

Attachment 1 – Detailed Examples of Continuous Improvement Impacts

The LIFT Program (*Few detailed examples*)

Fleet Management Process Review – As part of its continuous improvement efforts, the Fleet team partnered with the COE to develop a business case for implementing Telematics, which was presented to the Business Transformation Steering Committee (BTSC).

COE conducted a deeper analysis and calculated the cost of the manual effort the Fleet Management team would require to extract, manage, and analyze fleet data using the MEATY framework (Money, Error %, Amount, Time, Yearly Cost). This included insight generation such as:

- Under- and over-utilization of City vehicles by departments
- Fuel consumption tracking
- Maintenance and damage cost calculations
- Overall data analysis and leadership reporting

The analysis showed that approximately **\$100,000 in manual effort** could be saved along with additional operational cost savings (such as: Reducing need for rentals or surplus purchases, avoid costly breakdowns through preventive maintenance, extend vehicle lifespan) through the implementation of Telematics.

The resulting business case was detailed and gave the Fleet Management team an opportunity to pause and consider the most effective ways to achieve cost savings in their day-to-day operations. This ultimately demonstrated a positive return on investment, enabling the team to confidently present the proposal and secure BTSC approval.

As the next step, the COE will work with the Fleet team to develop robust processes that support Telematics implementation and enhance insight reporting for departments across the organization. This work will form a foundational input for upcoming budget discussions.

“The goal is not simply to purchase tools, but to build an environment with optimized processes and clearly defined methods for using data and insights, ensuring that our tools and systems deliver maximum value.”

Retrieving and Returning a City Vehicle – What began as a small, staff led idea to help Engineering inspectors retrieve and return City vehicles more efficiently has evolved into a broader process improvement initiative. Previously, inspectors often spent unnecessary time retrieving keys, logging entries, searching for parked vehicles, and locating available stalls adding 15–20 minutes to each inspection, which amounted to nearly **\$10,000 in staff time**. With COE’s support for implementation and cost analysis, several improvement opportunities were identified and acted upon, including:

- Creating a parking lot map to help staff locate vehicles quickly
- Establishing a centralized location for vehicle key collection instead of searching for individual staff offices
- Repurposing a central space (formerly a coffee machine area) for organized vehicle key storage
- Initiating the **Shared Vehicle Pool Program** to maximize utilization of City vehicles
- Facilitating discussions on optimizing the use of the City’s three parking lots, including exploring reserved stalls for responsive and inspection teams to reduce delays that directly impact the public

Facility Booking Process Review – The Process Review identified several key areas of waste, particularly the amount of time staff spent repeating steps, answering the same customer questions, and going back and forth over email to find suitable booking spaces or clarify the facility booking process. The review encouraged staff to pause and consider how to make information more transparent for customers and how to better leverage existing systems. As a result, process improvements were designed to address root causes from multiple angles. During implementation, the team also chose not to backfill an auxiliary staff position that had existed prior to the review, resulting in **direct savings of \$24,000**.

Examples of a few Improvement Actions

1. Updating key details and visuals for all CMR facilities on the CMR website
2. Making facility booking webpages easier to navigate
3. Adding one page guides and/or FAQ documents to facility booking webpages
4. Providing email confirmations for single use bookings (e.g., picnic shelters, meeting rooms)



5. Adding buffer times, where needed, to reduce conflicts between back-to-back bookings
6. Clarifying whether CMR will assume liability/responsibility or if user groups must purchase their own insurance