

## City of New Ulm

City Manager

100 North Broadway Telephone: (507) 359-8233 New Ulm. Minnesota 56073

Fax: (507) 359-9752

Email: chrisd@newulmmn.gov

Website: www.newulmmn.gov

June 18, 2020

Office of the State Auditor 525 Park Street - Suite 500 St. Paul, MN 55103

Re: Performance Measurement Program Survey

To Whom It May Concern:

Enclosed please find the results of the Performance Measurement Program survey. A copy of the survey is included as well as Resolution No. 2020-48 adopted by the New Ulm City Council at their regular meeting on June 16, 2020.

If you have any questions, please contact our office.

Respectfully submitted,

CITY OF NEW ULM, MINNESOTA

Chris W. Dalton City Manager

CWD:lap

Enclosures

#### **RESOLUTION No. 2020 - 48**

#### CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF NEW ULM, MINNESOTA

Councilor Fischer offered the following resolution and moved its adoption:

WHEREAS, the benefits to the City of New Ulm, Brown County for participation in the Minnesota Council on Local Results and Innovation's comprehensive performance measurement program are outlined in MS 6.91 and include eligibility for a reimbursement as set by State statute; and

WHEREAS, any city participating in the comprehensive performance measurement program is also exempt from levy limits for taxes, if levy limits are in effect; and

WHEREAS, the City Council of the City of New Ulm has adopted and implemented at least 10 of the performance measures, as developed by the Council on Local Results and Innovation, and a system to use this information to help plan, budget, manage and evaluate programs and processes for optimal future outcomes; and

Now, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the City Council of the City of New Ulm will continue to report the results of the performance measures to its citizenry by the end of the year through publication, direct mailing, posting on the city's website, or through a public hearing at which the budget and levy will be discussed and public input allowed.

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED,** the City Council of New Ulm will submit to the Office of the State Auditor the actual results of the performance measures adopted by the city.

The motion for the adoption of the foregoing resolution was duly seconded by Councilor Mack and, the roll being called, the following vote was recorded:

Voting Aye: Councilors Fischer, Mack, Schultz and President Schmitz.

Voting Nay: None.

Not Voting: Councilor Christian.

Whereupon said resolution was declared to have been duly adopted this 16th day of June 2020.

Attest:

The above resolution approved June 16, 2020.

Robert J. Beussner

### State Report City Wide Totals

tem Description	Percent	Scale	Coun
1 Indicate the number of years you lived in New Ulm.	5.43%	1-9 Years	11
	13.04%	10-19 Years	2
	11.96%	20-29 Years	2
	13.59%	30-39 Years	2
	15.76%	40-49 Years	2
	13.04%	50-59 Years	2
	10.87%	60-69 Years	20
	2.72%	70-79 Years	
	0.54%	80-89 Years	
2 How would you rate the overall appearance of the city?	0.87%	Poor	:
	0.87%	Fair	:
	29.69%	Satisfactory	68
	110.92%	Good	254
	57.64%	Exellent	132
3 How would you describe your overall feeling of police protection services in the city?	2.61%	Fair	- (
	19.13%	Satisfactory	44
	89.57%	Good	206
	88.70%	Exellent	204
4 How would you rate the overall quality of fire protection services in the city?	3.52%	Fair	
	9.69%	Satisfactory	22
	68.72%	Good	156
	118.06%	Exellent	268
5 How would you rate the overall condition of city streets?	7.83%	Poor	18
	25.22%	Fair	58
	79.13%	Satisfactory	182
	78.26%	Good	180
	9.57%	Exellent	22
6 How would you rate the overall quality of snowploweing on city streets?	8.73%	Poor	20
	17.47%	Fair	40
	42.79%	Satisfactory	98
	95.20%	Good	218
	35.81%	Exellent	82
7 How would you rate the dependability and overall quality of city sanitary sewer services?	0.88%	Poor	2
	20.35%	Satisfactory	46
	93.81%	Good	212
	84.96%	Exellent	192
8 How would you rate the dependability and overall quality of city water services?	2.62%	Poor	ε
	4.37%	Fair	10
	24.45%	Satisfactory	56
	89.96%	Good	206
	78.60%	Exellent	180

### State Report City Wide Totals

1   How would you rate the dependability and overall quality of city gas services?   92.1%   Good   20.0%   Sailant   20.0%	Item	Description	Percent	Scale	Count
10   How would you rate the dependability and overall quality of city electricity services?   0.87%   Foar   2.087%   Foar   2.19.21%   Salisfactory   4.087%   Foar   2.19.21%   Salisfactory   4.087%   Foar   2.19.21%   Salisfactory   4.087%   Foar   2.088%   Foar   2	9	How would you rate the dependability and overall quality of city gas services?	16.67%	Satisfactory	38
10   How would you rate the dependability and overall quality of city electricity services?			92.11%	Good	210
11   How would you rate the overall quality of city recreational programs?   1,77%   Poor   4,84   1,77%   Fair   4,84   1,8			90.35%	Exellent	206
19 21%   Satisfactory   24     89 96%   Good   206     89 08%   Exellent   204     11   How would you rate the overall quality of city recreational programs?   1.77%   Fair   4     34.51%   Satisfactory   78     92 24%   Good   206     69 91%   Good   206     69 91%   Exellent   158     12   How would you rate the overall quality of city recreational facilities? (e.g. parks, trails, park facilities, etc.)   0.88%   Poor   2     2.55%   Satisfactory   56     80 70%   Exellent   158     13   How would you rate the library services in the city?   0.91%   Good   206     80 70%   Exellent   158     14   How would you rate the quality of licensing, permitting and building inspection services in the city?   1.83%   Poor   4     14   How would you rate the quality of licensing, permitting and building inspection services in the city?   1.83%   Poor   4     15   How would you rate the overall programming of the Community Access Channel also known as NUCAT (Cornea   3.92%   Poor   8     16   How would you rate the utility billing/finance department services?   2.64%   Poor   8     16   How would you rate the utility billing/finance department services?   2.64%   Poor   6     16   How would you rate the overall quality of services provided by the city?   2.68%   Satisfactory   1.88     16   How would you rate the overall quality of services provided by the city?   2.68%   Satisfactory   3.68%   Satisfactory   3	10	How would you rate the dependability and overall quality of city electricity services?	0.87%	Poor	2
11   How would you rate the overall quality of city recreational programs?   1.77%   Foor   4   1.77%   Fair   4   4   4   4   4   4   4   4   4			0.87%	Fair	2
11   How would you rate the overall quality of city recreational programs?			19.21%	Satisfactory	44
11   How would you rate the overall quality of city recreational programs?			89.96%	Good	206
1.77%   Fair   34.51%   Satisfactory   78   92.04%   Good   208   69.91%   Evelient   58   58   58   58   58   58   58   5			89.08%	Exellent	204
12   How would you rate the overall quality of city recreational facilities? (e.g. parks, trails, park facilities, etc.)   0.889   Poor   2.84     13   How would you rate the ibrary services in the city?   24.56%   Satisfactory   56.00d   20.00d     14   How would you rate the quality of licensing, permitting and building inspection services in the city?   1.83%   Poor   2.45     14   How would you rate the quality of licensing, permitting and building inspection services in the city?   1.83%   Poor   2.45     15   How would you rate the overall programming of the Community Access Channel also known as NUCAT (Comea   3.92%   Fair   1.84     15   How would you rate the utility billing/finance department services?   2.64%   Poor   2.46     16   How would you rate the overall quality of services provided by the city?   2.63%   Satisfactory   2.63%   Satisfactory   2.66     16   How would you rate the overall quality of services provided by the city?   2.63%   Satisfactory   2.63%   Satisfactory   2.64%   Poor   2.66   Satisfactory   2.66   Satisfactory   2.66   Satisfactory   3.66   S	11	How would you rate the overall quality of city recreational programs?	1.77%	Poor	4
12   How would you rate the overall quality of city recreational facilities? (e.g. parks, trails, park facilities, etc.)   0.88%   Poor   2.8     12   How would you rate the overall quality of city recreational facilities? (e.g. parks, trails, park facilities, etc.)   0.88%   Poor   2.8     13   How would you rate the library services in the city?   0.91%   Exellent   184     13   How would you rate the library services in the city?   0.91%   Poor   2.7     14   How would you rate the quality of licensing, permitting and building inspection services in the city?   1.83%   Poor   4.8     14   How would you rate the quality of licensing, permitting and building inspection services in the city?   1.83%   Poor   4.8     15   How would you rate the overall programming of the Community Access Channel also known as NUCAT (Comca   1.2			1.77%	Fair	4
12   How would you rate the overall quality of city recreational facilities? (e.g. parks, trails, park facilities, etc.)   0.88%   Poor   2.3.51%   Fair   8.4.56%   Satisfactory   5.6.600d   20.6.600d   20.6.			34.51%	Satisfactory	78
12   How would you rate the overall quality of city recreational facilities? (e.g. parks, trails, park facilities, etc.)   0.88%   Poor   2.3.51%   Fair   8.8.24.56%   Satisfactory   56.000   90.39%   Good   206.000   90.70%   Exellent   184.000   184.00			92.04%	Good	208
3.51%   Fair   8   24.56%   Satisfactory   56   60   60   60   60   60   60   60			69.91%	Exellent	158
24.56%   Satisfactory   56   90.35%   Good   206   80.70%   Exellent   184	12	How would you rate the overall quality of city recreational facilities? (e.g. parks, trails, park facilities, etc.)	0.88%	Poor	2
13   How would you rate the library services in the city?   0.91%   Poor   2   27.40%   Satisfactory   60   78.54%   Good   172   77.40%   Satisfactory   60   78.54%   Good   172   78.54%   Good   172   78.54%   Good   172   78.54%   Fair   188   Fai			3.51%	Fair	8
13   How would you rate the library services in the city?			24.56%	Satisfactory	56
13   How would you rate the library services in the city?			90.35%	Good	206
27,40%   Satisfactory   50   78,54%   Good   172   173   174   How would you rate the quality of licensing, permitting and building inspection services in the city?   1,83%   Poor   4   8,22%   Fair   18   86,62%   Satisfactory   124   89,50%   Good   196   43,84%   Exellent   96   155   How would you rate the overall programming of the Community Access Channel also known as NUCAT (Comca   3,92%   Poor   8   12,75%   Fair   26   14,25%   14,			80.70%	Exellent	184
14   How would you rate the quality of licensing, permitting and building inspection services in the city?   1.83%   Poor   4.8.22%   Fair   1.8.8   Fair   1.8   Fair   1.8.8   Fair	13	How would you rate the library services in the city?	0.91%	Poor	2
14   How would you rate the quality of licensing, permitting and building inspection services in the city?			27.40%	Satisfactory	60
14   How would you rate the quality of licensing, permitting and building inspection services in the city?			78.54%	Good	172
8.22%   Fair   18   56.62%   Satisfactory   124   89.50%   Good   196   43.84%   Exellent   96   43.84%   Exellent   96   12.75%   Fair   26   75.49%   Satisfactory   154   69.61%   Good   142   38.24%   Exellent   78   70.5%   Fair   16   37.00%   Satisfactory   84   91.63%   Good   208   61.67%   Exellent   140   17   How would you rate the overall quality of services provided by the city?   0.88%   Poor   2   26.32%   Satisfactory   60   60.276   60   60.276   6			93.15%	Exellent	204
15   How would you rate the overall programming of the Community Access Channel also known as NUCAT (Comca   3.92%   Poor   8   12.75%   Fair   26   75.49%   Satisfactory   154   69.61%   69.61%   600d   142   38.24%   Exellent   78   70.5%   Fair   16   37.00%   Satisfactory   84   91.63%   Good   208   61.67%   Exellent   140   17   How would you rate the overall quality of services provided by the city?   0.88%   Poor   2   26.32%   Satisfactory   60   600d   276   600d   276	14	How would you rate the quality of licensing, permitting and building inspection services in the city?	1.83%	Poor	4
15   How would you rate the overall programming of the Community Access Channel also known as NUCAT (Comea 12.75% Fair 26 75.49% Satisfactory 154 (69.61% Good 142 38.24% Exellent 78 (69.61% Good 142 38.24% Exellent 78 (69.61% Good 142 37.05% Fair 16 (69.61% Good 142 37.05% Fair 16 (69.61% Good 142 37.05% Fair 16 (69.61% Good 142 37.00% Satisfactory 16.05% Good 16.67% Exellent 14.05% Good 14.05% Good 14.05% Good 14.05% Good 14.05% Good 16.67% Exellent 14.05% Good 16.67% Exellent 14.05% Good 16.67% Exellent 14.05% Good 16.67% Satisfactory 16.65% Satisfactory 1			8.22%	Fair	18
15   How would you rate the overall programming of the Community Access Channel also known as NUCAT (Comcast 12.75%   Fair   26.75.49%   Satisfactory   154.75%   Fair   26.75.49%   Satisfactory   154.75%   Fair   26.75.49%   Satisfactory   154.75%   Fair   15			56.62%	Satisfactory	124
15   How would you rate the overall programming of the Community Access Channel also known as NUCAT (Comca   12.75%   Fair   26   75.49%   Satisfactory   154   69.61%   Good   142   38.24%   Exellent   78			89.50%	Good	196
12.75% Fair 26 75.49% Satisfactory 154 69.61% Good 142 38.24% Exellent 78 16 How would you rate the utility billing/finance department services? 2.64% Poor 6 7.05% Fair 16 37.00% Satisfactory 84 91.63% Good 208 61.67% Exellent 140 17 How would you rate the overall quality of services provided by the city? 0.88% Poor 2 26.32% Satisfactory 60 121.05% Good 276			43.84%	Exellent	96
12.75% Fair 26 75.49% Satisfactory 154 69.61% Good 142 38.24% Exellent 78 16 How would you rate the utility billing/finance department services? 2.64% Poor 6 7.05% Fair 16 37.00% Satisfactory 84 91.63% Good 208 61.67% Exellent 140 17 How would you rate the overall quality of services provided by the city? 0.88% Poor 2 26.32% Satisfactory 60 121.05% Good 276	15		3.92%	Poor	8
16   How would you rate the utility billing/finance department services?   2.64%   Poor   6		at about 1.1.4 and \$111. I also and about 1.11	12.75%	Fair	26
16   How would you rate the utility billing/finance department services?   2.64%   Poor   6     7.05%   Fair   16     37.00%   Satisfactory   84     91.63%   Good   208     61.67%   Exellent   140     17   How would you rate the overall quality of services provided by the city?   0.88%   Poor   2     26.32%   Satisfactory   60     121.05%   Good   276     126.32%   Good   276     127.05%   Good   276     128.05%   G			75.49%	Satisfactory	154
16 How would you rate the utility billing/finance department services?  2.64% Poor 6 7.05% Fair 16 37.00% Satisfactory 84 91.63% Good 208 61.67% Exellent 140  17 How would you rate the overall quality of services provided by the city?  26.32% Satisfactory 60 121.05% Good 276			69.61%	Good	142
7.05% Fair 16 37.00% Satisfactory 84 91.63% Good 208 61.67% Exellent 140 17 How would you rate the overall quality of services provided by the city? 0.88% Poor 2 26.32% Satisfactory 60 121.05% Good 276			38.24%	Exellent	78
37.00%   Satisfactory   84   91.63%   Good   208     61.67%   Exellent   140     17   How would you rate the overall quality of services provided by the city?   0.88%   Poor   2   26.32%   Satisfactory   60   121.05%   Good   276	16	How would you rate the utility billing/finance department services?	2.64%	Poor	6
91.63% Good 208 61.67% Exellent 140 17 How would you rate the overall quality of services provided by the city? 0.88% Poor 2 26.32% Satisfactory 60 121.05% Good 276			7.05%	Fair	16
17 How would you rate the overall quality of services provided by the city?  18 Poor 2 26.32% Satisfactory 60 121.05% Good 276			37.00%	Satisfactory	84
17 How would you rate the overall quality of services provided by the city?  26.32% Satisfactory 60 121.05% Good 276			91.63%	Good	208
26.32% Satisfactory 60 121.05% Good 276			61.67%	Exellent	140
121.05% Good 276	17	How would you rate the overall quality of services provided by the city?	0.88%	Poor	2
			26.32%	Satisfactory	60
51.75% Exellent 118			121.05%	Good	276
			51.75%	Exellent	118

Criminal Investigation clearance rate:

68.80%

64.21%

67.00%

67.00%

#1 - Indicate th	he number	of years you	lived in Nev	v Ulm.															
	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019										
01-09 yr	23	25	15	27	19	22	18	42	34										
10-19 yr	19	25	17	29	15	23		38											
20-29 yr	24	18	15	18	20	18		23											
30-39 yr 40-49 yr	23 21	18 22	13 27	13 24	22 13	28 19		23 23											
50-59 yr	18	17	15	18	10	11		24											
60-69 yr	10	11	10	12	13	9		15											
70-79 yr	3	6	2	5	4	10	3	9											
80-89 yr	3	0	4	2	1	2		5											
90-99 yr	0	0	0	1	1	0		0											
Avg. % change	32.40	32.09 -0.96%	35.72 11.31%	32.09 -10.16%	33.07 3.05%	33.23 0.48%		31.91 0.66%											
NOTE: 2011-20:	17 300 surve	ys mailed; 20	18 500 surve	ys mailed															
#2 - How would	ld you rate 1	the overall a	ppearance o	of the city?															
Scale		2011	%	2012	%	2013	%	2014	%	2015	%	2016	%	2017	%	2018	%	2019	%
1 Poor		2	1.14	0	1.14	0		1	0.40	2	0.87	1	0.40	1	0.44	1	0.44	1	0.44
2 Fair		2	1.14	6	1.14	2		1			0.00			0	0.00	2	0.87	1	0.44
3 Satisfactory		15	8.57	24	8.57	15		20			5.68			8	3.49	29	12.66	34	14.85
4 Good 5 Excellent		89 67	53.71 35.43	110 40	53.71 35.43	76 60		101 55		77 51	33.62 22.27			85 44	37.12 19.21	150 65	65.50 28.38	127	55.46
Avg. rating		4.21	33.43	4.02	33.43	4.27		4.17		4.22	22.21	4.15		4.24	19.21	4.12	28.38	66 4.12	28.82
% change		-		-4.51%		6.22%		-2.34%		1.20%		-1.66%		2.17%		-2.83%		0.00%	
#3 - How would	d you desci	ribe your ove	erall feeling	of police pro	otection serv	ices in the	city?												
Scale		2011	%	2012	%	2013	%	2014	%	2015	%	2016	%	2017	%	2018	%	2019	%
1 Poor		1	0.57	1	0.57	2	0.80	3	1.20	2	0.87	1	0.40	2	0.87	3	1.30	0	0.00
2 Fair		5	2.84	8	2.84	7		4		4	1.75			0	0.00	5	2.17	3	1.30
3 Satisfactory		14	7.95	19	7.95	22		16			9.17			15	6.52	29	12.61	22	9.57
4 Good		89 67	50.57	79	50.57	65		81		52	22.71			47	20.43	108	46.96	103	44.78
5 Excellent Avg. rating		4.23	38.07	71 4.19	38.07	59 4.11		72 4.22		65 4.21	28.38	4.31		74 4.38	32.17	104 4.22	45.22	102 4.32	44.35
% change		4.23		-0.95%		-1.91%		2.68%		-0.24%		2.38%		1.62%		-3.65%		2.37%	
														1.027		3.0370		2.5770	
Part I Crime stati	istics:	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012		2014		2016	2017								
Homicide Rape		0 3	0 2	0 1	0	0 2		1 5	0		0 10								
Robbery		0	0	1	0	0		1			2								
Agg Assault		3	9	6	3	4	11	4			11								
Burglary		52	82	67	89	61		58			43								
Theft		199	175	153	176	171	131	194	135	98	121	144							
Auto Theft		9	9	7	2	3		11		5	10								
Arson		1	0	0	0	0		1			1								
Human Traffickir Total	ng	0 267	0	0	0	0		0			12								
Part II Crime Stat	tistics:	267	277	235	270	241	200	275	177	149	210	174							
Other Assault		67	84	85	88	61	79	65	64	74	67	52							
Forgery		2	7	4	7	6		7	6	4	7								
Fraud		42	39	38	34	34	27	23	44	28	57								
Embezzlement		0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0	0								
Stolen Property Vandalism		3 145	1 150	2 107	3 113	2 102	2 91	4 85	1 87	2 94	1 66								
Weapons		6	130	4	113	5	7	4		1	1								
Prostitution		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	1								
Sex Offenses		13	7	4	14	11	8	7		18	15								
Narcotics		48	33	43	32	46	37	47	31	56	48								
Gambling		0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0							
Family & Chlidre	en	24	16	8	3	1		6	12	6	11								
DUI		66	78	71	61	62	64	41	44	55	36								
Liquor Laws		46	45	46	38	25	23	21	15	11	10								
Drunkeness Disorderly Condu	uct	0 137	142	106	0	140	0	0	0	0	0								
Disorderly Condu Vagrancy	uct	137 0	142 0	106 0	95 0	140 0	96 0	88 0	76 0	65 0	70 0								
Other Ex-Traffic		258	105	100	92	119	180	216	253	268	319								
Total		857	708	618	580	615	629	615	653	686	709	437							
Priority Police av	erage respo	nse time:			2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019						
Dor	mestics				2 minutes		2 min 20 sec			5 min 11 sec 3			4 min 23 sec						
	dical Assists			3	min. 30 sec.					1 min 23 sec 3			3 min 35 sec						
Per	rsonal Injury	Acc.			min. 30 sec.					2 min 5 sec 3			5 min 31 sec						
Calle for Consider					0.700	0.000	0.252	05.24	11017	***	11170	10040	10533						
Calls for Service:					9,799	9,803	9,753	9521	11013	N/A	11178	10048	10532						

70.00%

74.00%

72.00%

62.00%

				_															
icale L Boor		2011	% 1.72	2012	% 173	2013	%	2014	%	2015 0	%	2016 0	%	2017	% 0.00	2018	% 0.00	2019	%
Poor Fair		3	1.73 1.73	0	1.73 1.73	1 0	0.40 0.00	0	0.00 0.00	0	0.00 0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0 1	0.00 0.44	0 4	0.00 1.76
Satisfactor	v	5	2.89	13	2.89	7	2.82	7	2.82	8	3.49	8	3.23	5	2.20	16	7.05	11	4.85
Good	,	56	32.37	66	32.37	54	21.77	81	32.66	46	20.09	66	26.61	45	19.82	89	39.21	78	34.36
Excellent		106	61.27	96	61.27	93	37.50	89	35.89	89	38.86	94	37.90	88	38.77	142	62.56	134	59.03
vg. rating		4.5		4.46		4.54		4.46		4.57	2.00	4.51		4.60		4.50		4.51	
6 change		-		-0.89%		1.79%		-1.76%		2.47%		-1.31%		2.00%		-2.17%		0.22%	
nsurance Se	rvice Office (I	SO) Fire rating	ţ:		in town														
verage resp	onse time (d	ispatch to scer	ne) in-town:	9	rural														
		Goal ≤7 min.	2009 7.85	2010 6.57	2011 5.44	2012 5.42	2013 5.51	2014 5.73	2015 5.17	2016 4.73	2017 4.91	2018 4.36	2019 5.14						
Number of fi	ire calls per o	opulation - (# c					5.51	3.73	5.17	4.73	4.51	4.30	3.14						
	Numbe	er of fire calls	от сапо, роран	2.7		. <b>population</b>							116						
Рориа	tion (2018 State Fire call	s/population							140.	N. Why			13,645 9						
Rental Inspe	ctions	607	N/A	N/A	832	748	647	550	889	647	924	659	884						
#5 - How w	ould you rat	e the overall	condition of	city streets	?														
Scale		2011	%	2012	%	2013	%	2014	%	2015	%	2016	%	2017	%	2018	%	2019	%
1 Poor		6	3.43	8	3.43	3	1.20	4	1.61	3	1.31	4	1.61	2	0.87	10	4.35	9	3.91
2 fair		14	8	20	8	16	6.43	18	7.23	15	6.55	27	10.84	10	4.35	31	13.48	29	12.61
3 Satisfactor	У	74	42.29	72	42.29	60	24.10	79	31.73	55	24.02	62	24.90	39	16.96	94	40.87	91	39.57
4 Good		63	36	63	36	60	24.10	60	24.10	58	25.33	62	24.90	71	30.87	100	43.48	90	39.13
Excellent		18	10.29	16	10.29	17	6.83	17	6.83	13	5.68	16	6.43	16	6.96	14	6.09	11	4.78
lvg. rating		3.42		3.33		3.46 3.90%		3.38 -2.31%		3.44 1.78%		3.35 -2.62%		3.64 8.66%		3.31 -9.07%		3.28 -0.91%	
% change Pavement Co	ondition Inde	in miles of st	reet:	-2.63%		3.3076		2.3176		1.7070		2.0276		0.00%		3.0176		3.3176	
Rating:	Score:	2011		2012		2013		2014		2015		2016		2017		2018		2019	
Adequate	66-100 pts	43.52	53.31%	45.38	55.42%	43.81	53.51%	45.98	55.96%	48.29	58.15%	47.65	57.04%	50.07	59.45%	52.16	61.58%	0.5162	60.52%
Marginal	28-66 pts	9.53	11.67%	10.22	12.48%	10.54	12.87%	10.54	12.83%	14.56	17.53%	16.47	19.72%	18.44	21.89%	18.19	21.48%	0.1915	22.45%
Failed	0-28 pts	28.70	35.15%	26.04	31.80%	27.53	33.62%	25.65	31.22%	20.20	24.32%	19.41	23.24%	15.72	18.66%	14.35	16.94%	0.1453	17.03%
Total miles		81.75		81.64		81.88		82.17		83.05		83.53		84.23		84.7		85.3	
#6 - How w	ould you rat	e the overall	quality of sn	owplowing	on city stree	ts?						***							
Scale		2011	%	2012	%	2013	%	2014	%	2015	%	2016	%	2017	%	2018	%	2019	%
1 Poor		8	4.6	8	4.6	10	4.00	6	2.40	5	2.18	6	2.40	7	3.06	18	7.86	10	4.37
2 Fair		12	6.9	16	6.9	18	7.20	13	5.20	5	2.18	12	4.80	11	4.80	29	12.66	20	8.73
3 Satisfactor	У	56	32.18	44	32.18	35	14.00	41	16.40	33	14.41	51	20.40	27	11.79	58	25.33	49	21.40
4 Good		70	40.23	72	40.23	63	25.20	79	31.60	67	29.26	68	27.20	59	25.76	100	43.67	109	47.60
5 Excellent		28	16.09	38 3.65	16.09	29 3.54	11.60	39 3.74	15.60	33 3.83	14.41	34 3.65	13.60	33 3.73	14.41	45 3.50	19.65	41 3.66	17.90
Avg. rating % change		3.56		2.53%		-3.01%		5.65%		2.41%		-4.70%		2.19%		-6.17%		4.57%	
Number of n	niles																		
of city street		81.75		83.21		83.48		85.52		88.8		88.8		88.8		89.08		89.08	
Snow removes	al equipment al operators:	:			units FTE's	14 u 14 F		14 t 14 F		14 u 14 F		14 un 14 FT		14 u 14 F		14 u 14 F		14 L 14 F	units FTE's
Figures repre	esent 2012 an	d 2013																	
#7 - How w	ould you rat	e the depend	dability and o	verall qualit	ty of city san	tary sewer se	ervices?												
Scale		2011	%	2012	%	2013	%	2014	%	2015	%	2016	%	2017	%	2018	%	2019	%
1 Poor		2	1.14	0	1.14	1	0.40	0	0.00	1	0.44	0	0.00	2	0.88	2	0.88	1	0.44
2 Fair		1	0.57	2	0.57	0	0.00	2	0.81	1	0.44	2	0.81	3	1.33	3	1.33	0	0.00
3 Satisfactor 3 Good	y	19 81	10.8 46.02	27 85	10.8 46.02	16 68	6.48 27.53	25 94	10.12 38.06	17 68	7.42 29.69	20 <b>85</b>	8.10 34.41	8 70	3.54 30.97	30 117	13.27 51.77	23 106	10.18 46.90
Excellent		73	41.48	63	41.48	68	27.53	56	22.67	55	24.02	63	25.51	56	24.78	95	42.04	96	42.48
vg. rating		4.26	41.46	4.18	41.48	4.32	21.33	4.15	22.07	4.23	24.02	4.23	25.51	4.26	24.70	4.21	72.04	4.31	72.90
K change		4.20		-1.88%		3.35%		-3.94%		1.93%		0.00%		0.71%		-1.17%		2.38%	
	ewage blocka	ges per 100 co																	
			2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019					
Goal: 0 Goal: 0		ratio actual#	0 0 per 5189	0.0192 1 per 5199	0 0 per 5197	0.0192 1 per 5220 0	0 per 5247 0	0 per 5252 0	0 per 5252 0	0 Oper 5297 0	0 per 5300	0 5,358 0 (	0 per 5364 0	0 per 5412					
	on Gallons tre		\$3,557	\$3,800	\$4,061	\$3,958	\$4,721	\$4,406	\$4,196	\$4,249	\$4,318	\$4,342	\$4,358	\$4,452					
						2012 and 2013			. ,	. ,			. ,						
TOTE. MICHELL				d ===															
	y MPCA viola	tions (764 par	ameters teste 0	d annually) 0	1*	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0					

Scale	2011	%	2012	%	2013	%	2014	%	2015	%	2016	%	2017	%	2018	%	2019	%
1 Poor	3	1.7	0	1.7	3	1.20	3	1.20	1	0.44	2010	0.80	3	1.31	1	0.44	3	1.31
? Fair	2	1.14	12	1.14	1	0.40	4	1.61	4	1.75	7	2.81	4	1.75	5	2.18	5	2.18
Satisfactory	22	12.5	27	12.5	17	6.83	25	10.04	16	6.99	22	8.84	10	4.37	36	15.72	28	12.23
1 Good	76	43.18	71	43.18	65	26.10	86	34.54	59	25.76	72	28.92	65	28.38	117	51.09	103	44.98
Excellent	73	41.48	69	41.48	68	27.31	60	24.10	63	27.51	67	26.91	56	24.45	90	39.30	90	39.30
Avg. rating	4.22		4.22		4.26		4.10		4.25		4.15		4.21		4.16		4.19	
% change	-		0.00%		0.95%		-3.76%		3.66%		-2.35%		1.45%		-1.1 <b>9%</b>		0.72%	
Storage capacity:	8.5 million ga	lons in four fa	icilities															
cost per 1,000,000	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019						
f water produced:	\$3,333	\$3,274	\$4,090	\$4,065	\$3,491	\$3,730	\$3,539	\$4,128	\$3,629	\$3,860	\$4,570	\$4,860						
Sallons produced in millions):	785.1	756.9	632.7	655.3	765.3	729.0	772.7	720.9	726.5	750.7	626	625.3						
Water Quality: No cor for * Preliminary figures	ntaminants were di the 5 year review p			ed federal drin	king water st	tandards												
#9 How would you r	ate the dependa	ility and ove	erall quality	of city gas se	rvices?													
Scale	2011	%	2012	%	2013	%	2014	%	2015	%	2016	%	2017	%	2018	%	2019	%
1 Poor	3	1.71	1	1.71	1	0.41	0	0.00	1	0.44	0	0.00	2	0.88	1	0.44	1	0.44
2 Fair	1	0.57	2	0.57	1	0.41	3	1.22	4	1.75	2	0.81	4	1.75	2	0.88	0	0.00
Satisfactory	14	8	23	8	13	5.28	17	6.91	13	5.68	15	6.10	7	3.07	26	11.40	19	8.33
Good	72	41.14	75	41.14	69	28.05	83	33.74	53	23.14	77	31.30	55	24.12	110	48.25	105	46.05
5 Excellent	85	48.57	78	48.57	69 4.33	28.05	73	29.67	72	31.44	75	30.49	67	29.39	107	46.93	103	45.18
Avg. rating % change	4.34		4.27 -1.61%		4.33 1.41%		4.28 -1.15%		4.34 1.40%		4.33 -0.23%		4.34 0.23%		4.30 -0.92%		4.36 1.40%	
		2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019						
Dist. Syst. Gas Leaks		0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	2	0						
Supply Gas Interruptio Volume of Gas sold (m		0 1.540 Mcf	0 1.192 Mcf	0 1.259 Mcf 1.	0 160 Mcf 1	0 1.348 Mcf 1	0 .335 MCF 1	0 .172 MCF 1.	0 21 MCF 1	0 .246 MCF 1.:	0 33 MCF 1	0 88 MCF	<u></u>					
Supply Gas Interruption  Volume of Gas sold (material for the sold forethe sold for the sold for the sold for the sold for the sold for	rate the dependa	1.540 Mcf  ability and or  % 1.17	1.192 Mcf verall quality 2012	1.259 Mcf 1.  y of city elect  % 1.17	ricity servic	es? % 0.81	2014 0	% 0.00	21 MCF 1 2015	% 1.31	2016 1	% 0.40	2017	% 0.00	2018	% 0.87	2019	% 0.44
Supply Gas Interruptio Volume of Gas sold (m  #10 How would you  Scale L Poor	rate the depend:  2011 3 2	1.540 Mcf ability and or % 1.17 1.14	1.192 Mcf verall quality 2012 1 5	1.259 Mcf 1. y of city elect % 1.17 1.14	160 Mcf 1  ricity servic  2013 2 4	es?  0.81 1.61	2014 0 2	% 0.00 0.81	2015 3 4	% 1.31 1.75	2016 1 3	% 0.40 1.21	0 5	0.00 2.18	2 8	0.87 3.49	1 1	0.44 0.44
Supply Gas Interruption Volume of Gas sold (m  #10 How would you  Scale L Poor E Fair B Satisfactory	rate the depend:  2011 3 2 17	1.540 Mcf  **Bility and of  1.17 1.14 9.66	1.192 Mcf  verall quality  2012  1  5 26	1.259 Mcf 1.  y of city elect  % 1.17 1.14 9.66	160 Mcf 1  ricity servic  2013 2 4 17	es?  % 0.81 1.61 6.85	2014 0 2	% 0.00 0.81 8.06	2015 3 4 12	% 1.31 1.75 5.24	2016 1 3 15	% 0.40 1.21 6.05	0 5 8	0.00 2.18 3.49	2 8 26	0.87 3.49 11.35	1 1 22	0.44 0.44 9.61
Supply Gas Interruption  Yolume of Gas sold (mostly the Mostly of Gas sold (mostly of	rate the depend:  2011 3 2	1.540 Mcf ability and or % 1.17 1.14	1.192 Mcf verall quality 2012 1 5	1.259 Mcf 1. y of city elect % 1.17 1.14	160 Mcf 1  ricity servic  2013 2 4 17 64	es?  % 0.81 1.61 6.85 25.81	2014 0 2 20 84	% 0.00 0.81 8.06 33.87	2015 3 4 12 61	% 1.31 1.75 5.24 26.64	2016 1 3 15 81	% 0.40 1.21 6.05 32.66	0 5 8 65	0.00 2.18 3.49 28.38	2 8 26 115	0.87 3.49 11.35 50.22	1 1 22 103	0.44 0.44 9.61 44.98
Supply Gas Interruption Volume of Gas sold (m  #10 How would you  scale 1. Poor 2. Fair 3. Satisfactory 3. Good 5. Excellent	rate the depend:  2011 3 2 17 82	1.540 Mcf *** *** *** *** *** *** *** *** *** **	1.192 Mcf  verall quality  2012  1  5  26  75	1.259 Mcf 1.  y of city elect  % 1.17 1.14 9.66 46.59	160 Mcf 1  ricity servic  2013 2 4 17	es?  % 0.81 1.61 6.85	2014 0 2	% 0.00 0.81 8.06	2015 3 4 12	% 1.31 1.75 5.24	2016 1 3 15	% 0.40 1.21 6.05	0 5 8	0.00 2.18 3.49	2 8 26 115 97	0.87 3.49 11.35	1 22 103 102	0.44 0.44 9.61
Supply Gas Interruption Volume of Gas sold (movernment) VIO How would you Scale I. Poor 2 Fair 3 Satisfactory 4 Good 5 Excellent Nog, rating	rate the depend: 2011 3 2 17 82 72	1.540 Mcf *** *** *** *** *** *** *** *** *** **	1.192 Mcf  verall quality  2012  1  5  26  75  70	1.259 Mcf 1.  y of city elect  % 1.17 1.14 9.66 46.59	160 Mcf 1  ricity servic  2013 2 4 17 64 68	es?  % 0.81 1.61 6.85 25.81	2014 0 2 20 84 72	% 0.00 0.81 8.06 33.87	2015 3 4 12 61 62	% 1.31 1.75 5.24 26.64	2016 1 3 15 81 71	% 0.40 1.21 6.05 32.66	0 5 8 65 60	0.00 2.18 3.49 28.38	2 8 26 115	0.87 3.49 11.35 50.22	1 1 22 103	0.44 0.44 9.61 44.98
supply Gas Interruption foliume of Gas sold (more of Gas sold (mor	rate the depend:  2011 3 2 17 82 72 4.24	1.540 Mcf  **  1.17  1.14  9.66  46.59  40.91	2012 1 5 26 75 70 4.18 -1.42%	1.259 Mcf 1. y of city elect % 1.17 1.14 9.66 46.59 40.91	160 Mcf 1  ricity servic  2013 2 4 17 64 68 4.24 1.44% 2011	es?  % 0.81 1.61 6.85 25.81 27.42	2014 0 2 20 84 72 4.27 0.71%	% 0.00 0.81 8.06 33.87 29.03	2015 3 4 12 61 62 4.23 -0.94%	% 1.31 1.75 5.24 26.64 27.07	2016 1 3 15 81 71 4.27 0.95%	% 0.40 1.21 6.05 32.66 28.63	0 5 8 65 60 4.30 0.70%	0.00 2.18 3.49 28.38	2 8 26 115 97 4.20	0.87 3.49 11.35 50.22	1 22 103 102 4.33	0.44 0.44 9.61 44.98
supply Gas Interruption follower of Gas sold (moreoff Gas sold (mo	rate the depend:  2011 3 2 17 82 72 4.24	1.540 Mcf  **  **  **  **  **  **  **  **  **	1.192 Mcf  verall quality  2012  1  5  26  75  70  4.18  -1.42%  2009  0.18	1.259 Mcf 1.  y of city elect  1.17 1.14 9.66 46.59 40.91  2010 2.13	2013 2 4 17 64 68 4.24 1.44% 2011 0.18	es?  % 0.81 1.61 6.85 25.81 27.42	2014 0 2 20 84 72 4.27 0.71% 2013 0.52	% 0.00 0.81 8.06 33.87 29.03	2015 3 4 12 61 62 4.23 -0.94% 2015 0.066	% 1.31 1.75 5.24 26.64 27.07	2016 1 3 15 81 71 4.27 0.95% 2017 0.2632	% 0.40 1.21 6.05 32.66 28.63	0 5 8 65 60 4.30 0.70% 2019	0.00 2.18 3.49 28.38	2 8 26 115 97 4.20	0.87 3.49 11.35 50.22	1 22 103 102 4.33	0.44 0.44 9.61 44.98
#10 How would you scale I. Poor 2 Fair 3 Good 5 Excellent Avg. rating 6 Change  2006 US / 5AIFI 1.49 inter 6AIDI 244 minu	rate the depend:  2011 3 2 17 82 72 4.24 Average rruptions/cust. tes	1.540 Mcf  **  1.17  1.14  9.66  46.59  40.91	2012 1 5 26 75 70 4.18 -1.42%	1.259 Mcf 1. y of city elect % 1.17 1.14 9.66 46.59 40.91	160 Mcf 1  ricity servic  2013 2 4 17 64 68 4.24 1.44% 2011	es?  % 0.81 1.61 6.85 25.81 27.42	2014 0 2 20 84 72 4.27 0.71%	% 0.00 0.81 8.06 33.87 29.03	2015 3 4 12 61 62 4.23 -0.94%	% 1.31 1.75 5.24 26.64 27.07	2016 1 3 15 81 71 4.27 0.95%	% 0.40 1.21 6.05 32.66 28.63	0 5 8 65 60 4.30 0.70%	0.00 2.18 3.49 28.38	2 8 26 115 97 4.20	0.87 3.49 11.35 50.22	1 22 103 102 4.33	0.44 0.44 9.61 44.98
Supply Gas Interruption Volume of Gas sold (m #10 How would you Scale 1 Poor 2 Fair 3 Satisfactory 4 Good 5 Excellent Avg. rating % change  2006 US J. SAIFI 1.49 inter SAIDI 244 minu CAIDI 164 minu SAIFI = Total number of SAIDI Sum of total int CAIDI = Sum of total int	rate the depend:  2011 3 2 17 82 72 4.24 - Average ruptions/cust. tes ters f interruptions divise terruption duration	1.540 Mcf  ability and or  %  1.17 1.14 9.66 46.59 40.91  Goal 0 0 0 ded by total in si in minutes s divided by t	1.192 Mcf  2012  1 5 26 75 70 4.18 -1.42%  2009 0.18 1.73 9.42  20umber of custivided by tototal number	1.259 Mcf 1. y of city elect % 1.17 1.14 9.66 46.59 40.91  2010 2.13 78.6 36.94 stormers tal number of cof interruption	2013 2 4 17 64 4.24 1.44% 2011 0.18 9.7 53.8	es?  % 0.81 1.61 6.85 25.81 27.42	2014 0 0 2 20 84 72 0.71% 2013 0.52 14.95	% 0.00 0.81 8.06 33.87 29.03	2015 3 4 12 61 62 4.23 -0.94% 2015 0.066 3.38	% 1.31 1.75 5.24 26.64 27.07	2016 1 3 15 81 71 4.27 0.95% 2017 0.2632 11.22	% 0.40 1.21 6.05 32.66 28.63 2018 0.0304 3.186	0 5 8 65 60 4.30 0.70% 2019 0.7 68.37	0.00 2.18 3.49 28.38	2 8 26 115 97 4.20	0.87 3.49 11.35 50.22	1 22 103 102 4.33	0.44 0.44 9.61 44.98
Supply Gas Interruption Volume of Gas sold (more	rate the depend:  2011 3 2 17 82 72 4.24 - Average ruptions/cust. tes ters f interruptions divise terruption duration	1.540 Mcf  ability and or  %  1.17 1.14 9.66 46.59 40.91  Goal 0 0 0 ded by total in si in minutes s divided by t	1.192 Mcf  2012  1 5 26 75 70 4.18 -1.42%  2009 0.18 1.73 9.42  20umber of custivided by tototal number	1.259 Mcf 1. y of city elect % 1.17 1.14 9.66 46.59 40.91  2010 2.13 78.6 36.94 stormers tal number of cof interruption	2013 2 4 17 64 4.24 1.44% 2011 0.18 9.7 53.8	es?  % 0.81 1.61 6.85 25.81 27.42	2014 0 0 2 20 84 72 0.71% 2013 0.52 14.95	% 0.00 0.81 8.06 33.87 29.03	2015 3 4 12 61 62 4.23 -0.94% 2015 0.066 3.38	% 1.31 1.75 5.24 26.64 27.07	2016 1 3 15 81 71 4.27 0.95% 2017 0.2632 11.22	% 0.40 1.21 6.05 32.66 28.63 2018 0.0304 3.186	0 5 8 65 60 4.30 0.70% 2019 0.7 68.37	0.00 2.18 3.49 28.38	2 8 26 115 97 4.20	0.87 3.49 11.35 50.22	1 22 103 102 4.33	0.44 0.44 9.61 44.98
Supply Gas Interruption Volume of Gas sold (m  #10 How would you  Scale I Poor 2 Fair 3 Satisfactory 4 Good 5 Excellent Avg, rating 86 change  2006 US / 5AIFI 1.49 inter SAIDI 244 minu CAIDI 164 minu SAIFI = Total number of SAIDI Sum of total int CAIDI Sum of total int CAIDI Sum of total int  #11 How would you Scale	rate the depend:  2011 3 2 17 82 72 4.24 - Average ruptions/cust. tes tes f interruption duration erruption duration erruption duration	ability and or % 1.17 1.14 9.66 46.59 40.91  Goal 0 0 0 ded by total in is in minutes is divided by t	1.192 Mcf  2012 1 5 26 75 70 4.18 -1.42% 2009 0.18 1.73 9.42  sumber of cust divided by tot otal number.	1.259 Mcf 1. y of city elect % 1.17 1.14 9.66 46.59 40.91 2010 2.13 78.6 36.94 stomers tal number of cof interruption	2013 2 4 17 64 68 4.24 1.44% 2011 0.18 9.7 53.8	es?  % 0.81 1.61 6.85 25.81 27.42  2012 0.32 2.88 88.62	2014 0 2 20 84 72 4.27 0.71% 2013 0.52 14.95 28.75	% 0.00 0.81 8.06 33.87 29.03 2014 0.65 64.39 99.67	2015 3 4 12 61 62 4.23 -0.94% 2015 0.066 3.38 51.2	% 1.31 1.75 5.24 26.64 27.07  2016 0.09 8.04 88.65	2016 1 3 15 81 71 4.27 0.95% 2017 0.2632 11.22 42.61	% 0.40 1.21 6.05 32.66 28.63 2018 0.0304 3.186 104.913	0 5 8 65 60 4.30 0.70% 2019 0.7 68.37 96.84	0.00 2.18 3.49 28.38 26.20	2 8 26 115 97 4.20 -2.33%	0.87 3.49 11.35 50.22 42.36	1 1 22 103 102 4.33 3.10%	0.44 0.44 9.61 44.98 44.54
Supply Gas Interruption Volume of Gas sold (m  #10 How would you  Scale 1. Poor 2. Fair 3. Satisfactory 4. Good 5. Excellent Avg. rating 6. Change  2006 US / 5. SAIFI 1. 49 inter 5. SAIFI 1. 41 inter 5. SAIFI 1. 41 inter 5. SAIFI 1. 42 inter 5. SAIFI 1. 43 inter 5. SAIFI 1. 44 inter 5. SAIFI 1. 45 inter 5. SAIFI 1. 47 inter 5. SAIFI 1. 48 inter 5. SAIFI 1. 49 inter 5. SAIFI 1. 40 inte	rate the depend:  2011 3 2 17 82 72 4.24 Average ruptions/cust. tes tes f interruption duration erruption duration rate the overall of	1.540 Mcf  shillty and or  1.17 1.14 9.66 46.59 40.91  Goal 0 0 0 ded by total ns in minutes is divided by total and so divided by total ns in which the solution of city.	1.192 Mcf  verall quality  2012  1 5 26 75 70 4.18 -1.42% 2009 0.18 1.73 9.42  sumber of custivided by too otal numbers  y recreations 2012	1.259 Mcf 1. y of city elect % 1.17 1.14 9.66 46.59 40.91 2010 2.13 78.6 36.94 storners tal number of cof interruption al programs? %	160 Mcf 1  2013 2 4 17 64 68 4.24 1.44% 2011 0.18 9.7 53.8	.348 Mcf 1 es? % 0.81 1.61 6.85 25.81 27.42 2012 0.32 2.84 88.62	2014 0 2 2 0 2 2 0 84 72 4.27 0.71% 2013 0.52 14.95 28.75	% 0.00 0.81 8.06 33.87 29.03 2014 0.65 64.39 99.67	2015 3 4 12 661 662 4.23 -0.94% 2015 0.066 3.38 51.2	% 1.31 1.75 5.24 27.07 2016 0.09 8.04 88.65	2016 1 3 15 81 71 4.27 0.95% 2017 0.2632 11.22 42.61	% 0.40 1.21 6.05 32.66 28.63 2018 0.0304 3.186 104.913	0 5 8 65 60 4.30 0.70% 2019 0.7 68.37 96.84	0.00 2.18 3.49 28.38 26.20	2 8 26 115 97 4.20 -2.33%	0.87 3.49 11.35 50.22 42.36	1 1 22 103 102 4.33 3.10%	0.44 0.44 9.61 44.98 44.54
#10 How would you  Scale 1 Poor 2 Fair 3 Good 5 Excellent Avg. rating 6 K change  2006 US J.  SAIFI 1.49 inter SAIDI 164 minu SAIFI = Total number of SAIDI= Sum of total inti	rate the depend:  2011 3 2 17 82 72 4.24 Average ruptions/cust. tes tes f interruption duration erruption duration arrate the overall of 2011 4 7 17	1.540 Mcf  shillty and or  1.17 1.14 9.66 46.59 40.91  Goal 0 0 0 ded by total ns in minutes is divided by total and so divided by total ns in minutes is divided by t  uality of city  2.33 4.07	1.192 Mcf  verall quality  2012  1 5 26 75 70 4.18 -1.42% 2009 0.18 1.73 9.42  sumber of custivided by too total number:  verceation: 2012 2 8 8 26	1.259 Mcf 1. y of city elect % 1.17 1.14 9.66 46.59 40.91  2010 2.13 78.6 36.94 storners tal number of cof interruption al programs? % 2.33	2013 160 Mcf 1 2013 2 4 17 64 68 4.24 1.44% 2011 0.18 9.7 53.8	*** ss. *** ss	2014 0 2 2 2 0 2 2 0 84 72 4.27 0.71% 2013 0.55 28.75	% 0.00 0.81 8.06 33.87 29.03 2014 0.65 64.39 99.67	2015 3 4 12 661 62 4.23 -0.94% 2015 0.066 3.38 51.2	% 1.31 1.75 5.24 26.64 27.07  2016 0.09 8.04 88.65	2016 1 3 15 81 71 4.27 0.95% 2017 0.2632 11.22 42.61	% 0.40 1.21 6.05 32.66 28.63 2018 0.0304 3.186 104.913	0 5 8 65 60 4.30 0.70% 2019 0.7 68.37 96.84	0.00 2.18 3.49 28.38 26.20	2 8 26 115 97 4.20 -2.33%	0.87 3.49 11.35 50.22 42.36	1 1 22 103 102 4.33 3.10%	0.44 0.44 9.61 44.98 44.54
Supply Gas Interruption Volume of Gas sold (movernment)  ##10 How would you scale 1 Poor 2 Fair Satisfactory 4 Good SExcellent Awg. rating & Change  2006 US / SAIFI 1.49 inter SAIDI 244 minu 164 minu SAIFI = Total number of SAIDI Sum of total interpretation of total int	rate the depend:  2011 3 2 17 82 72 4.24 4.24 Average rruptions/cust. tes tes f interruption duration erruption duration rate the overall of 7 17 78	1.540 Mcf  **  1.17  1.14  9.66  46.59  40.91  Goal  0  0  0  ded by total in sis in minutes: s divided by t	1.192 Mcf  verall quality  2012  1 5 6 75 70 4.18 -1.42% 2009 0.18 1.73 9.42  sumber of custivided by tototal number.  vercreation:  2012 2 8 26 6 76	1.259 Mcf 1. y of city elect % 1.17 1.14 9.66 46.59 40.91  2010 2.13 78.6 36.94  storners tal number of cof interruption al programs? % 2.33 4.07 9.88 45.35	2013 2 4 17 68 4.24 1.44% 2011 0.18 9.7 53.8 sustomers 5	*** *** *** *** *** *** *** *** *** **	2014 0 2 2 2 4.27 0.71% 2013 0.52 14.95 28.75	% 0.00 0.81 8.06 33.87 29.03 2014 0.65 64.39 99.67 % 0.00 1.65 11.93 30.04	2015 3 4 12 661 62 4.23 -0.94% 2015 0.066 3.38 51.2	% 1.31 1.75 5.24 27.07  2016 0.09 8.04 88.65	2016 1 3 15 81 71 4.27 0.95% 2017 0.2632 11.22 42.61	% 0.40 1.21 6.05 32.66 28.63 2018 0.0304 3.186 104.913	0 5 8 65 60 4.30 0.70% 2019 0.7 68.37 96.84	0.00 2.18 3.38 26.20 % 0.00 0.00	2 8 26 115 97 4.20 -2.33%	0.87 3.49 11.35 50.22 42.36 % 0.88 2.65	1 1 22 103 102 4.33 3.10%	0.44 0.44 9.61 44.98 44.54
Supply Gas Interruption Volume of Gas sold (more volume of Gas sold (more volume of Gas sold (more volume of Gas sold)  Scale  1. Poor  2. Satisfactory  3. Good  5. Excellent  4. Ag., rating  4. Change  2. 2006 US //  3. AIFI 1. 49 interested in the control of	rate the depend:  2011 3 2 17 82 72 4.24  Average erruptions/cust. tes terruption duration erruption duration erruption duration erruption duration rate the overall of 7 7 78 66	1.540 Mcf  shillty and or  1.17 1.14 9.66 46.59 40.91  Goal 0 0 0 ded by total ns in minutes is divided by total and so divided by total ns in minutes is divided by t  uality of city  2.33 4.07	1.192 Mcf  verall quality  2012 1 5 26 75 70 4.18 -1.42% 2009 0.18 1.73 9.42  sumber of custivided by tototal number:  vereation: 2012 2 8 26 76 67	1.259 Mcf 1. y of city elect % 1.17 1.14 9.66 46.59 40.91  2010 2.13 78.6 36.94 stomers tal number of cof interruption al programs? % 2.33 4.07 9.88	2013 1 5 21 7 7 59 59	**************************************	2014 0 2 20 84 72 4.27 0.71% 2013 0.52 14.95 28.75	% 0.00 0.81 8.06 33.87 29.03 2014 0.65 64.39 99.67 % 0.00 1.65 11.93	2015 3 4 12 61 62 4.23 -0.94% 2015 0.066 3.38 51.2 2015 1 2 2 2 2 6 4 5 4	% 1.31 1.75 5.24 27.07  2016 0.09 8.04 88.65	2016 1 3 15 81 71 4.27 0.95% 2017 0.2632 11.22 42.61	% 0.40 1.21 6.05 32.66 28.63 2018 0.0304 3.186 104.913	0 5 8 65 60 0.70% 2019 0.7 68.37 96.84	% 0.00 2.18 3.49 28.38 26.20	2 8 26 115 97 4.20 -2.33% 2018 2 6 6 41	% 0.87 3.49 11.35 50.22 42.36 % 0.88 2.65 18.14	1 1 22 103 102 4.33 3.10%	0.44 0.44 9.61 44.98 44.54 % 0.88 0.88 17.26
supply Gas Interruption follower of Gas sold (more of Gas sold (mo	rate the depend:  2011 3 2 17 82 72 4.24 4.24 Average rruptions/cust. tes tes f interruption duration erruption duration rate the overall of 7 17 78	1.540 Mcf  **  1.17  1.14  9.66  46.59  40.91  Goal  0  0  0  ded by total in sis in minutes: s divided by t	1.192 Mcf  verall quality  2012  1 5 6 75 70 4.18 -1.42% 2009 0.18 1.73 9.42  sumber of custivided by tototal number.  vercreation:  2012 2 8 26 6 76	1.259 Mcf 1. y of city elect % 1.17 1.14 9.66 46.59 40.91  2010 2.13 78.6 36.94  storners tal number of cof interruption al programs? % 2.33 4.07 9.88 45.35	160 Mcf 1  ricity servic  2013 2 4 17 64 68 4.24 1.44% 2011 0.18 9.7 53.8  rustomers 5 2013 1 5 21 70 59 4.16	*** *** *** *** *** *** *** *** *** **	2014 0 2 20 84 72 4.27 0.71% 2013 0.92 14.95 28.75	% 0.00 0.81 8.06 33.87 29.03 2014 0.65 64.39 99.67 % 0.00 1.65 11.93 30.04	2015 3 4 12 661 662 4.23 -0.94% 2015 0.066 3.38 51.2 2015 1 2 22 64 54 4.17	% 1.31 1.75 5.24 27.07  2016 0.09 8.04 88.65	2016 1 3 15 81 71 4.27 0.95% 2017 0.2632 11.22 42.61  2016 2 5 15 80 65 4.20	% 0.40 1.21 6.05 32.66 28.63 2018 0.0304 3.186 104.913	0 5 8 65 60 4.30 0.70% 2019 0.7 68.37 96.84 2017 0 0 12 60 67 4.40	% 0.00 2.18 3.49 28.38 26.20	2 8 26 115 97 4.20 -2.33% 2018 2 6 41 99 95 4.15	% 0.88 2.65 50.22 42.36	1 1 1 22 103 102 4.33 3.10%	% 0.88 0.88 0.88 0.88 0.88
Supply Gas Interruption Volume of Gas sold (moreovolume of Gas sold (mo	rate the depend:  2011 3 2 17 82 4.24 Average erruptions/cust. tes finterruption duration erruption duration erruption duration rate the overall of 7 7 78 66 4.13	1.540 Mcf  **  1.17  1.14  9.66  46.59  40.91  Goal  0  0  0  ded by total in sis in minutes: s divided by t	1.192 Mcf  verall quality  2012  1 5 26 75 70 4.18 -1.42% 2009 0.18 1.73 9.42 20umber of curdivided by too otal number:  vercreation: 2012 2 8 26 76 67 76 67 4.11	1.259 Mcf 1. y of city elect % 1.17 1.14 9.66 46.59 40.91  2010 2.13 78.6 36.94  storners tal number of cof interruption al programs? % 2.33 4.07 9.88 45.35	2013 1 5 21 7 7 59 59	*** *** *** *** *** *** *** *** *** **	2014 0 2 20 84 72 4.27 0.71% 2013 0.52 14.95 28.75	% 0.00 0.81 8.06 33.87 29.03 2014 0.65 64.39 99.67 % 0.00 1.65 11.93 30.04	2015 3 4 12 61 62 4.23 -0.94% 2015 0.066 3.38 51.2 2015 1 2 2 2 2 6 4 5 4	% 1.31 1.75 5.24 27.07  2016 0.09 8.04 88.65	2016 1 3 15 81 71 4.27 0.95% 2017 0.2632 11.22 42.61	% 0.40 1.21 6.05 32.66 28.63 2018 0.0304 3.186 104.913	0 5 8 65 60 4.30 0.70% 2019 0.7 68.37 96.84	% 0.00 2.18 3.49 28.38 26.20	2 8 26 115 97 4.20 -2.33% 2018 2 6 41 99 95	% 0.88 2.65 50.22 42.36	1 1 1 22 103 102 4.33 3.10%	% 0.88 0.88 0.88 0.88 0.88
Supply Gas Interruption Volume of Gas sold (more volume of Gas sold (more volume of Gas sold (more volume of Gas sold)  Scale  1. Poor  2. Satisfactory  3. Good  5. Excellent  Avg. rating  4. Change  2. 2006 US / A.  3. AIFI	rate the depend:  2011 3 2 17 82 4.24 Average erruptions/cust. tes finterruption duration erruption duration erruption duration rate the overall of 7 7 78 66 4.13	1.540 Mcf  **  1.17  1.14  9.66  46.59  40.91  Goal  0  0  0  ded by total in sis in minutes: s divided by t	1.192 Mcf  verall quality  2012  1 5 26 75 70 4.18 -1.42%  2009 0.18 1.73 9.42  pumber of cudivided by too total number:  vercreation: 2012 2 8 6 6 6 6 7 4.11 -0.48%	1.259 Mcf 1. y of city elect % 1.17 1.14 9.66 46.59 40.91  2010 2.13 78.6 36.94 stomers tal number of cof interruption al programs? % 2.33 4.07 9.88 45.35 38.37	2013 1 5 2 2 1 7 7 0 5 9 9 4.16 1.22%	*** se?**  ***  ***  ***  **  **  **  **  **	2014 0 2 20 4.72 4.27 0.71% 2013 0.52 14.95 28.75	% 0.00 0.81 8.06 33.87 29.03 2014 0.65 64.39 99.67 % 0.00 1.65 11.93 30.04 27.98	2015 3 4 12 661 62 4.23 -0.94% 2015 0.066 3.38 51.2 2015 1 2 2 2 2 64 54 4.17 -0.24% 2017 1,346 906	246 MCF 1  % 1.31 1.75 5.24 26.64 27.07  2016 0.09 8.04 88.65  % 0.44 0.87 9.61 27.95 23.58	2016 1 3 15 81 71 4.27 0.95% 2017 0.2632 11.22 42.61  2016 2 5 15 80 65 4.20 0.72% 2019 1143 600	% 0.40 1.21 6.05 32.66 28.63 2018 0.0304 3.186 104.913	0 5 8 65 60 4.30 0.70% 2019 0.7 68.37 96.84 2017 0 0 12 60 67 4.40	% 0.00 2.18 3.49 28.38 26.20	2 8 26 115 97 4.20 -2.33% 2018 2 6 41 99 95 4.15	% 0.88 2.65 50.22 42.36	1 1 1 22 103 102 4.33 3.10%	% 0.88 0.88 0.88 0.88 17.26 46.02
Supply Gas Interruption Volume of Gas sold (more volume of Gas sold (mo	rate the depend:  2011 3 2 17 82 72 4.24 - Average ruptions/cust. tes tes f interruption duration rate the overall of 2011 4 7 17 78 66 4.13 - articipants	1.540 Mcf  **  1.17  1.14  9.66  46.59  40.91  Goal  0  0  0  ded by total in sis in minutes: s divided by t	1.192 Mcf  verall quality  2012  1 5 26 75 70 4.18 -1.42%  2009 0.18 1.73 9.42  pumber of cudivided by too total number:  vercreation: 2012 2 8 6 6 6 6 7 4.11 -0.48%	1.259 Mcf 1. y of city elect % 1.17 1.14 9.66 46.59 40.91  2010 2.13 78.6 36.94 stomers tal number of cof interruption al programs? % 2.33 4.07 9.88 45.35 38.37	2013 1 5 2 2 1 7 7 0 5 9 9 4.16 1.22%	*** se?**  ***  ***  ***  **  **  **  **  **	2014 0 2 20 4.72 4.27 0.71% 2013 0.52 14.95 28.75	% 0.00 0.81 8.06 33.87 29.03 2014 0.65 64.39 99.67 % 0.00 1.65 11.93 30.04 27.98	2015 3 4 12 61 62 4.23 -0.94% 2015 0.066 3.38 51.2 2015 1 2 2 64 4.3 -0.94% 2017 1,346	% 1.31 1.75 5.24 26.64 27.07  2016 0.09 8.04 88.65  % 0.44 0.87 9.61 27.95 23.58	2016 1 3 15 81 71 4.27 0.95% 2017 0.2632 11.22 42.61  2016 2 5 15 80 65 4.20 0.72% 2019	% 0.40 1.21 6.05 32.66 28.63 2018 0.0304 3.186 104.913	0 5 8 65 60 4.30 0.70% 2019 0.7 68.37 96.84 2017 0 0 12 60 67 4.40	% 0.00 2.18 3.49 28.38 26.20	2 8 26 115 97 4.20 -2.33% 2018 2 6 41 99 95 4.15	% 0.88 2.65 50.22 42.36	1 1 1 22 103 102 4.33 3.10%	% 0.88 0.88 0.88 0.88 0.88
Supply Gas Interruption Volume of Gas sold (moverage of Gas sold (	rate the depend:  2011 3 2 17 82 72 4.24 - Average rruptions/cust. tes tes f interruption duration erruption duration erruption duration 2011 4 7 17 78 66 4.13 - articipants	1.540 Mcf  **  1.17  1.14  9.66  40.59  40.91  Goal  0  0  0  ded by total in is in minutes: s divided by t  **  2.33  4.07  9.88  45.35  38.37	1.192 Mcf  verall qualit  2012  1 5 26 75 70 4.18 -1.42% 2009 0.18 1.73 9.42  sumber of custivided by tol otal number:  verceation: 2012 2 8 26 76 67 71 4.11 -0.48%	1.259 Mcf 1. y of city elect % 1.17 1.14 9.66 46.59 40.91  2010 2.13 78.6 36.94 stomers tal number of cof interruption al programs? % 2.33 4.07 9.88 45.35 38.37	160 Mcf 1  ricity servic  2013 2 4 17 64 68 4.24 1.444 2011 0.18 9.7 53.8  rustomers 5 2013 1 5 21 70 59 4.16 1.22% 2013	**************************************	2014 0 2 20 84 72 4.27 0.71% 2013 0.92 14.95 28.75	% 0.00 0.81 8.06 33.87 29.03  2014 0.65 64.39 99.67  % 0.00 1.65 11.93 30.04 27.98	2015 3 4 12 661 662 4.23 -0.94% 2015 0.066 3.38 51.2 2015 1 2 22 64 4.17 -0.24% 2017 1.346 906 791	246 MCF 1  % 1.31 1.75 5.24 26.64 27.07  2016 0.09 8.04 88.65  % 0.44 0.87 9.61 27.95 23.58  1108 700 560	2016 1 3 15 81 71 4.27 0.95% 2017 0.2632 11.22 42.61  2016 2 5 15 80 65 4.20 0.72% 2019 1143 600 545	% 0.40 1.21 6.05 32.66 28.63 2018 0.0304 3.186 104.913	0 5 8 65 60 4.30 0.70% 2019 0.7 68.37 96.84 2017 0 0 12 60 67 4.40	% 0.00 2.18 3.49 28.38 26.20	2 8 26 115 97 4.20 -2.33% 2018 2 6 41 99 95 4.15	% 0.88 2.65 50.22 42.36	1 1 1 22 103 102 4.33 3.10%	% 0.88 0.88 0.88 0.88 17.26 46.02
Supply Gas Interruption Volume of Gas sold (moreovolume of Gas sold (mo	rate the depend:  2011 3 2 17 82 72 4.24 - Average rruptions/cust. tes tes f interruption duration erruption duration erruption duration 2011 4 7 17 78 66 4.13 - articipants	1.540 Mcf  **  1.17  1.14  9.66  40.59  40.91  Goal  0  0  0  ded by total in is in minutes: s divided by t  **  2.33  4.07  9.88  45.35  38.37	1.192 Mcf  verall qualit  2012  1 5 26 75 70 4.18 -1.42% 2009 0.18 1.73 9.42  sumber of custivided by tol otal number:  verceation: 2012 2 8 26 76 67 71 4.11 -0.48%	1.259 Mcf 1. y of city elect % 1.17 1.14 9.66 46.59 40.91  2010 2.13 78.6 36.94 stomers tal number of cof interruption al programs? % 2.33 4.07 9.88 45.35 38.37	160 Mcf 1  ricity servic  2013 2 4 17 64 68 4.24 1.444 2011 0.18 9.7 53.8  rustomers 5 2013 1 5 21 70 59 4.16 1.22% 2013	**************************************	2014 0 2 2 00 84 72 4.27 0.71% 2013 0.52 14.95 28.75	% 0.00 0.81 8.06 33.87 29.03  2014 0.65 64.39 99.67  % 0.00 1.65 11.93 30.04 27.98	2015 3 4 12 661 662 4.23 -0.94% 2015 1 2 22 64 5.1 2 22 64 5.1 7 -0.24% 2017 1,346 906 791 3,043	% 1.31 1.75 5.24 26.64 27.07  2016 0.09 8.04 88.65  % 0.44 0.87 9.61 27.95 23.58  2018 1108 700 560 2368	2016 1 3 15 81 71 4.27 0.95% 2017 0.2632 11.22 42.61  2016 2 5 15 80 65 4.20 0.72% 2019 1143 600 545 2288	% 0.40 1.21 6.05 32.66 28.63 2018 0.0304 3.186 104.913	0 5 8 65 60 4.30 0.70% 2019 0.7 68.37 96.84 2017 0 0 12 60 67 4.40	% 0.00 2.18 3.49 28.38 26.20	2 8 26 115 97 4.20 -2.33% 2018 2 6 41 99 95 4.15	% 0.88 2.65 50.22 42.36	1 1 1 22 103 102 4.33 3.10%	% 0.88 0.88 0.88 0.88 17.26 46.02
Supply Gas Interruption Volume of Gas sold (more	rate the depend:  2011 3 2 17 82 72 4.24 - Average rruptions/cust. tes tes f interruption duration erruption duration erruption duration arte the overall of 4 7 17 78 66 4.13 - articipants	1.540 Mcf  **  1.17  1.14  9.66  46.59  40.91  Goal  0  0  0  ded by total in is in minutes: s divided by t	1.192 Mcf  verall quality  2012  1 5 26 75 70 4.18 -1.42% 2009 0.18 1.73 9.42  sumber of custivided by too total number:  verceation: 2012 2 8 26 67 4.11 -0.48% 2011	1.259 Mcf 1. y of city elect % 1.17 1.14 9.66 46.59 40.91  2010 2.13 78.6 36.94  storners tal number of cof interruption al programs? % 2.33 4.07 9.88 45.35 38.37	2013 1 5 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2	*** *** *** *** *** *** *** *** *** **	2014 0 2 2 2 4.27 0.71% 2013 0.52 28.75 2014 0 4 29 73 68 4.18 9.048% 2015	% 0.00 0.81 8.06 33.87 29.03  2014 0.65 64.39 99.67  % 0.00 1.65 11.93 3.004 27.98	2015 3 4 12 661 62 4.23 -0.94% 2015 0.066 3.38 51.2 2015 1 2 2 2 64 5.4 4.17 -0.24% 2017 1,346 906 791 3,043 3,268	246 MCF 1  % 1.31 1.75 5.24 26.64 27.07  2016 0.09 8.04 88.65   % 0.44 0.87 9.61 27.95 23.58  1108 700 560 2368 4600	2016 1 3 15 81 71 4.27 0.95% 2017 0.2632 11.22 42.61  2016 2 5 15 80 65 4.20 0.72% 2019 1143 600 545 2288 5055	% 0.40 1.21 6.05 32.66 28.63 2018 0.0304 3.186 104.913	0 5 8 65 60 4.30 0.70% 2019 0.7 68.37 96.84 2017 0 0 12 60 67 4.40	% 0.00 2.18 3.49 28.38 26.20	2 8 26 115 97 4.20 -2.33% 2018 2 6 41 99 95 4.15	% 0.88 2.65 50.22 42.36	1 1 1 22 103 102 4.33 3.10%	% 0.88 0.88 0.88 0.88 17.26 46.02

NOTE: 2011-2017 totals reflect overall quality of city recreational programs and facilities combined. In 2018, question was divided into two separate questions by program and facilities.

Scale 1 Poor 2 Fair 3 Satisfactory 4 Good	2011 4	%	2012	%	2013	%	2014	%	2015	%	2016	%	2017	%	2018	%	2019	%
! Fair ! Satisfactory		2.33	2	2.33	1	0.41	0	0.00	1	0.44	2	0.82	0	0.00	3	1.33	1	0.44
	7	4.07	8	4.07	5	2.06	4	1.65	2	0.87	5	2.06	0	0.00	6	2.65	4	1.77
Good	17	9.88	26	9.88	21	8.64	29	11.93	22	9.61	15	6.17	12	5.31	36	15.93	28	12.39
	78	45.35	76	45.35	70	28.81	73	30.04	64	27.95	80	32.92	60	26.55	100	44.25	103	45.58
i Excellent	66	38.37	67	38.37	59	24.28	68	27.98	54	23.58	65	26.75	67	29.65	101	44.69	92	40.71
lvg. rating	4.13		4.11		4.16		4.18		4.17		4.20		4.40		4.18		4.23	
% change	-		-0.48%		1.22%		0.48%		-0.24%		0.72%		4.76%		-5.00%		1.20%	
A - 6 C - 1884 - 10 b-			43		42		42		43		43		43		43		43	
of Facilities/Parks	41		42			4				. 4	43 177,343		43 177,343 sq	4	177,343 sq	. 6	43 177,343 sq	. 64
	177,343 sq	rt	177,343 sq f	rt.	177,343 sq	n	177,343 sq 319	ıı	177,343 sq 319	į it	319		319	11	319	4 114	319	i i i
Park Area in acres	319		319		319 143		143		143		143		143		143		143	
Park Area mowed Trail miles	143 6.3		143 6.3		6.3		6.3		6.3		6.3		6.3		6.3		6.3	
trail miles	0.3		0.3		0.3		0.5		0.3		0.3		0.5		0.5		0.5	
NOTE: 2011-2017 totals reflec	t overall qua	ality of city re	creational pro	grams and fa	cilities combir	ned. In 2018,	question was	divided into t	wo separate	questions by p	rogram and fac	cilitles.						
#13 How would you rate the	e library se	rvices in the	e city?															
Scale	2011	%	2012	%	2013	%	2014	%	2015	%	2016	%	2017	%	2018	%	2019	%
1 Poor	3	1.79	1	1.79	1	0.42	0	0.00	1	0.44	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	0.46
2 Fair	2	1.19	2	1.19	1	0.42	0	0.00	1	0.44	٥	0.00	1	0.46	3	1.37	0	0.00
3 Satisfactory	15	8.93	28	8.93	17	7.08	24	10.00	15	6.55	13	5.42	8	3.65	29	13.24	30	13.70
4 Good	74	44.05	67	44.05	65	27.08	72	30.00	58	25.33	66	27.50	55	25.11	92	42.01	86	39.27
5 Excellent	74	44.05	72	44.05	68	28.33	75	31.25	63	27.51	86	35.83	72	32.88	116	52.97	102	46.58
Avg. rating	4.27		4.22		4.30		4.30		4.31		4.44		4.46		4.34		4.32	
% change	-		-1.17%		1.90%		0.00%		0.23%		3.02%		0.45%		-2.69%		-0.46%	
	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019							
Circulation Children	72327	66640	71630	76853	72653	71546	55856	61438	62652	70568	72105							
Circulation Adult	95839	79399	80213	71208	69899	67295	59640	64849	67359	70312	71166							
Public Computer Use	16259	17173	15826	15939	18352	25956	20640	19383	18593	14966	13818							
Stimated Visits	76830	82433	79031	85723	75414	80717	70637	65738	78414	116745	114286							
of Cardholders	6929	6367	6374	6443	6302	5594	6391	6486	6424	7452	7863							
NOTE: 2015 totals are lower du 2016 will be more accurate.	ue to migrati	ion of autom	ataion system	in February.	Total for Janu	ary/February	2015 not acco	unted for.										
#1.6 U.a		: liennoina -	nemittina on	d building i	senaction car	nicae in the	ritu?											
													2047		2010	•	2010	
Scale	2011	%	2012	%	2013	%	2014	% 0.86	2015	% 1.75	2016	% 0.00	2017	% 0.91	2018	% 1.83	2019	% 0.91
Scale 1 Poor	2011	% 2.42	2012 8	% 2.42	2013 4	% 1.72	2014	0.86	4	1.75	0	0.00	2	0.91	4	1.83	2	0.91
Scale 1 Poor 2 Fair	2011 4 10	% 2.42 6.06	2012 8 12	% 2.42 6.06	2013 4 5	% 1.72 2.16	2014 2 8	0.86 3.45	4 8	1.75 3.49	0 8	0.00 3.45	2 4	0.91 1.83	4 15	1.83 6.85	2 9	0.91 4.11
Scale 1 Poor 2 Fair 3 Satisfactory	2011 4 10 41	% 2.42 6.06 24.85	2012 8 12 47	% 2.42 6.06 24.85	2013 4 5 50	% 1.72 2.16 21.55	2014 2 8 46	0.86 3.45 19.83	4 8 39	1.75 3.49 17.03	0 8 45	0.00 3.45 19.40	2 4 26	0.91 1.83 11.87	4 15 68	1.83 6.85 31.05	2 9 62	0.91 4.11 28.31
Scale 1 Poor 2 Fair 3 Satisfactory 4 Good	2011 4 10 41 78	% 2.42 6.06 24.85 47.27	2012 8 12 47 66	% 2.42 6.06 24.85 47.27	2013 4 5 50 61	% 1.72 2.16 21.55 26.29	2014 2 8 46 79	0.86 3.45 19.83 34.05	4 8 39 59	1.75 3.49 17.03 25.76	0 8 45 76	0.00 3.45 19.40 32.76	2 4 26 67	0.91 1.83	4 15	1.83 6.85	2 9	0.91 4.11 28.31 44.75
Scale 1 Poor 2 Fair 3 Satisfactory 4 Good 5 Excellent	2011 4 10 41 78 32	% 2.42 6.06 24.85	2012 8 12 47 66 35	% 2.42 6.06 24.85	2013 4 5 50 61 32	% 1.72 2.16 21.55	2014 2 8 46 79 35	0.86 3.45 19.83	4 8 39 59 30	1.75 3.49 17.03	0 8 45	0.00 3.45 19.40	2 4 26	0.91 1.83 11.87 30.59	4 15 68 98	1.83 6.85 31.05 44.75	2 9 62 98	0.91 4.11 28.31 44.75
Scale 1 Poor 2 Fair 3 Satisfactory 4 Good 5 Excellent Avg. rating	2011 4 10 41 78	% 2.42 6.06 24.85 47.27	2012 8 12 47 66	% 2.42 6.06 24.85 47.27	2013 4 5 50 61	% 1.72 2.16 21.55 26.29	2014 2 8 46 79	0.86 3.45 19.83 34.05	4 8 39 59	1.75 3.49 17.03 25.76	0 8 45 76 36	0.00 3.45 19.40 32.76	2 4 26 67 35	0.91 1.83 11.87 30.59	4 15 68 98 47	1.83 6.85 31.05 44.75	2 9 62 98 48	0.91 4.11 28.31 44.75
#14 How would you rate the Scale 1 Poor 2 Fair 3 Satisfactory 4 Good 5 Excellent Avg. rating % change	2011 4 10 41 78 32	% 2.42 6.06 24.85 47.27	2012 8 12 47 66 35 3.64	% 2.42 6.06 24.85 47.27	2013 4 5 50 61 32 3.74	% 1.72 2.16 21.55 26.29	2014 2 8 46 79 35 3.81	0.86 3.45 19.83 34.05	4 8 39 59 30 3.74	1.75 3.49 17.03 25.76	0 8 45 76 36 3.85	0.00 3.45 19.40 32.76	2 4 26 67 35 3.96	0.91 1.83 11.87 30.59	4 15 68 98 47 3.73	1.83 6.85 31.05 44.75	2 9 62 98 48 3.83	
Scale 1 Poor 2 Fair 3 Satisfactory 4 Good 5 Excellent Avg. rating % change	2011 4 10 41 78 32 3.75	% 2.42 6.06 24.85 47.27 19.39	2012 8 12 47 66 35 3.64	% 2.42 6.06 24.85 47.27 19.39	2013 4 5 50 61 32 3.74 2.75%	% 1.72 2.16 21.55 26.29 13.79	2014 2 8 46 79 35 3.81 1.87%	0.86 3.45 19.83 34.05 15.09	4 8 39 59 30 3.74 -1.84%	1.75 3.49 17.03 25.76 13.10	0 8 45 76 36 3.85 2.94%	0.00 3.45 19.40 32.76 15.52	2 4 26 67 35 3.96	0.91 1.83 11.87 30.59	4 15 68 98 47 3.73	1.83 6.85 31.05 44.75	2 9 62 98 48 3.83	0.91 4.11 28.31 44.75
Scale 1 Poor 2 Fair 3 Satisfactory 4 Good 5 Excellent Avg. rating	2011 4 10 41 78 32 3.75 -	% 2.42 6.06 24.85 47.27 19.39	2012 8 12 47 66 35 3.64 -2.93% 2010 2,051	% 2.42 6.06 24.85 47.27 19.39	2013 4 5 50 61 32 3.74 2.75% 2012 528	% 1.72 2.16 21.55 26.29 13.79 2013 410	2014 2 8 46 79 35 3.81 1.87% 2014 431	0.86 3.45 19.83 34.05 15.09 2015 370	4 8 39 59 30 3.74 -1.84%	1.75 3.49 17.03 25.76 13.10	0 8 45 76 36 3.85 2.94%	0.00 3.45 19.40 32.76 15.52	2 4 26 67 35 3.96	0.91 1.83 11.87 30.59	4 15 68 98 47 3.73	1.83 6.85 31.05 44.75	2 9 62 98 48 3.83	0.91 4.11 28.31 44.75
Scale 1 Poor 2 Fair 3 Satisfactory 4 Good 5 Excellent Avg. rating % change  Total Building Permits  #15 How would you rate the	2011 4 10 41 78 32 3.75 Goal N/A	% 2.42 6.06 24.85 47.27 19.39 2009 546	2012 8 12 47 66 35 3.64 -2.93% 2010 2,051	% 2.42 6.06 24.85 47.27 19.39 2011 1,213	2013 4 5 50 61 32 3.74 2.75% 2012 528	% 1.72 2.16 21.55 26.29 13.79 2013 410	2014 2 8 46 79 35 3.81 1.87% 2014 431	0.86 3.45 19.83 34.05 15.09 2015 370	4 8 39 59 30 3.74 -1.84% 2016 375	1.75 3.49 17.03 25.76 13.10	0 8 45 76 36 3.85 2.94% 2018 269	0.00 3.45 19.40 32.76 15.52 2019 303	2 4 26 67 35 3.96 2.86%	0.91 1.83 11.87 30.59 15.98	4 15 68 98 47 3.73 -5.81%	1.83 6.85 31.05 44.75 21.46	2 9 62 98 48 3.83 2.68%	0.91 4.11 28.31 44.75 21.92
Scale 1 Poor 2 Fair 3 Satisfactory 4 Good 5 Excellent Avg. rating % change  Total Building Permits  #15 How would you rate the Scale 1 Poor	2011 4 10 41 78 32 3.75 - Goal N/A	% 2.42 6.06 24.85 47.27 19.39 2009 546 and programs % 0	2012 8 12 47 66 35 3.64 -2.93% 2010 2,051 	% 2.42 6.06 24.85 47.27 19.39 2011 1,213	2013 4 5 50 61 32 3.74 2.75% 2012 528 Access Chann	% 1.72 2.16 21.55 26.29 13.79 2013 410	2014 2 8 46 79 35 3.81 1.87% 2014 431	0.86 3.45 19.83 34.05 15.09 2015 370	4 8 39 59 30 3.74 -1.84% 2016 375	1.75 3.49 17.03 25.76 13.10 2017 339	0 8 45 76 36 3.85 2.94% 2018 269	0.00 3.45 19.40 32.76 15.52 2019 303	2 4 26 67 35 3.96 2.86%	0.91 1.83 11.87 30.59 15.98	4 15 68 98 47 3.73 -5.81%	1.83 6.85 31.05 44.75 21.46	2 9 62 98 48 3.83 2.68%	0.91 4.11 28.31 44.75 21.92
Scale 1 Poor 2 Fair 3 Satisfactory 4 Good 5 Excellent Avg. rating % change  Total Building Permits  #15 How would you rate the Scale 1 Poor 2 Fair	2011 4 10 41 78 32 3.75 Goal N/A	% 2.42 6.06 24.85 47.27 19.39 2009 546 and programs % 0 0	2012 8 12 47 66 35 3.64 -2.93% 2010 2,051 ming of the Co	% 2.42 6.06 24.85 47.27 19.39 2011 1,213	2013 4 5 5 60 61 32 3.74 2.75% 2012 528 Access Chann 2013 5 10	% 1.72 2.16 21.55 26.29 13.79 2013 410	2014 2 8 46 79 35 3.81 187% 2014 431	0.86 3.45 19.83 34.05 15.09 2015 370 ** 1.40 6.54	4 8 39 59 30 3.74 -1.84% 2016 375 2015 2 7	1.75 3.49 17.03 25.76 13.10 2017 339 % 0.87 3.06	0 8 45 76 36 3.85 2.94% 2018 269	0.00 3.45 19.40 32.76 15.52 2019 303 % 0.93 5.14	2 4 26 67 35 3.96 2.86%	0.91 1.83 11.87 30.59 15.98	4 15 68 98 47 3.73 -5.81%	1.83 6.85 31.05 44.75 21.46	2 9 62 98 48 3.83 2.68%	0.91 4.11 28.31 44.75 21.92 % 1.96 6.37
Scale 1 Poor 2 Fair 3 Satisfactory 4 Good 5 Excellent Avg. rating % change  Total Building Permits  #15 How would you rate the Scale 1 Poor 2 Fair 3 Satisfactory	2011 4 10 41 78 32 3.75 Goal N/A	% 2.42 6.06 24.85 47.27 19.39 2009 546 md programs % 0 0 0 0	2012 8 12 47 66 35 3.64 -2.93% 2010 2,051 	% 2.42 6.06 24.85 47.27 19.39 2011 1,213	2013 4 5 50 61 32 3.74 2.75% 2012 528 Access Chann 2013 5 10 49	% 1.72 2.16 21.55 26.29 13.79  2013 410  net also know % 2.34 4.67 22.90	2014 2 8 46 79 35 3.81 187% 2014 431 2014 3 14 55	0.86 3.45 19.83 34.05 15.09 2015 370 % 1.40 6.54 25.70	4 8 8 39 59 30 3.74 -1.84% 2016 375 2015 2 7 49	1.75 3.49 17.03 25.76 13.10 2017 339 % 0.87 3.06 21.40	0 8 45 76 36 3.85 2.94% 2018 269	0.00 3.45 19.40 32.76 15.52 2019 303 % 0.93 5.14 26.64	2 4 26 67 35 3.96 2.86%	% 0.98 2.45 15.69	4 15 68 98 47 3.73 -5.81% 2018 3 18	1.83 6.85 31.05 44.75 21.46 % 1.47 8.82 45.10	2 9 62 98 48 3.83 2.68%	% 1.96 6.37 37.75
Scale 1 Poor 2 Fair 3 Satisfactory 4 Good 5 Excellent Avg. rating % change  Total Building Permits  #15 How would you rate the Scale 1 Poor 2 Fair 3 Satisfactory 4 Good	2011 4 10 41 78 32 3.75 - Goal N/A	% 2.42 6.06 24.85 47.27 19.39 2009 546 and programs % 0 0 0 0 0 0	2012 8 12 47 66 35 3.64 -2.93% 2010 2,051 	% 2.42 6.06 24.85 47.27 19.39 2011 1,213 2011 1,213 2011 0000000000000000000000000000000	2013 4 5 50 61 32 3.74 2.75% 2012 528 Access Chann 2013 5 10 49 954	% 1.72 2.16 21.55 26.29 13.79 2013 410 we also know % 2.34 4.67 22.90 25.23	2014 2 8 46 7 9 35 3.81 1.87% 2014 431 2014 3 14 55 61	0.86 3.45 19.83 34.05 15.09 2015 370 % 1.40 6.54 25.70 28.50	4 8 8 39 59 30 3.74 -1.84% 2016 375 2015 2 7 49 46	1.75 3.49 17.03 25.76 13.10 2017 339 % 0.87 3.06 21.40 20.09	0 8 45 76 36 3.85 2.94% 2018 269 2016 2 11 57 53	0.00 3.45 19.40 32.76 15.52 2019 303 % 0.93 5.14 26.64 24.77	2 4 4 26 67 35 3.96 2.86% 2017 2 5 32 5 4	% 0.98 15.69 15.98	4 15 68 98 47 3.73 -5.81% 2018 3 18 92 76	1.83 6.85 31.05 44.75 21.46 % 1.47 8.82 45.10 37.25	2 9 62 98 48 3.83 2.68%	% 1.96 6.37 34.80
Scale 1 Poor 2 Fair 3 Satisfactory 4 Good 5 Excellent Avg. rating % change  Total Building Permits  #15 How would you rate the Scale 1 Poor 2 Fair 3 Satisfactory 4 Good 5 Excellent	2011 4 10 41 78 32 3.75 - Goal N/A 2011 0 0	% 2.42 6.06 24.85 47.27 19.39 2009 546 md programs % 0 0 0 0	2012 8 12 47 66 35 3.64 -2.93% 2010 2,051 ming of the Co	% 2.42 6.06 24.85 47.27 19.39 2011 1,213	2013 4 5 5 60 61 32 3.74 2.75% 2012 528 Access Chann 2013 5 10 49 54 26	% 1.72 2.16 21.55 26.29 13.79  2013 410  net also know % 2.34 4.67 22.90	2014 2 8 46 79 35 3.81 187% 2014 431 2014 3 14 55 61 128	0.86 3.45 19.83 34.05 15.09 2015 370 % 1.40 6.54 25.70	4 8 8 39 59 30 3.74 -1.84% 2016 375 2015 2 7 49 46 6 22	1.75 3.49 17.03 25.76 13.10 2017 339 % 0.87 3.06 21.40	0 8 45 76 36 3.85 2.94% 2018 269 2016 2 11 57 53 31	0.00 3.45 19.40 32.76 15.52 2019 303 % 0.93 5.14 26.64	2 4 4 26 67 35 3.96 2.86% 2.86	% 0.98 2.45 15.69	4 15 68 98 47 3.73 -5.81% 2018 3 18 92 76 6 25	1.83 6.85 31.05 44.75 21.46 % 1.47 8.82 45.10	2 9 62 98 48 3.83 2.68% 2019 4 13 77 71 39	% 1.96 6.37 34.80
Scale 1 Poor 2 Fair 3 Satisfactory 4 Good 5 Excellent Avg. rating % change  Total Building Permits  #15 How would you rate the Scale 1 Poor 2 Fair 3 Satisfactory 4 Good 5 Excellent Avg. rating	2011 4 10 41 78 32 3.75 - Goal N/A	% 2.42 6.06 24.85 47.27 19.39 2009 546 and programs % 0 0 0 0 0 0	2012 8 12 47 66 35 3.64 -2.93% 2010 2,051 ming of the Co	% 2.42 6.06 24.85 47.27 19.39 2011 1,213 2011 1,213 2011 0000000000000000000000000000000	2013 4 5 50 61 32 3.74 2.75% 2012 528 Access Chann 2013 5 10 49 54 26 3.60	% 1.72 2.16 21.55 26.29 13.79 2013 410 we also know % 2.34 4.67 22.90 25.23	2014 2 8 46 79 35 3.81 1.87% 2014 431 2014 3 14 55 61 28 3.60	0.86 3.45 19.83 34.05 15.09 2015 370 % 1.40 6.54 25.70 28.50	4 8 8 39 59 30 3.74 -1.84% 2016 375 2015 2 7 49 46 22 3.63	1.75 3.49 17.03 25.76 13.10 2017 339 % 0.87 3.06 21.40 20.09	0 8 45 76 36 3.85 2.94% 2018 269 2016 2 11 57 53 31 3.65	0.00 3.45 19.40 32.76 15.52 2019 303 % 0.93 5.14 26.64 24.77	2 4 4 26 67 35 3.96 2.86% 2017 2 5 32 54 32 3.87	% 0.98 15.69 15.98	4 15 68 98 47 3.73 -5.81% 2018 3 18 92 76 25 3.48	1.83 6.85 31.05 44.75 21.46 % 1.47 8.82 45.10 37.25	2 98 48 3.83 2.68% 2019 4 13 77 71 39 3.63	% 1.96 6.37 34.80
Scale 1 Poor 2 Fair 3 Satisfactory 4 Good 5 Excellent Avg. rating % change  Total Building Permits  #15 How would you rate the Scale 1 Poor 2 Fair 3 Satisfactory 4 Good 5 Excellent Avg. rating	2011 4 10 41 78 32 3.75 - Goal N/A 2011 0 0	% 2.42 6.06 24.85 47.27 19.39 2009 546 and programs % 0 0 0 0 0 0	2012 8 12 47 66 35 3.64 -2.93% 2010 2,051 ming of the Co	% 2.42 6.06 24.85 47.27 19.39 2011 1,213 2011 1,213 2011 0000000000000000000000000000000	2013 4 5 5 60 61 32 3.74 2.75% 2012 528 Access Chann 2013 5 10 49 54 26	% 1.72 2.16 21.55 26.29 13.79 2013 410 we also know % 2.34 4.67 22.90 25.23	2014 2 8 46 79 35 3.81 187% 2014 431 2014 3 14 55 61 128	0.86 3.45 19.83 34.05 15.09 2015 370 % 1.40 6.54 25.70 28.50	4 8 8 39 59 30 3.74 -1.84% 2016 375 2015 2 7 49 46 6 22	1.75 3.49 17.03 25.76 13.10 2017 339 % 0.87 3.06 21.40 20.09	0 8 45 76 36 3.85 2.94% 2018 269 2016 2 11 57 53 31	0.00 3.45 19.40 32.76 15.52 2019 303 % 0.93 5.14 26.64 24.77	2 4 4 26 67 35 3.96 2.86% 2.86	% 0.98 15.69 15.98	4 15 68 98 47 3.73 -5.81% 2018 3 18 92 76 6 25	1.83 6.85 31.05 44.75 21.46 % 1.47 8.82 45.10 37.25	2 9 62 98 48 3.83 2.68% 2019 4 13 77 71 39	% 1.96 6.37 34.80
Scale 1 Poor 2 Fair 3 Satisfactory 4 Good 5 Excellent Avg. rating % change  Total Building Permits  #15 How would you rate the Scale 1 Poor 2 Fair 3 Satisfactory 4 Good 5 Excellent Avg. rating	2011 4 10 41 78 32 3.75 - Goal N/A 2011 0 0	% 2.42 6.06 24.85 47.27 19.39  2009 546  0 0 0 0	2012 8 12 47 66 35 3.64 -2.93% 2010 2,051 ming of the Co 2012 6 16 60 54 32 3.54 100.00%	% 2.42 6.06 24.85 47.27 19.39  2011 1,213  community / % 0 0 0 0	2013 4 5 50 61 32 3.74 2.75% 2012 528 Access Chann 2013 5 10 49 54 26 3.60 1.69%	% 1.72 2.16 21.55 26.29 13.79 2013 410 weil also know % 2.34 4.67 22.90 25.23 12.15	2014 2 8 46 79 35 3.81 1.87% 2014 431 2014 3 14 55 61 28 3.60 0.00%	0.86 3.45 19.83 34.05 15.09 2015 370 ** ** ** ** ** ** ** ** ** ** ** ** **	4 8 8 39 59 30 3.74 -1.84% 2016 375 2 7 4 9 46 22 3.63 0.83%	1.75 3.49 17.03 25.76 13.10 2017 339 % 0.87 3.06 21.40 20.09 9.61	0 8 45 76 36 3.85 2.94% 2018 269 2016 2 11 57 53 31 3.65 0.55%	0.00 3.45 19.40 32.76 15.52 2019 303 % 0.93 5.14 26.64 24.77 14.49	2 4 4 26 67 35 3.96 2.86% 2017 2 5 32 54 32 3.87	% 0.98 15.69 15.98	4 15 68 98 47 3.73 -5.81% 2018 3 18 92 76 25 3.48	1.83 6.85 31.05 44.75 21.46 % 1.47 8.82 45.10 37.25	2 98 48 3.83 2.68% 2019 4 13 77 71 39 3.63	% 1.96 6.37 34.80
Scale 1 Poor 2 Fair 3 Satisfactory 4 Good 5 Excellent Avg. rating % change  Total Building Permits  #15 How would you rate the Scale 1 Poor 2 Fair 3 Satisfactory 4 Good 5 Excellent Avg. rating % change	2011 4 10 41 78 32 3.75 - Goal N/A 2011 0 0	% 2.42 6.06 24.85 47.27 19.39 2009 546 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	2012 8 12 47 66 35 3.64 -2.93% 2010 2,051 ming of the Co 2012 6 60 54 32 3.54 100.00%	% 2.42 6.06 24.85 47.27 19.39 2011 1,213 2000 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	2013 4 5 50 61 32 3.74 2.75% 2012 528 Access Chann 2013 5 10 49 54 26 3.60 1.69%	% 1.72 2.16 21.55 26.29 13.79  2013 410  ** 4.67 22.90 25.23 12.15	2014 2 8 46 79 35 3.81 1.87% 2014 431 2014 3 14 55 61 12 8 3.60 0.00%	0.86 3.45 19.83 34.05 15.09 2015 370 % 1.40 6.54 25.70 28.50 13.08	4 8 8 39 59 30 3.74 -1.84% 2016 375 2015 2 7 49 46 22 3.63 0.83% 2016	1.75 3.49 17.03 25.76 13.10 2017 339 % 0.87 3.06 21.40 20.09 9.61	0 8 45 76 36 3.85 2.94% 2018 269 2016 2 11 57 53 31 3.65 0.55% 2018	0.00 3.45 19.40 32.76 15.52 2019 303 % 0.93 5.14 26.64 24.77 14.49	2 4 4 26 67 35 3.96 2.86% 2017 2 5 32 54 32 3.87	% 0.98 15.69 15.98	4 15 68 98 47 3.73 -5.81% 2018 3 18 92 76 25 3.48	1.83 6.85 31.05 44.75 21.46 % 1.47 8.82 45.10 37.25	2 98 48 3.83 2.68% 2019 4 13 77 71 39 3.63	% 1.96 6.37 34.80
Scale 1 Poor 2 Fair 3 Satisfactory 4 Good 5 Excellent Avg. rating % change  Total Building Permits  #15 How would you rate the Scale 1 Poor 2 Fair 3 Satisfactory 4 Good 5 Excellent Avg. rating % change	2011 4 10 41 78 32 3.75 - Goal N/A 2011 0 0	% 2.42 6.06 24.85 47.27 19.39 2009 546 0 0 0 0 0 0 2009 2,239	2012 8 12 47 66 35 3.64 -2.93% 2010 2,051 	% 2.42 6.06 24.85 47.27 19.39 2011 1,213 2011 1,213 2011 4,092	2013 4 5 50 61 32 3.74 2.75% 2012 528 Access Chann 2013 5 10 49 54 26 3.60 1.69%	% 1.72 2.16 21.55 26.29 13.79 2013 410 61 21.54 4.67 22.90 25.23 12.15 2013 3,120	2014 2 8 46 79 35 3.81 1.87% 2014 431 2014 3 14 55 61 28 3.60 0.00% 2014 3,312	0.86 3.45 19.83 34.05 15.09 2015 370 % 1.40 6.54 25.70 28.50 13.08	4 8 8 39 59 30 3.74 -1.84% 2016 375 2015 2 7 49 46 22 3.63 0.83% 2016 3,500	1.75 3.49 17.03 25.76 13.10 2017 339 % 0.87 3.06 21.40 20.09 9.51	0 8 45 76 36 3.85 2.94% 2018 269 2016 2 11 57 53 31 3.65 0.55% 2018 3400	0.00 3.45 19.40 32.76 15.52 2019 303 % 0.93 5.14 26.64 24.77 14.49	2 4 4 26 67 35 3.96 2.86% 2017 2 5 32 54 32 3.87	% 0.98 15.69 15.98	4 15 68 98 47 3.73 -5.81% 2018 3 18 92 76 25 3.48	1.83 6.85 31.05 44.75 21.46 % 1.47 8.82 45.10 37.25	2 98 48 3.83 2.68% 2019 4 13 77 71 39 3.63	% 1.96 6.37 34.80
Scale 1 Poor 2 Fair 3 Satisfactory 4 Good 5 Excellent Avg. rating % change  Total Building Permits  #15 How would you rate the Scale 1 Poor 2 Fair 3 Satisfactory 4 Good 5 Excellent Avg. rating % change  Edit Suite use (hours) Studio use (hours)	2011 4 10 41 78 32 3.75 - Goal N/A 2011 0 0	% 2.42 6.06 24.85 47.27 19.39 2009 546 0 0 0 0 0 2009 2,239 125	2012 8 12 47 66 35 3.64 -2.93% 2010 2,051 ming of the Co 2012 6 16 60 54 32 3.54 100.00%	% 2.42 6.06 24.85 47.27 19.39  2011 1,213  community / % 0 0 0 0 2011 4,092 271	2013 4 5 50 61 32 3.74 2.75% 2012 528 2013 5 10 49 54 26 3.69% 2012 3713 est 268 est	% 1.72 2.16 21.55 26.29 13.79 2013 410 4.67 22.90 25.23 12.15 2013 3,120 144	2014 2 8 46 79 35 3.81 1.87% 2014 431 2014 3 14 55 61 28 3.60 0.00% 2014 3.312 192	0.86 3.45 19.83 34.05 15.09  2015 370  *  1.40 6.54 25.70 28.50 13.08	4 8 8 39 59 30 3.74 -1.84% 2016 375 2 7 49 46 22 3.63 0.83% 2016 3.500 47	1.75 3.49 17.03 25.76 13.10  2017 339  % 0.87 3.06 21.40 20.09 9.61	0 8 45 76 36 3.85 2.94% 2018 269 2016 2 11 57 53 31 3.65 0.55% 2018 3400 60	0.00 3.45 19.40 32.76 15.52  2019 303  % 0.93 5.14 26.64 24.77 14.49	2 4 4 26 67 35 3.96 2.86% 2017 2 5 32 54 32 3.87	% 0.98 15.69 15.98	4 15 68 98 47 3.73 -5.81% 2018 3 18 92 76 25 3.48	1.83 6.85 31.05 44.75 21.46 % 1.47 8.82 45.10 37.25	2 98 48 3.83 2.68% 2019 4 13 77 71 39 3.63	% 1.96 6.37 34.80
Scale 1 Poor 2 Fair 3 Satisfactory 4 Good 5 Excellent Avg. rating % change  Total Building Permits  #15 How would you rate the Scale 1 Poor 2 Fair 3 Satisfactory 4 Good 5 Excellent Avg. rating % change	2011 4 10 41 78 32 3.75 - Goal N/A 2011 0 0	% 2.42 6.06 24.85 47.27 19.39 546 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	2012 8 12 47 66 35 3.64 -2.93% 2010 2,051 ming of the Co 2012 6 60 54 32 3.54 100.00% 2010 3,247 156 147	% 2.42 6.06 24.85 47.27 19.39 2011 1,213 2000 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	2013 4 5 50 61 32 3.74 2.75% 2012 528 Access Chann 2013 5 10 49 54 26 3.60 1.69% 2012 3713 est 268 est 145 est 145 est	% 1.72 2.16 21.55 26.29 13.79  2013 410  % 2.34 4.67 22.90 25.23 12.15  2013 3,120 144 175	2014 2 8 46 79 35 3.81 1.87% 2014 431 2014 3 14 55 61 1 28 3.60 0.00% 2014 3.312 192 240	0.86 3.45 19.83 34.05 15.09  2015 370  % 1.40 6.54 25.70 28.50 13.08	4 8 8 39 59 30 3.74 -1.84% 2016 375 2 7 49 46 22 3.63 0.83% 2016 3.500 47 165	1.75 3.49 17.03 25.76 13.10  2017 339  % 0.87 3.06 21.40 20.09 9.51  2017 3,200 38 159	0 8 45 76 36 3.85 2.94% 2018 269 2016 2 11 57 53 31 3.65 0.55% 2018 3400 60 160	0.00 3.45 19.40 32.76 15.52  2019 303  % 0.93 5.14 26.64 24.77 14.49	2 4 4 26 67 35 3.96 2.86% 2017 2 5 32 54 32 3.87	% 0.98 15.69 15.98	4 15 68 98 47 3.73 -5.81% 2018 3 18 92 76 25 3.48	1.83 6.85 31.05 44.75 21.46 % 1.47 8.82 45.10 37.25	2 98 48 3.83 2.68% 2019 4 13 77 71 39 3.63	% 1.96 6.37 34.80
Scale 1 Poor 2 Fair 3 Satisfactory 4 Good 5 Excellent Avg. rating % change  Total Building Permits  #15 How would you rate the Scale 1 Poor 2 Fair 3 Satisfactory 4 Good 5 Excellent Avg. rating % change	2011 4 10 41 78 32 3.75 - Goal N/A 2011 0 0	% 2.42 6.06 24.85 47.27 19.39 2009 546 0 0 0 0 0 2009 2,239 125 154 0	2012 8 12 47 66 35 3.64 -2.93% 2010 2,051 	% 2.42 6.06 24.85 47.27 19.39 2011 1,213 2011 1,213 2011 4,092 271 14,092 271 145 30	2013 4 5 5 50 61 132 3.74 2.75% 2012 528  Access Chann 2013 5 10 49 54 26 3.60 1.69% 2012 3713 est 268 est 145 est	% 1.72 2.16 21.55 26.29 13.79 2013 410 2013 410 2013 12.15 2013 3,120 144 175 36	2014 2 8 46 79 35 3.81 187% 2014 431 2014 3 14 55 61 28 3.60 0.00% 2014 3,312 192 240 36	0.86 3.45 19.83 34.05 15.09 2015 370 % 1.40 6.54 25.70 28.50 13.08	4 8 8 39 59 30 3.74 -1.84% 2016 375 2015 2 7 49 46 22 3.63 0.83% 2016 3,500 47 165 28	1.75 3.49 17.03 25.76 13.10 2017 339 % 0.87 3.06 21.40 20.09 9.61 2017 3,200 38 159 10	0 8 45 76 36 3.85 2.94% 2018 269 2016 2 11 57 53 31 3.65 0.55% 2018 3400 60 160 36	0.00 3.45 19.40 32.76 15.52 2019 303 % 0.93 5.14 26.64 24.77 14.49 2019 3222 151 146 36	2 4 4 26 67 35 3.96 2.86% 2017 2 5 32 54 32 3.87	% 0.98 15.69 15.98	4 15 68 98 47 3.73 -5.81% 2018 3 18 92 76 25 3.48	1.83 6.85 31.05 44.75 21.46 % 1.47 8.82 45.10 37.25	2 98 48 3.83 2.68% 2019 4 13 77 71 39 3.63	% 1.96 6.37 34.80
Scale 1 Poor 2 Fair 3 Satisfactory 4 Good 5 Excellent Avg. rating % change  Total Building Permits  #15 How would you rate the Scale 1 Poor 2 Fair 3 Satisfactory 4 Good 5 Excellent Avg. rating % change  Edit Suite use (hours) Studio use (hours) City meetings produced County meetings produced County meetings produced Live production events	2011 4 10 41 78 32 3.75 - Goal N/A 2011 0 0 0 0	% 2.42 6.06 24.85 47.27 19.39 2009 546 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	2012 8 12 47 66 35 3.64 -2.93% 2010 2,051 	% 2.42 6.06 24.85 47.27 19.39 2011 1,213 2000 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	2013 4 5 50 61 32 3.74 2.75% 2012 528 2013 5 10 49 54 26 3.69% 2012 3713 est 268 est 145 est 36 est 145 est 36 est 16 est 61	% 1.72 2.16 21.55 26.29 13.79 2013 410 61 81s0 know   2.34 4.67 22.90 25.23 12.15 2013 3,120 144 175 36 63	2014 2 8 46 7 7 35 3.81 1.87% 2014 431 2014 3 14 55 61 28 3.60 0.00% 2014 3,312 192 240 36 58	0.86 3.45 19.83 34.05 15.09  2015 370  1.40 6.54 25.70 13.08  2015 4,016 340 245 36 60	4 8 8 39 59 30 3.74 -1.84% 2016 375 2 7 4 9 46 22 3.63 3.63 2016 3.500 47 165 28 47	1.75 3.49 17.03 25.76 13.10  2017 339  % 0.87 3.06 21.40 20.09 9.61  2017 3,200 38 159 10 84	0 8 45 76 36 3.85 2.94% 2018 269 2016 2 11 57 53 31 3.65 0.55% 2018 3400 60 160 36 90	0.00 3.45 19.40 32.76 15.52 2019 303 % 0.93 5.14 26.64 24.77 14.49 2019 3222 151 146 36 40	2 4 4 26 67 35 3.96 2.86% 2017 2 5 32 54 32 3.87	% 0.98 15.69 15.98	4 15 68 98 47 3.73 -5.81% 2018 3 18 92 76 25 3.48	1.83 6.85 31.05 44.75 21.46 % 1.47 8.82 45.10 37.25	2 98 48 3.83 2.68% 2019 4 13 77 71 39 3.63	% 1.96 6.37 34.80
Scale 1 Poor 2 Fair 3 Satisfactory 4 Good 5 Excellent Avg. rating % change  Total Building Permits  #15 How would you rate the Scale 1 Poor 2 Fair 3 Satisfactory 4 Good 5 Excellent Avg. rating % change	2011 4 10 41 78 32 3.75 - Goal N/A 2011 0 0 0 0	% 2.42 6.06 24.85 47.27 19.39 2009 546 0 0 0 0 0 2009 2,239 125 154 0	2012 8 12 47 66 35 3.64 -2.93% 2010 2,051 	% 2.42 6.06 24.85 47.27 19.39 2011 1,213 2011 1,213 2011 4,092 271 14,092 271 145 30	2013 4 5 5 50 61 132 3.74 2.75% 2012 528  Access Chann 2013 5 10 49 54 26 3.60 1.69% 2012 3713 est 268 est 145 est	% 1.72 2.16 21.55 26.29 13.79 2013 410 2013 410 2013 12.15 2013 3,120 144 175 36	2014 2 8 46 79 35 3.81 187% 2014 431 2014 3 14 55 61 28 3.60 0.00% 2014 3,312 192 240 36	0.86 3.45 19.83 34.05 15.09 2015 370 % 1.40 6.54 25.70 28.50 13.08	4 8 8 39 59 30 3.74 -1.84% 2016 375 2015 2 7 49 46 22 3.63 0.83% 2016 3,500 47 165 28	1.75 3.49 17.03 25.76 13.10 2017 339 % 0.87 3.06 21.40 20.09 9.61 2017 3,200 38 159 10	0 8 45 76 36 3.85 2.94% 2018 269 2016 2 11 57 53 31 3.65 0.55% 2018 3400 60 160 36	0.00 3.45 19.40 32.76 15.52 2019 303 % 0.93 5.14 26.64 24.77 14.49 2019 3222 151 146 36	2 4 4 26 67 35 3.96 2.86% 2017 2 5 32 54 32 3.87	% 0.98 15.69 15.98	4 15 68 98 47 3.73 -5.81% 2018 3 18 92 76 25 3.48	1.83 6.85 31.05 44.75 21.46 % 1.47 8.82 45.10 37.25	2 98 48 3.83 2.68% 2019 4 13 77 71 39 3.63	% 1.96 6.37 31.89
Scale 1 Poor 2 Fair 3 Satisfactory 4 Good 5 Excellent Avg. rating % change  Total Building Permits  #15 How would you rate the Scale 1 Poor 2 Fair 3 Satisfactory 4 Good 5 Excellent Avg. rating % change  Edit Suite use (hours) Studio use (hours) City meetings produced County meetings produced County meetings produced County meetings produced Live production events	2011 4 10 41 78 32 3.75 - Goal N/A 2011 0 0 0 0	% 2.42 6.06 24.85 47.27 19.39 2009 546 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	2012 8 12 47 66 35 3.64 -2.93% 2010 2,051 ming of the Co 2012 6 16 60 54 32 3.54 100.00% 2010 3,247 156 147 0 66 YES	% 2.42 6.06 24.85 47.27 19.39 2011 1,213 2000 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	2013 4 5 50 61 32 3.74 2.75% 2012 528 2012 528 Access Chann 2013 5 10 49 54 26 3.60 1.69% 2012 3713 est 268 est 145 est 36 est 145 est 36 est 145 est 145 est 146 est 147 est 148	% 1.72 2.16 21.55 26.29 13.79 2013 410 61 81s0 know   2.34 4.67 22.90 25.23 12.15 2013 3,120 144 175 36 63	2014 2 8 46 7 7 35 3.81 1.87% 2014 431 2014 3 14 55 61 28 3.60 0.00% 2014 3,312 192 240 36 58	0.86 3.45 19.83 34.05 15.09  2015 370  1.40 6.54 25.70 13.08  2015 4,016 340 245 36 60	4 8 8 39 59 30 3.74 -1.84% 2016 375 2 7 4 9 46 22 3.63 3.63 2016 3.500 47 165 28 47	1.75 3.49 17.03 25.76 13.10  2017 339  % 0.87 3.06 21.40 20.09 9.61  2017 3,200 38 159 10 84	0 8 45 76 36 3.85 2.94% 2018 269 2016 2 11 57 53 31 3.65 0.55% 2018 3400 60 160 36 90	0.00 3.45 19.40 32.76 15.52 2019 303 % 0.93 5.14 26.64 24.77 14.49 2019 3222 151 146 36 40	2 4 4 26 67 35 3.96 2.86% 2017 2 5 32 54 32 3.87	% 0.98 15.69 15.98	4 15 68 98 47 3.73 -5.81% 2018 3 18 92 76 25 3.48	1.83 6.85 31.05 44.75 21.46 % 1.47 8.82 45.10 37.25	2 98 48 3.83 2.68% 2019 4 13 77 71 39 3.63	% 1.96 6.37 34.80
Scale 1 Poor 2 Fair 3 Satisfactory 4 Good 5 Excellent Avg. rating % change  Total Building Permits  #15 How would you rate the Scale 1 Poor 2 Fair 3 Satisfactory 4 Good 5 Excellent Avg. rating % change  Edit Suite use (hours) Studio use (hours) City meetings produced County meetings produced County meetings produced Live production events MACTA PEG Award	2011 4 10 41 78 32 3.75 - Goal N/A 2011 0 0 0 0	% 2.42 6.06 24.85 47.27 19.39 2009 546 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	2012 8 12 47 66 35 3.64 -2.93% 2010 2,051 ming of the Co 2012 6 16 60 54 32 3.54 100.00% 2010 3,247 156 147 0 66 YES	% 2.42 6.06 24.85 47.27 19.39 2011 1,213 2000 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	2013 4 5 50 61 32 3.74 2.75% 2012 528 2012 528 Access Chann 2013 5 10 49 54 26 3.60 1.69% 2012 3713 est 268 est 145 est 36 est 145 est 36 est 145 est 145 est 146 est 147 est 148	% 1.72 2.16 21.55 26.29 13.79 2013 410 61 81s0 know   2.34 4.67 22.90 25.23 12.15 2013 3,120 144 175 36 63	2014 2 8 46 7 7 35 3.81 1.87% 2014 431 2014 3 14 55 61 28 3.60 0.00% 2014 3,312 192 240 36 58	0.86 3.45 19.83 34.05 15.09  2015 370  1.40 6.54 25.70 13.08  2015 4,016 340 245 36 60	4 8 8 39 59 30 3.74 -1.84% 2016 375 2 7 4 9 46 22 3.63 3.63 2016 3.500 47 165 28 47	1.75 3.49 17.03 25.76 13.10  2017 339  % 0.87 3.06 21.40 20.09 9.61  2017 3,200 38 159 10 84	0 8 45 76 36 3.85 2.94% 2018 269 2016 2 11 57 53 31 3.65 0.55% 2018 3400 60 160 36 90	0.00 3.45 19.40 32.76 15.52 2019 303 % 0.93 5.14 26.64 24.77 14.49 2019 3222 151 146 36 40	2 4 4 26 67 35 3.96 2.86% 2017 2 5 32 54 32 3.87	% 0.91 1.83 11.87 30.59 15.98 % 0.98 2.45 15.69 26.47 15.69	4 15 68 98 47 3.73 -5.81% 2018 3 18 92 76 25 3.48 -10.08%	1.83 6.85 31.05 44.75 21.46 % 1.47 8.82 45.10 37.25 12.25	2 9 9 4 48 3.83 2.68% 2019 4 13 77 71 39 3.63 4.31%	% 1.92 % 1.96 6.33 37.75 19.12
Scale 1 Poor 2 Fair 3 Satisfactory 4 Good 5 Excellent Avg. rating % change  Total Building Permits  #15 How would you rate the Scale 1 Poor 2 Fair 3 Satisfactory 4 Good 5 Excellent Avg. rating % change  Edit Suite use (hours) Studio use (hours) Studio use (hours) City meetings produced County meetings produced Live production events MACTA PEG Award  #16 How would you rate the Scale	2011 4 10 41 78 32 3.75  Goal N/A  e quality ar  2011 0 0 0 0 0	% 2.42 6.06 24.85 47.27 19.39 546 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	2012 8 12 47 66 35 3.64 -2.93% 2010 2,051 ming of the Co 2012 6 60 54 32 3.54 100.00% 2010 3,247 156 147 0 66 YES	% 2.42 6.06 24.85 47.27 19.39 2011 1,213 2000 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	2013 4 5 5 60 61 32 3.74 2.75% 2012 528  Access Chann 2013 5 10 49 54 26 3.60 1.69% 2012 3713 est 268 est 145 est 36 est 61 est YES	% 1.72 2.16 21.55 26.29 13.79  2013 410  % 2.34 4.67 22.90 25.23 12.15  2013 3,120 144 175 36 63 N/A	2014 2 8 46 79 35 3.81 1.87% 2014 431 2014 3 14 55 61 28 3.60 0.00% 2014 3.312 192 240 36 58 N/A	0.86 3.45 19.83 34.05 15.09  2015 370  % 1.40 6.54 25.70 28.50 13.08  2015 4,016 340 245 36 60 N/A	4 8 8 39 59 30 3.74 -1.84% 2016 375 2015 2 7 49 46 22 3.63 0.83% 2016 3.500 47 165 28 47 N/A	1.75 3.49 17.03 25.76 13.10  2017 339  % 0.87 3.06 21.40 20.09 9.61  2017 3,200 38 159 10 84 no entries	0 8 45 76 36 3.85 2.94% 2018 269 2016 2 11 57 53 31 3.65 0.55% 2018 3400 60 160 36 90 no entries	0.00 3.45 19.40 32.76 15.52 2019 303 % 0.93 5.14 26.64 24.77 14.49 2019 3222 151 146 36 40 no entries	2 4 4 26 67 35 3.96 2.86%	% 0.98 15.69 15.69 2.45 15.69 26.47 15.69	4 15 98 47 3.73 3.75.81% 2018 3 18 92 76 25 3.48 -10.08%	1.83 6.85 31.05 44.75 21.46 % 1.47 8.82 45.10 37.25 12.25	2 9 62 98 48 3.83 2.68% 2019 4 13 77 71 39 3.63 4.31%	% 1.91 % 1.94 6.33 37.75 19.11
Scale 1 Poor 2 Fair 3 Satisfactory 4 Good 5 Excellent Avg. rating % change  Total Building Permits  #15 How would you rate the Scale 1 Poor 2 Fair 3 Satisfactory 4 Good 5 Excellent Avg. rating % change  Edit Suite use (hours) Studio use (hours) City meetings produced County meetings produced County meetings produced Live production events MACTA PEG Award	2011 4 10 41 78 32 3.75 Goal N/A  2011 0 0 0 0 e utility bill 2011	% 2.42 6.06 24.85 47.27 19.39 2009 546 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	2012 8 12 47 66 35 3.64 -2.93% 2010 2,051 ming of the Co 2012 6 16 60 54 32 3.54 100.00% 2010 3,247 156 147 0 66 YES	% 2.42 6.06 24.85 47.27 19.39 2011 1,213 2011 4,092 271 145 30 67 no entries services in %	2013 4 5 50 61 61 32 3.74 2.75% 2012 528  Access Chann 2013 5 10 49 54 26 3.60 1.69% 2012 3713 est 268 est 145 est 145 est 45 61 est YES  the city?	% 1.72 2.16 21.55 26.29 13.79 2013 410 8 2.34 4.67 22.90 25.23 12.15 2013 3,120 144 175 36 63 N/A	2014 2 8 46 76 79 35 3.81 1.87% 2014 431 2014 3 14 55 61 28 3.60 0.00% 2014 3,312 192 240 36 58 N/A	0.86 3.45 19.83 34.05 15.09  2015 370  % 1.40 6.54 25.70 13.08  2015 4,016 340 245 60 N/A	4 8 8 39 59 30 3.74 -1.84% 2016 375 2015 2 7 49 46 22 3.63 0.83% 2016 3.500 47 165 28 47 N/A	1.75 3.49 17.03 25.76 13.10  2017 339  % 0.87 3.06 21.40 20.09 9.61  2017 3,200 38 159 10 84 no entries	0 8 45 76 36 3.85 2.94% 2018 269 2016 2 11 57 53 31 3.65 0.55% 2018 3400 60 160 36 90 no entries 2016	0.00 3.45 19.40 32.76 15.52 2019 303 % 0.93 5.14 26.64 24.77 14.49 2019 3222 151 146 36 40 no entries	2 4 4 26 67 35 3.96 2.86% 2.86% 2.86% 2.017 2 5 32 3.87 6.03%	% 0.91 1.83 11.87 30.59 15.98 % 0.98 2.45 15.69 26.47 15.69	4 15 68 98 47 3.73 -5.81% 2018 3 18 92 76 25 3.48 -10.08%	1.83 6.85 31.05 44.75 21.46 % 1.47 8.82 45.10 37.25 12.25	2 9 9 4 48 3.83 2.68% 2019 4 13 77 71 39 3.63 4.31%	0.9: 41: 28.3: 44.7: 21.9: 44.7: 21.9: 3.7.7: 34.8: 19.1:
Scale 1 Poor 2 Fair 3 Satisfactory 4 Good 5 Excellent Avg. rating % change  Total Building Permits  #15 How would you rate the Scale 1 Poor 2 Fair 3 Satisfactory 4 Good 5 Excellent Avg. rating % change  Edit Suite use (hours) Studio use (hours) Studio use (hours) City meetings produced County meetings produced County meetings produced Live production events MACTA PEG Award  #16 How would you rate the Scale 1 Poor 2 Fair	2011 4 10 41 78 32 3.75 - Goal N/A  2011 0 0 0 e utility bill 2011 0	% 2.42 6.06 24.85 47.27 19.39  2009 546  0 0 0 0 2009 2,239 125 154 0 45 no entries	2012 8 12 47 66 35 3.64 -2.93% 2010 2,051 ming of the Co 2012 6 60 54 32 3.54 100.00% 2010 3,247 156 147 0 66 YES	% 2.42 6.06 24.85 47.27 19.39  2011 1,213  community / % 0 0 0 0 2011 4,092 271 145 30 67 no entries  services in	2013 4 5 5 60 61 32 3.74 2.75% 2012 528  Access Chann 2013 5 10 49 54 26 3.60 1.69% 2012 3713 est 145 est 36 est 61 est 61 est 7ES	% 1.72 2.16 21.55 26.29 13.79  2013 410  wei also know % 2.34 4.67 22.90 25.23 12.15  2013 3,120 144 175 36 63 N/A	2014 2 8 46 79 35 3.81 187% 2014 431 2014 3 14 55 61 28 3.60 0.00% 2014 3,312 192 240 36 58 N/A	0.86 3.45 19.83 34.05 15.09  2015 370  % 1.40 6.54 25.70 28.50 13.08  2015 4,016 340 245 36 60 N/A	4 8 8 39 59 30 3.74 -1.84% 2016 3.75 2 7 49 46 22 3.63 0.83% 2016 3.500 47 165 28 47 N/A	1.75 3.49 17.03 25.76 13.10  2017 339  % 0.87 3.06 21.40 20.09 9.61  2017 3,200 38 159 10 84 no entries	0 8 45 76 36 3.85 2.94% 2018 269 2016 2 11 57 53 31 3.65 0.55% 2018 3400 60 160 36 90 no entries 2016 4	0.00 3.45 19.40 32.76 15.52 2019 303 % 0.93 5.14 26.64 24.77 14.49 2019 3222 151 146 36 40 no entries	2 4 4 26 67 35 3.96 2.86% 2.86% 2.86% 2.017 2 5 32 3.87 6.03% 2017 8	% 0.91 11.87 30.59 15.98 % 0.98 2.45 15.69 26.47 15.69	4 15 68 98 47 3.73 -5.81% 2018 3 18 92 76 25 3.48 -10.08%	1.83 6.85 31.05 44.75 21.46 % 1.47 8.82 45.10 37.25 12.25	2 9 9 4 48 3.83 2.68% 2019 4 13 77 71 39 3.63 4.31%	% 1.9.1 % % 1.9.1 % % 1.9.1 % % 1.3.3.5
Scale 1 Poor 2 Fair 3 Satisfactory 4 Good 5 Excellent Avg. rating % change  Total Building Permits  #15 How would you rate the Scale 1 Poor 2 Fair 3 Satisfactory 4 Good 5 Excellent Avg. rating % change  Edit Suite use (hours) Studio use (hours) Studio use (hours) City meetings produced County meetings produced Live production events MACTA PEG Award  #16 How would you rate the Scale 1 Poor 2 Fair 3 Satisfactory	2011 4 10 41 78 32 3.75  Goal N/A  2011 0 0 0 0 0	% 2.42 6.06 24.85 47.27 19.39 546 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	2012 8 12 47 66 35 3.64 -2.93% 2010 2,051 	% 2.42 6.06 24.85 47.27 19.39 2011 1,213 2011 1,213 2011 1,213 2011 1,213 2011 1,213 2011 1,213 2011 1,092 271 1,092 271 1,092 271 1,092 2,093 2	2013 4 5 5 50 61 32 3.74 2.75% 2012 528  Access Chann 2013 5 10 49 54 26 3.60 1.69% 2012 3713 est 268 est 61 est YES  the city? 2013 5 10	% 1.72 2.16 21.55 26.29 13.79  2013 410  % 2.34 4.67 22.90 25.23 12.15  2013 3,120 144 175 36 63 N/A	2014 2 8 46 79 35 3.81 1.87% 2014 431 2014 3 14 55 61 12 3.60 0.00% 2014 3.312 240 36 58 N/A	0.86 3.45 19.83 34.05 15.09  2015 370  % 1.40 6.54 25.70 28.50 13.08  2015 4,016 340 245 36 60 N/A	4 8 8 39 59 30 3.74 -1.84% 2016 375 2 7 49 46 22 3.63 0.83% 2016 3.500 47 165 28 47 N/A	1.75 3.49 17.03 25.76 13.10  2017 3399  % 0.87 3.06 21.40 20.09 9.61  2017 3,200 38 159 10 84 no entries	0 8 45 76 36 3.85 2.94% 2018 269 2016 2 11 57 53 31 3.65 0.55% 2018 3400 60 160 36 90 no entries 2016 4 7	0.00 3.45 19.40 32.76 15.52 2019 303 % 0.93 5.14 26.64 24.77 14.49 2019 3222 151 146 36 40 no entries	2 4 4 26 67 35 3.96 2.86% 2.86% 2.017 2 5 32 54 32 3.87 6.03% 2017 8 7	% 0.91 1.83 11.87 30.59 15.98 % 0.98 2.45 15.69 26.47 15.69	4 15 98 47 3.73 -5.81% 2018 3 18 92 76 25 3.48 -10.08%	1.83 6.85 31.05 44.75 21.46 % 1.47 8.82 45.10 37.25 12.25	2 9 62 98 48 3.83 2.68% 2019 4 13 77 71 39 3.63 4.31%	% 1.9 % 1.9 % 1.9 % 1.9 8 % 1.8 1.5 1.8 1.8 1.8 1.8 1.8 1.8 1.8 1.8 1.8 1.8
Scale 1 Poor 2 Fair 3 Satisfactory 4 Good 5 Excellent 4 Avg. rating % change  Total Building Permits  #15 How would you rate the Scale 1 Poor 2 Fair 3 Satisfactory 4 Good 5 Excellent Avg. rating % change  Edit Suite use (hours) Situdio use (hours) City meetings produced County meetings produced Live production events MACTA PEG Award  #16 How would you rate the Scale 1 Poor 2 Fair 3 Satisfactory 4 Good	2011 4 10 41 78 32 3.75 - Goal N/A  e quality ar  2011 0 0 0 -  e utility bill 2011 0 0 0 0	% 2.42 6.06 24.85 47.27 19.39 2009 546 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	2012 8 12 47 66 35 3.64 -2.93% 2010 2,051 ming of the Co 2012 6 16 60 54 32 3.54 100.00% 2010 3,247 156 147 0 66 YES	% 2.42 6.06 24.85 47.27 19.39 2011 1,213 2011 4,092 271 145 30 67 no entries services in % 0 0 0	2013 4 5 50 61 32 3.74 2.75% 2012 528	% 1.72 2.16 21.55 26.29 13.79  2013 410  wei also know % 2.34 4.67 22.90 25.23 12.15  2013 3,120 144 175 36 63 N/A  % 2.03 4.07 14.23 26.02	2014 2 8 46 79 35 3.81 1.87% 2014 431 2014 3 14 55 61 28 3.60 0.00% 2014 3,312 192 240 36 58 N/A	0.86 3.45 19.83 34.05 15.09  2015 370  % 1.40 6.54 25.70 13.08  2015 4,016 340 245 60 N/A  % 1.63 4.07 16.26	4 8 8 39 59 30 3.74 -1.84% 2015 2 7 49 46 22 3.63 0.83% 2016 3.500 47 165 28 47 N/A 2015 8 6 6 22	1.75 3.49 17.03 25.76 13.10  2017 339  % 0.87 3.06 21.40 20.09 9.61  2017 3,200 38 159 10 84 no entries	0 8 45 76 36 3.85 2.94% 2018 269 2016 2 11 57 53 31 3.65 0.55% 2018 3400 60 160 36 90 no entries 2016 4 7 30	0.00 3.45 19.40 32.76 15.52 2019 303 % 0.93 5.14 26.64 24.77 14.49 2019 3222 151 146 36 40 no entries % 1.63 2.85 12.20	2 4 4 26 67 35 3.96 2.86% 2.86% 2017 2 5 32 3.87 6.03% 2017 8 8 7 23	% 0.91 1.83 11.87 30.59 15.98 % 0.98 2.45 15.69 26.47 15.69	4 15 68 98 47 3.73 -5.81% 2018 3 18 92 76 25 3.48 -10.08%	1.83 6.85 31.05 44.75 21.46 % 1.47 8.82 45.10 37.25 12.25	2 99 448 3.83 2.68% 2019 4 13 77 71 39 3.63 4.31% 2019 3 8 8 42	% 1.91 % 1.91 % 1.91 6.3: 3.7.7: 3.4.8: 19.1:
Scale 1 Poor 2 Fair 3 Satisfactory 4 Good 5 Excellent Avg. rating % change  Total Building Permits  #15 How would you rate the Scale 1 Poor 2 Fair 3 Satisfactory 4 Good 5 Excellent Avg. rating % change  Edit Suite use (hours) Studio use (hours) City meetings produced County meetings produced County meetings produced Live production events MACTA PEG Award  #16 How would you rate the Scale 1 Poor 2 Fair 3 Satisfactory 4 Good 5 Excellent	2011 4 10 41 78 32 3.75  Goal N/A  2011 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	% 2.42 6.06 24.85 47.27 19.39  2009 546  0 0 0 0 2009 2,239 125 154 0 45 0 one ontries	2012 8 12 47 66 35 3.64 -2.93% 2010 2,051 ming of the Co 2012 6 60 54 32 3.54 100.00% 2010 3,247 156 147 0 66 YES	% 2.42 6.06 24.85 47.27 19.39  2011 1,213  community / % 0 0 0 0 2011 4,092 271 145 30 67 no entries  services in % 0 0 0 0	2013 4 5 5 60 32 3.74 2.75% 2012 528  Access Chann 2013 5 10 49 54 26 3.60 1.69% 2012 3713 est 268 est 61 est YES  the city? 2013 5 10 35 64 41	% 1.72 2.16 21.55 26.29 13.79 2013 410 21.55 26.29 13.79 2013 410 21.5 20.34 4.67 22.90 25.23 12.15 2013 3,120 144 175 36 63 N/A 2.03 4.07 14.23	2014 2 8 46 79 35 3.81 1.87% 2014 431 2014 3 14 55 61 12 3 3.60 0.00% 2014 3.312 240 36 58 N/A	0.86 3.45 19.83 34.05 15.09  2015 370  % 1.40 6.54 25.70 28.50 13.08  2015 4,016 340 245 36 60 N/A  % 1.63 4.07 16.26 30.89	4 8 8 39 59 30 3.74 -1.84% 2016 375 2 7 49 46 22 3.63 0.83% 2016 3.500 47 165 28 47 N/A 2015 8 6 22 7 7 137 37	1.75 3.49 17.03 25.76 13.10  2017 3399  % 0.87 3.06 21.40 20.09 9.61  2017 3,200 38 159 10 84 no entries	0 8 45 76 36 3.85 2.94% 2018 269 2016 2 11 57 53 31 3.65 0.55% 2018 3400 36 90 no entries 2016 4 7 30 80 48	0.00 3.45 19.40 32.76 15.52 2019 303 % 0.93 5.14 26.64 24.77 14.49 2019 3222 151 146 36 40 no entries % 1.63 2.85 12.20 32.52	2 4 4 26 67 35 3.96 2.86% 2.86% 2.017 2 5 32 5 4 32 3.87 6.03% 2017 8 7 23 64 35	% 0.98 15.98 % 0.98 2.45 15.69 26.47 15.69 % 3.52 3.08 10.13 28.19	4 15 68 98 47 3.73 -5.81% 2018 3 18 92 76 25 3.48 -10.08%	1.83 6.85 31.05 44.75 21.46 % 1.47 8.82 45.10 37.25 12.25	2 9 9 4 48 3.83 2.68% 2019 4 13 77 71 39 3.63 4.31% 2019 3 8 42 104 70	% 1.91 % 1.91 % 1.91 6.3: 3.7.7: 3.4.8: 19.1:
Scale 1 Poor 2 Fair 3 Satisfactory 4 Good 5 Excellent Avg. rating % change  Total Building Permits  #15 How would you rate the Scale 1 Poor 2 Fair 3 Satisfactory 4 Good 5 Excellent Avg. rating % change  Edit Suite use (hours) Studio use (hours) Studio use (hours) Gity meetings produced County meetings produced County meetings produced Live production events MACTA PEG Award  #16 How would you rate the Scale 1 Poor 2 Fair 3 Satisfactory 4 Good 5 Excellent Avg. rating	2011 4 10 41 78 32 3.75 - Goal N/A  e quality ar  2011 0 0 0 -  e utility bill 2011 0 0 0 0	% 2.42 6.06 24.85 47.27 19.39  2009 546  0 0 0 0 2009 2,239 125 154 0 45 0 one ontries	2012 8 12 47 66 35 3.64 -2.93% 2010 2,051 ming of the Co 2012 6 16 60 54 32 3.54 100.00% 2010 3,247 156 147 0 66 YES 18 40 40 40 41 42 43 44 48 3.75	% 2.42 6.06 24.85 47.27 19.39  2011 1,213  community / % 0 0 0 0 2011 4,092 271 145 30 67 no entries  services in % 0 0 0 0	2013 4 5 5 60 61 32 3.74 2.75% 2012 528  Access Chann 2013 5 10 49 54 26 3.60 1.69% 2012 3713 est 268 est 145 est 61 est YES  the city? 2013 5 10 35 64 41 3.81	% 1.72 2.16 21.55 26.29 13.79  2013 410  wei also know % 2.34 4.67 22.90 25.23 12.15  2013 3,120 144 175 36 63 N/A  % 2.03 4.07 14.23 26.02	2014 2 8 46 79 35 3.81 187% 2014 431 2014 3 14 55 61 28 3.60 0.00% 2014 3,312 192 240 36 58 N/A	0.86 3.45 19.83 34.05 15.09  2015 370  % 1.40 6.54 25.70 28.50 13.08  2015 4,016 340 245 36 60 N/A  % 1.63 4.07 16.26 30.89	4 8 8 39 59 30 3.74 -1.84% 2015 2 7 7 49 46 22 3.63 0.83% 2016 3.500 47 165 28 47 N/A 2015 8 6 22 71 37 3.85	1.75 3.49 17.03 25.76 13.10  2017 3399  % 0.87 3.06 21.40 20.09 9.61  2017 3,200 38 159 10 84 no entries	0 8 45 76 36 3.85 2.94% 2018 269 2016 2 11 57 53 31 3.65 0.55% 2018 3400 60 160 36 90 no entries 2016 4 7 30 80 48 3.95	0.00 3.45 19.40 32.76 15.52 2019 303 % 0.93 5.14 26.64 24.77 14.49 2019 3222 151 146 36 40 no entries % 1.63 2.85 12.20 32.52	2 4 4 26 67 35 3.96 2.86% 2.86% 2017 2 5 32 3.87 6.03% 2017 8 7 23 364	% 0.98 15.98 % 0.98 2.45 15.69 26.47 15.69 % 3.52 3.08 10.13 28.19	4 15 68 98 47 3.73 -5.81% 2018 3 18 92 76 25 3.48 -10.08%	1.83 6.85 31.05 44.75 21.46 % 1.47 8.82 45.10 37.25 12.25	2 9 9 4 48 3.83 2.68%  2019 4 13 77 71 39 3.63 4.31%	% 1.91 % 1.91 % 1.92 % 1.92 % 1.93 % 1.94 1.95 1.95 1.95 1.95 1.95 1.95 1.95 1.95
Scale 1 Poor 2 Fair 3 Satisfactory 4 Good 5 Excellent Avg. rating % change  Total Building Permits  #15 How would you rate the Scale 1 Poor 2 Fair 3 Satisfactory 4 Good 5 Excellent Avg. rating % change  Edit Suite use (hours) Studio use (hours) Studio use (hours) Gity meetings produced County meetings produced County meetings produced Live production events MACTA PEG Award  #16 How would you rate the Scale 1 Poor 2 Fair 3 Satisfactory 4 Good 5 Excellent Avg. rating	2011 4 10 41 78 32 3.75  Goal N/A  2011 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	% 2.42 6.06 24.85 47.27 19.39  2009 546  0 0 0 0 2009 2,239 125 154 0 45 0 one ontries	2012 8 12 47 66 35 3.64 -2.93% 2010 2,051 ming of the Co 2012 6 60 54 32 3.54 100.00% 2010 3,247 156 147 0 66 YES	% 2.42 6.06 24.85 47.27 19.39  2011 1,213  community / % 0 0 0 0 2011 4,092 271 145 30 67 no entries  services in % 0 0 0 0	2013 4 5 5 60 32 3.74 2.75% 2012 528  Access Chann 2013 5 10 49 54 26 3.60 1.69% 2012 3713 est 268 est 61 est YES  the city? 2013 5 10 35 64 41	% 1.72 2.16 21.55 26.29 13.79  2013 410  wei also know % 2.34 4.67 22.90 25.23 12.15  2013 3,120 144 175 36 63 N/A  % 2.03 4.07 14.23 26.02	2014 2 8 46 79 35 3.81 1.87% 2014 431 2014 3 14 55 61 12 3 3.60 0.00% 2014 3.312 240 36 58 N/A	0.86 3.45 19.83 34.05 15.09  2015 370  % 1.40 6.54 25.70 28.50 13.08  2015 4,016 340 245 36 60 N/A  % 1.63 4.07 16.26 30.89	4 8 8 39 59 30 3.74 -1.84% 2016 375 2 7 49 46 22 3.63 0.83% 2016 3.500 47 165 28 47 N/A 2015 8 6 22 7 7 137 37	1.75 3.49 17.03 25.76 13.10  2017 3399  % 0.87 3.06 21.40 20.09 9.61  2017 3,200 38 159 10 84 no entries	0 8 45 76 36 3.85 2.94% 2018 269 2016 2 11 57 53 31 3.65 0.55% 2018 3400 36 90 no entries 2016 4 7 30 80 48	0.00 3.45 19.40 32.76 15.52 2019 303 % 0.93 5.14 26.64 24.77 14.49 2019 3222 151 146 36 40 no entries % 1.63 2.85 12.20 32.52	2 4 4 26 67 35 3.96 2.86% 2.86% 2017 2 5 32 3.87 6.03% 2017 8 8 7 23 64 35 3.81	% 0.98 15.98 % 0.98 2.45 15.69 26.47 15.69 % 3.52 3.08 10.13 28.19	2018 3 18 92 3.73 -5.81% 2018 3 18 92 76 25 3.48 -10.08%	1.83 6.85 31.05 44.75 21.46 % 1.47 8.82 45.10 37.25 12.25	2 99 448 3.83 2.68% 2019 4 13 77 71 39 3.63 4.31% 2019 3 8 42 104 70 70 70 70 70 70 70 70 70 70 70 70 70	0.91 4.11 28.31 44.75 21.92 % 1.96 6.37 37.75 31.75 19.12
Scale 1 Poor 2 Fair 3 Satisfactory 4 Good 5 Excellent Avg. rating % change  Total Building Permits  #15 How would you rate the Scale 1 Poor 2 Fair 3 Satisfactory 4 Good 5 Excellent Avg. rating % change  Edit Suite use (hours) Studio use (hours) Studio use (hours) Gity meetings produced County meetings produced County meetings produced Live production events MACTA PEG Award  #16 How would you rate the Scale 1 Poor 2 Fair 3 Satisfactory 4 Good 5 Excellent Avg. rating	2011 4 10 41 78 32 3.75  Goal N/A  2011 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	% 2.42 6.06 24.85 47.27 19.39 546 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	2012 8 12 47 66 35 3.64 -2.93% 2010 2,051 ming of the Co 2012 6 60 54 32 3.54 100.00% 2010 3,247 156 147 0 66 YES 18 40 64 48 3.75 100.00%	% 2.42 6.06 24.85 47.27 19.39 2011 1,213 2000 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	2013 4 5 5 60 31 32 3.74 2.75% 2012 528  Access Chann 2013 5 10 49 54 26 3.60 1.69% 2012 3713 est 268 est 61 est YES  the city? 2013 5 10 35 64 41 3.81 1.60%	% 1.72 2.16 21.55 26.29 13.79  2013 410  % 2.34 4.67 22.90 25.23 12.15  2013 3,120 144 175 36 63 N/A  % 2.03 4.07 14.23 26.02 16.67	2014 2 8 46 79 35 3.81 1.87% 2014 431 2014 3 14 55 61 128 3.60 0.00% 2014 3.312 240 36 58 N/A 2014 4 10 40 40 40 40 40 40 40 40 40 4	0.86 3.45 19.83 34.05 15.09  2015 370  % 1.40 6.54 25.70 28.50 13.08  2015 4,016 340 245 36 60 N/A  % 1.63 4.07 16.26 30.89 19.51	4 8 8 39 59 30 3.74 -1.84% 2016 375 2 7 49 46 22 3.63 0.83% 2016 3.500 47 165 28 47 N/A 2015 8 6 22 71 37 3.85 -0.52%	1.75 3.49 17.03 25.76 13.10  2017 3399  % 0.87 3.06 21.40 20.09 9.61  2017 3,200 38 159 10 84 no entries  % 3.49 2.62 9.61 31.00 16.16	0 8 45 76 36 3.85 2.94% 2018 269 2016 2 11 57 53 31 3.65 0.55% 2018 3400 60 160 36 90 no entries 2016 4 7 30 80 48 3.95 2.60%	0.00 3.45 19.40 32.76 15.52  2019 303  % 0.93 5.14 26.64 24.77 14.49  2019 3222 151 146 36 40 no entries  % 1.63 2.85 12.20 32.52 19.51	2 4 4 26 67 35 3.96 2.86% 2.86% 2017 2 5 32 3.87 6.03% 2017 8 8 7 23 64 35 3.81	% 0.98 15.98 % 0.98 2.45 15.69 26.47 15.69 % 3.52 3.08 10.13 28.19	2018 3 18 92 3.73 -5.81% 2018 3 18 92 76 25 3.48 -10.08%	1.83 6.85 31.05 44.75 21.46 % 1.47 8.82 45.10 37.25 12.25	2 99 448 3.83 2.68% 2019 4 13 77 71 39 3.63 4.31% 2019 3 8 42 104 70 70 70 70 70 70 70 70 70 70 70 70 70	0.91 4.11 28.31 44.75 21.92 % 1.96 6.37 37.75 19.12
Scale 1 Poor 2 Fair 3 Satisfactory 4 Good 5 Excellent Avg. rating % change  Total Building Permits  #15 How would you rate the Scale 1 Poor 2 Fair 3 Satisfactory 4 Good 5 Excellent Avg. rating % change  Edit Suite use (hours) Studio use (hours) City meetings produced County meetings produced County meetings produced Live production events MACTA PEG Award  #16 How would you rate the Scale 1 Poor 2 Fair 3 Satisfactory 4 Good 5 Excellent	2011 4 10 41 78 32 3.75  Goal N/A  2011 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	% 2.42 6.06 24.85 47.27 19.39  2009 546  0 0 0 0 2009 2,239 125 154 0 45 0 one ontries	2012 8 12 47 66 35 3.64 -2.93% 2010 2,051 ming of the Co 2012 6 16 60 54 32 3.54 100.00% 2010 3,247 156 147 0 66 YES 18 40 40 40 41 42 43 44 48 3.75	% 2.42 6.06 24.85 47.27 19.39  2011 1,213  community / % 0 0 0 0 2011 4,092 271 145 30 67 no entries  services in % 0 0 0 0	2013 4 5 5 60 61 32 3.74 2.75% 2012 528  Access Chann 2013 5 10 49 54 26 3.60 1.69% 2012 3713 est 268 est 145 est 61 est YES  the city? 2013 5 10 35 64 41 3.81	% 1.72 2.16 21.55 26.29 13.79  2013 410  wei also know % 2.34 4.67 22.90 25.23 12.15  2013 3,120 144 175 36 63 N/A  % 2.03 4.07 14.23 26.02	2014 2 8 46 79 35 3.81 187% 2014 431 2014 3 14 55 61 28 3.60 0.00% 2014 3,312 192 240 36 58 N/A	0.86 3.45 19.83 34.05 15.09  2015 370  % 1.40 6.54 25.70 28.50 13.08  2015 4,016 340 245 36 60 N/A  % 1.63 4.07 16.26 30.89	4 8 8 39 59 30 3.74 -1.84% 2015 2 7 7 49 46 22 3.63 0.83% 2016 3.500 47 165 28 47 N/A 2015 8 6 22 71 37 3.85	1.75 3.49 17.03 25.76 13.10  2017 3399  % 0.87 3.06 21.40 20.09 9.61  2017 3,200 38 159 10 84 no entries	0 8 45 76 36 3.85 2.94% 2018 269 2016 2 11 57 53 31 3.65 0.55% 2018 3400 60 160 36 90 no entries 2016 4 7 30 80 48 3.95	0.00 3.45 19.40 32.76 15.52 2019 303 % 0.93 5.14 26.64 24.77 14.49 2019 3222 151 146 36 40 no entries % 1.63 2.85 12.20 32.52	2 4 4 26 67 35 3.96 2.86% 2.86% 2017 2 5 32 3.87 6.03% 2017 8 8 7 23 64 35 3.81	% 0.98 15.98 % 0.98 2.45 15.69 26.47 15.69 % 3.52 3.08 10.13 28.19	2018 3 18 92 3.73 -5.81% 2018 3 18 92 76 25 3.48 -10.08%	1.83 6.85 31.05 44.75 21.46 % 1.47 8.82 45.10 37.25 12.25	2 99 448 3.83 2.68% 2019 4 13 77 71 39 3.63 4.31% 2019 3 8 42 104 70 70 70 70 70 70 70 70 70 70 70 70 70	0.91 4.11 28.31 44.75 21.92 % 1.96 6.37 37.75 34.80 19.12

#17 How would you rate the overall quality of services provided by the cit	y?

Scale	2011	%	2012	%	2013	%	2014	%	2015	%	2016	%	2017	%	2018	%	2019	%
1 Poor	1	0.58	1	0.58	1	0.41	0	0.00	3	1.31	0	0.00	3	1.32	2	0.88	1	0.44
2 Fair	3	1.75	7	1.75	1	0.41	1	0.41	0	0.00	1	0.41	2	0.88	2	0.88	0	0.00
3 Satisfactory	26	15.2	32	15.2	27	11.07	29	11.89	17	7.42	24	9.84	14	6.14	36	15.79	30	13.16
4 Good	98	57.31	. 89	57.31	84	34.43	98	40.16	81	35.37	93	38.11	81	35.53	151	66.23	138	60.53
5 Excellent	43	25.15	45	25.15	43	17.62	47	19.26	40	17.47	47	19.26	38	16.67	53	23.25	59	25.88
Avg. rating	4.05		3.98		4.07		4.09		4.1		4.13		4.08		4.03		4.11	
% change					2.26%		0.49%		0.24%		0.73%		-1.21%		-1.23%		1.99%	
		2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020					
Tax Levy		\$5,363,923	\$5,401,056	\$5,629,543	\$5,682,219	\$5,924,827	\$6,102,572	\$6,596,406	\$6,897,246	\$7,104,578	\$7,223,672	\$7,693,527	\$7,896,725					
Taxable Market Value (millions):		\$763.20	\$769.30	\$742.60	\$653.80	\$649.60	\$662.10	\$679.40	\$703.03	\$721.24	\$746.01	\$808.25	\$828.24					
Taxable Market Value Percentage Ch. MVC to MVE state law change	ange:		0.79%	-3.60%	-13.58%	-0.65%	1.89%	2.55%	3.36%	2.52%	3.32%	7.70%	2.41%					

# PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT PROGRAM CITY OF NEW ULM CITIZEN SURVEY



Scale

1. Please indicate the number of years you have lived in New Ulm

years

For each item identified below, circle the number to the right that best fits your judgment of its quality. Use the scale to select the quality number.

				Scale	2	E
Des	scription/Identification of Survey Item	P 0 0 r	No. of All	· Li vide mino vidence degle	marie e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e	X C e II
			_			t
2.	How would you rate the overall <b>appearance</b> of the city?	1	2	3	4	5
3.	How would you rate the overall feeling of police protection services in the city?	1	2	3	4	5
4.	How would you rate the overall <b>quality of fire protection services</b> in the city?	1	2	3	4	5
5.	How would you rate the overall condition of city streets?	1	2	. 3	4	5
6.	How would you rate the overall quality of snowplowing on city streets?	1	2	3	4	5
7.	How would you rate the dependability and overall quality of city sanitary sewer service?	1	2	3	4	5
8.	How would you rate the <b>dependability and overall quality of the city water service</b> ?	1	2	3	4	5
9.	How would you rate the dependability and overall quality of the city gas service?	1	2	3	4	5
10.	How would you rate the dependability and overall quality of city electricity service?	1	: <b>2</b>	3	4	5
11.	How would you rate the overall quality of city recreational programs?	1	2	3	4	5
12.	How would you rate the overall quality of city recreational facilities? (e.g. parks, trails, park facilities, etc.)	1	2	3	4	5
13.	How would you rate the <b>library services</b> in the city?	1	2	3	4	5
14.	How would you rate the quality of licensing, permitting and building inspection services in the city?	1	2	3	4	5
15.	How would you rate the overall <b>programming of the Community Access Channel</b> also known as NUCAT (Comcast channel 14 and NU-Telecom channel 3)?	1	2	3	4	5
16.	How would you rate the utility billing/finance department services?	1	2	3	4	5
17.	How would you rate the <b>overall</b> quality of services provided by the city?	1	2	3	4	5
Comr	nents:					

Please use the enclosed self-addressed, postage paid envelope to return the survey to City Hall by Friday, March 13, 2020

Thank you for your time and consideration in completing this survey