

Council on Local Results and Innovation

League of MN Cities
145 University Avenue W. St. Paul
Wednesday, December 15th
1:00-3:00 p.m.

Members Present

Patricia Coldwell, Association of MN Counties
Mark Hintmeyer, City of Moorhead
Jay Kiedrowski, Humphrey Institute at the University of Minnesota
Katie Nerem, Blue Earth County
Matt Stemwedel, City of Woodbury
Jay Stroebel, City of Minneapolis
Rebecca Otto, State Auditor
Wendy Underwood, City of Saint Paul

Members Absent

John Gunyou, City of Minnetonka
Tim Walsh, Scott County
Ben Woessner, City of Pelican Rapids

Others present

Ann Olson, Animal Folks MN
Amanda Hollis, Washington County
James Collins, Humphrey Institute at the University of Minnesota
Dave Bartholomay, Mayor, Circle Pines
Keith Carlson, MN Intercounty Association
Kevin McHenry, Metro Cities
James McClean, St. Paul Area Chamber of Commerce
Jennifer O'Rourke, League of MN Cities
Lena Gould, League of MN Cities (taking minutes)

I. Call to Order

- a. Chair Jay Kiedrowski called the meeting to order. Members and guests introduced themselves.

II. Review and Approval of Meeting Minutes

- a. Minutes approved with correction of spelling of Jay Stroebel's name.

III. Discussion on City Performance Measures

- a. Chair Kiedrowski recapped the last meeting's discussion: agreed to focus on outcome measures as priority over output measures, per Rep. Marquart's report of the intent. Agreed to focus on basic services counties/cities are providing: e.g. police, fire, streets, water, sewer, and inspection and code enforcement. Chair

indicated we need to hone down the number of measures, as the legislation says approximately 10 measures each for cities and counties. Members noted that not all cities may be able to collect citizen survey data so it may be good to have more than ten from which to choose. The group agreed to list first choice of measures among those suggested. The following were determined to be changes to be made to the cities' measures (*Yes/No/Hold below indicates whether to include a given measure or put it on hold*):

- i. General: include rating of overall quality of services provided by city, include measure of public rating general value of city services but not question re: property taxes *Yes*
 - ii. Police: preferred measure is part 1 and 2 crime rates (versus citizens' rating of crime) *Yes*
 - iii. Fire: preferred measure is insurance rating of fire services (response time could be included as an optional measure) *Yes*
 - iv. Emergency Medical Services Response Time: add "where applicable" as this is not done by most smaller cities *Yes*
 - v. Streets: need clarification of average pavement condition index (PCI vs other). Possibly change to generic rating of average road/street condition rather than specify an index *Yes*
 - vi. Consider adding snowplowing as an additional measure *Hold*
 - vii. Water: add 'where applicable' as many parts of cities have private wells. Noted health violations are rare but citizens complain about odor, etc. *Hold*—Agreed water is an important area to measure performance but need to think more about what to track
 - viii. Sewer: add "if centrally provided". Change 'per 10,000 people' to 'per hundred hookups' *Yes*
 - ix. Environment: recycling rate *Yes*
 - x. Libraries: *Hold*. Need to discuss how libraries are managed/governed (collaboratively with other governments and what that implies, before deciding to include it as a measure).
 - xi. Recreation: 2 measures, could be combined into one measure of citizens' rating of the quality of programs *and* facilities. Considered adding number of visits but it was determined that this was not necessary if we want to keep the number of measures closer to 10. Cities could add this as an additional measure if they track this and determine it's important. *No (?)*
 - xii. Inspection and enforcement: several factors are candidates for measures: timeliness of permits, overall appearance and/or safety of city. Both counties and cities do permitting but counties have different standards. Some members thought safety (which in this case refers to whether a building/project is structurally sound) was confusing as this could be confused with public safety. *No*
- b. Conclusion: with the changes made, there are eight measures to be included in the report, nine if snow removal is included. No decision has yet been made on libraries.
- c. Kiedrowski suggested group could also include output measures or a message on why they might also be included.

- d. Members discussed the fact that outcome measures often come from citizen surveys. Not all cities/counties have the capacity to do a survey. Members asked about the best way to get citizen feedback.
- e. Output: measure of efficiency (i.e., police response time); Outcome: relates to effectiveness; addressees “helping solve the problem?” (i.e., fire insurance rating).
- f. The group’s three criteria for selecting measures:
 - i. Ease of reporting
 - ii. Keep simple (for citizens too)
 - iii. From perspective of citizen
- g. The group briefly discussed how to include citizen feedback as required in statute.

IV. Discussion on County Performance Measures

- a. Katie Nerem walked the group through potential county measures (*Yes/No/Hold below indicates whether to include a given measure or put it on hold*):
 - i. Environment: Recycling rate *Yes*
 - ii. Libraries: number of visits per 1,000 residents – HOLD on whether to include libraries (see cities above) *Hold*
 - iii. Property taxation and records: Outcome measure: level of assessment *Yes* Output measure: average days to process real estate documents (this could be optional measure)
 - iv. Veteran’s services: % of veterans who said their questions were answered when seeking benefit information—question if this is a big enough program to include, but others felt it was good to have because it is politically popular *HOLD*
 - v. Public safety Output measure—average response time to 911 calls Part 1 and 2 crime rate (occurrences per 1000 residents *Yes* Community perception of safety from crime
 - vi. Public Works—see city
 - vii. Maintenance—see city
 - viii. Construction—discussed crash rate, roads meeting CSAH standard, etc. – Decided not to include (??)
 - ix. Parks: customer satisfaction with park facilities—Decided not to include
 - x. Probation: % of offenders (adult and juvenile) with new offense during 3 years since discharge or intervention
 - xi. Public Health: agreed to bring in a broad measure of the health of the population for next meeting
 - xii. Social Services
 - xiii. Income supports: Change in MFIP/DWP self support index over three year period *Yes*
 - xiv. Child safety/well-being Level of recurrence of child maltreatment (within 12 months) *Yes* (versus reunified with parents)

- xv. Adults with disabilities: Adults with disabilities who live successfully in the community *No*

V. Discussion on Minnesota Performance Management Document

- a. Chair Kiedrowski shared the draft, “Guiding the North Star State: Proposal for a Performance Management System in Minnesota. This will be discussed in more detail at the January meeting. He volunteered to send other documents related to performance management to the council prior to the next meeting.

VI. Other

Next meeting January 12, 1-3 p.m. at the League of Minnesota Cities Building

VII. Adjournment