diversity of native, aquatic species.   |  |               |                |
| <b>SOURCE</b>                   | <b>SUB OBJECTIVES</b>   | <b>OUTCOME INDICATORS</b>  | <b>Vote %</b> | <b>RANKING</b> |
| Preliminary Draft<br>Final      | Want to consistently protect and continuously improve the quality of the existing inventory of aquatic habitat uniformly throughout the community   |  | 25%           | 1/2            |
|                                 |   | Average Aquatic Habitat Quality Index  |               |                |
|                                 |   | Distribution of Average Habitat Quality Index throughout the community   |               |                |
| Preliminary Draft<br>Final      | Want a well informed public with regards to aquatic habitat   |  | 25%           | 1/2            |
|                                 |   | Survey measures of aquatic habitat resource management awareness and public involvement  |               |                |
| Preliminary Draft<br>Final      | Want ecologically sound and physically stable riparian zones  |  | 23%           | 3              |
|                                 |   | Average Riparian Zone Quality Index (Disturbed vs Undisturbed, Stable vs Unstable, Ecologically Healthy/Unhealthy)   |               |                |
| Preliminary Draft<br>Final      | Want available aquatic habitat carrying capacity to meet the community's future aesthetic, recreational and environmental demands consistently and uniformly throughout the community   |  | 13%           | 4              |
|                                 |   | Years of available Aquatic habitat Capacity (Available excess capacity/capacity absorption rate) = (Capacity - Demand) / (rate of decrease in capacity + rate of increase in demand) |               |                |
| Preliminary Draft<br>Final      | Want suitable stocks and diversity of native aquatic flora and fauna  |  | 10%           | 5              |
|                                 |   | Average Aquatic Species Index (Diversity and Abundance)  |               |                |
| Preliminary Draft<br>Final      | Want an aquatic habitat management program that is cost efficient   | Indicator Scored within Economics/Public Sector workgroup  | 4%            | 6              |
|                                 |   |  |               |                |

|                                 |  |  |               |                |
|---------------------------------|--|--|---------------|----------------|
| <b>DIMENSION GOAL:</b>          | <b>ENVIRONMENT - An environmentally conscious community with quality management and protection of environmental resources in a cost, effective, reliable, equitable, affordable and effective manner to support the community's infrastructure, quality of life and economic development through the 10-yr planning horizon in a sustainable manner.</b> |  |               |                |
| <b>SUB-DIMENSION OBJECTIVE:</b> | <b>Habitat - A community with abundant natural habitat that supports a diversity of native species.</b>  |  |               |                |
| <b>SECTOR OBJECTIVE:</b>        | <b>Terrestrial Habitat - A community with abundant native, terrestrial habitat that supports a diversity of native, terrestrial species.</b>   |  |               |                |
| <b>SOURCE</b>                   | <b>SUB OBJECTIVES</b>  | <b>OUTCOME INDICATORS</b>  | <b>Vote %</b> | <b>RANKING</b> |
| Preliminary Draft<br>Final      | Want a well informed public with regards to terrestrial habitat  |  | 27%           | 1              |
|                                 |  | Survey measures of terrestrial habitat resource management awareness and public involvement  |               |                |
| Preliminary Draft<br>Final      | Want available terrestrial habitat carrying capacity to meet the community's future aesthetic, recreational and environmental demands consistently and uniformly throughout the community  |  | 21%           | 2/3            |
|                                 |  | Years of available terrestrial habitat capacity (Available excess capacity/capacity absorption rate) = (Capacity - Demand) / (rate of decrease in capacity + rate of increase in demand) |               |                |
| Preliminary Draft<br>Final      | Want ecologically sound and physically stable riparian zones   | (repeat from Aquatic? One or the other not both)   | 21%           | 2/3            |
|                                 |  | Average Riparian Zone Quality Index (Disturbed vs Undisturbed, Stable vs Unstable, Ecologically Healthy/Unhealthy)   |               |                |
| Preliminary Draft<br>Final      | Want to consistently protect and continuously improve the quality of the existing inventory of terrestrial habitat uniformly throughout the community  |  | 19%           | 4              |
|                                 |  | Average Terrestrial Habitat Quality Index  |               |                |
|                                 |  | Distribution of Average Habitat Quality Index throughout the community   |               |                |
| Preliminary Draft<br>Final      | Want suitable stocks and diversity of native terrestrial flora and fauna   |  | 8%            | 5              |
|                                 |  | Average Terrestrial Species Index (Diversity and Abundance)  |               |                |
| Preliminary Draft<br>Final      | Want a terrestrial habitat management program that is cost efficient   | Indicator Scored within Economics/Public Sector workgroup  | 4%            | 6              |
|                                 |  |  |               |                |