City of New Hope

Resolution No. 2021 - 52

Resolution declaring adoption and implementation of State performance measures

- WHEREAS. the State Legislature created the Council on Local Results and Innovation which set a standard set of ten performance measures for cities that will aid residents, taxpayers and state and local elected officials in determining the efficiency of local services; and
- WHEREAS. the city of New Hope has participated in the new standards measure program voluntarily since 2011 and wishes to do so again in 2021, and the city may be eligible for a reimbursement and exemption from levy limits; and
- WHEREAS, the city has adopted the following performance measures:
 - 1. Rating of the overall quality of services in New Hope
 - 2. Percent change in the taxable property market value
 - 3. Citizens' rating of the overall general appearance of the city
 - 4. Bond rating
 - 5. Citizens' rating of the quality of city recreational programs and facilities
 - 6. Citizens' likelihood of using public transit if readily available
 - 7. Citizens' support of funding home repair and improvement programs
 - 8. Part I and II crime rates
 - 9. Citizens' rating of safety in the community
 - 10. Average police response time
 - 11. Insurance industry rating of fire services
 - 12. Citizens' rating of the fire protection services
 - 13. Fire calls per 1,000 population
 - 14. Average city pavement rating index
 - 15. Citizens' rating of overall condition of county roads
 - 16. Citizens' rating of overall condition of city streets
 - 17. Citizens' rating of the quality of snowplowing on city streets
 - 18. Citizens' rating of the dependability and overall quality of city water supply
 - 19. Citizens' rating of the quality of stormwater management in the city
 - 20. Citizens' rating of the dependability and overall quality of city sanitary sewer service
 - 21. Number of sewer blockages on city system per 1,000 connections
 - 22. Citizens' rating of the quality of code enforcement
 - 23. Citizens' rating of communication/distribution of information

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the New Hope City Council will 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 of New Hope will submit to the Office of the State Auditor the actual results of the performance measures adopted by the city.

Adopted by the City Council of the city of New Hope, Hennepin County, Minnesota, the 26th day of April, 2021.

____ Kathi Hemkin recie Scone

Attest:

City of New Hope Performance Measures

Quantifiable performance measures are shaded and Summaries of Survey Questions are attached

Category	#	Measure	Comparison of results between online and paper city services surveys from 2018 (679 responses), 2019 (610 responses) and 2020 (839 responses)
General	1.	Rating of the overall quality of city services	2018: 23% excellent; 58% good; 11% neutral; 5% fair, 1% poor; 2% don't know/blank (81% excellent or good) 2019: 20% excellent; 61% good; 12% neutral; 5% fair, 1% poor; 1% don't know/blank (81% excellent or good) 2020: 20% excellent; 61% good; 10% neutral; 6% fair, 1% poor; 2% don't know/blank (81% excellent or good)
	2.	Percent change in the taxable property market value	Payable 2018: 10.56% (total taxable market value: \$1,697,092,365) Payable 2019: 7.92% (total taxable market value: \$1,831,436,951) Payable 2020: 10.37% (total taxable market value: \$2,021,382,123)
	3.	Citizens' rating of the overall appearance of the city	2018: 13% excellent; 66% good; 12% neutral, 8% fair; 1% poor (79% excellent or good) 2019: 15% excellent; 64% good; 9% neutral; 10% fair, 1% poor; 1% don't know/blank (79% excellent or good) 2020: 15% excellent; 65% good; 11% neutral; 7% fair, 1% poor; 1% don't know/blank (80% excellent or good)
	4.	Bond rating	2018: AA 2019: AA 2020: AA
	5.	Citizens' rating of the quality of city recreational programs and facilities	2018: 28% excellent; 47% good; 17% neutral; 5% fair; 1% poor; 2% don't know/blank (75% excellent or good) 2019: 25% excellent; 49% good; 17% neutral; 7% fair, 1% poor; 1% don't know/blank (74% excellent or good) 2020: 23% excellent; 49% good; 19% neutral; 5% fair, 1% poor; 2% don't know/blank (72% excellent or good)
	6.	Would use public transit if readily available	 2018: 10% very likely; 22% somewhat likely; 29% somewhat unlikely; 37% very unlikely; 2% don't know/blank (32% very likely or somewhat likely) 2019: 10% very likely; 22% somewhat likely; 26% somewhat unlikely; 42% very unlikely; 0% don't know/blank (32% very likely or somewhat likely) 2020: 8% very likely; 21% somewhat likely; 24% somewhat unlikely; 46% very unlikely; 2% don't know/blank (29% very likely or somewhat likely)
	7.	Citizens' support of funding home repair and improvement programs	2019: 50% Yes; 48% No; 2% Blank 2020: 51% Yes; 46% No; 3% Blank
Police Services	8.	Part I and II crime rates	2017: Part 1: 581; Part 2: 628 2018: Part 1: 682; Part 2: 721 2019: Part 1: 611; Part 2: 680 *Full crime stats for current year compiled after January 1 to ensure accuracy
	9.	Citizens' rating of safety in the community	2018: 47% very safe; 45% somewhat safe: 6% somewhat unsafe; 1% very unsafe; 1% don't know/blank (92% very safe or somewhat safe) 2019: 39% very safe; 54% somewhat safe: 6% somewhat unsafe; <1% very unsafe; <1% don't know/blank (93% very safe or somewhat safe) 2020: 45% very safe; 47% somewhat safe: 7% somewhat unsafe; 1% very unsafe; <1% don't know/blank (92% very safe or somewhat safe)
	10.	Average police response time	2017: 4.32 minutes for priority 1 calls 2018: 4.36 minutes for priority 1 calls 2019: 4.35 minutes for priority 1 calls *Full police stats for current year compiled after January 1 to ensure accuracy

Fire & EMS	11.	Insurance industry rating of	2018: 3
Services		fire services	2019: 3
Services			2020: 3
	12.	Citizens' rating of the	2018: 36% excellent; 43% good; 16% neutral; 1% fair; <1% poor; <4% don't know/blank (79% excellent or
		quality of fire protection	good)
		services	2019: 39% excellent; 41% good; 17% neutral; <1% fair, <1% poor; 2% don't know/blank (80% excellent or
			good)
			2020: 36% excellent; 42% good; 18% neutral; 1% fair, 1% poor; 1% don't know/blank (78% excellent or good)
	13.	Fire calls per 1,000	2018: 47.79 (972 calls for service; population 20,339)
		population	2019: 53.94 (1097 calls for service; population 20,339)
			2020: 677; calls for service through 9/29/20; population 20,339)
Streets	14.	Average city pavement	2018: 76
		condition rating	2019: 76
			2020: 76
	15.	Citizens' rating of county	2018: 11% excellent; 60% good; 16% neutral; 10% fair; 3% poor (71% excellent or good)
		roads	2019: 8% excellent; 54% good; 15% neutral; 16% fair, 6% poor; 1% don't know/blank (62% excellent or good)
			2020: 5% excellent; 48% good; 18% neutral; 20% fair, 8% poor; 1% don't know/blank (53% excellent or good)
	16.	Citizens' rating of city	2018: 10% excellent; 60% good; 13% neutral; 10% fair; 2% poor; 5% don't know/blank (70% excellent or good)
		streets	2019: 9% excellent; 57% good; 14% neutral; 17% fair, 3% poor; <1% don't know/blank (64% excellent or good)
			2020: 6% excellent; 58% good; 17% neutral; 15% fair, 3% poor; 1% don't know/blank (64% excellent or good)
	17.	Citizens' rating of the	2018: 30% excellent; 50% good; 6% neutral; 9% fair; 4% poor; 1% don't know/blank (80% excellent or good)
		quality of snowplowing on	2019: 33% excellent; 45% good; 8% neutral; 10% fair, 4% poor; 0% don't know/blank (78% excellent or good)
		city streets	2020: 33% excellent; 48% good; 7% neutral; 9% fair, 2% poor; 1% don't know/blank (81% excellent or good)
Water	18.	Citizens' rating of the	2018: 42% excellent; 44% good; 8% neutral; 4% fair; 1% poor; 1% don't know/blank (86% excellent or good)
		dependability and quality of	2019: 39% excellent; 48% good; 8% neutral; 3% fair, 1% poor; 1% don't know/blank (87% excellent or good)
		city water supply	2020: 41% excellent; 47% good; 7% neutral; 3% fair, 1% poor; 1% don't know/blank (88% excellent or good)
	19.	Citizens' rating of the	2019: 20% excellent; 50% good; 20% neutral; 6% fair, 3% poor; 1% don't know/blank (70% excellent or good)
		quality of stormwater	2020: 19% excellent; 53% good; 19% neutral; 6% fair, 2% poor; 1% don't know/blank (72% excellent or good)
		management in the city	
Sanitary	20.	Citizens' rating of the	2018: 30% excellent; 50% good; 13% neutral; 3% fair; 1% poor; 3% don't know/blank (80% excellent or good)
Sewer		dependability and quality of	2019: 28% excellent; 53% good; 14% neutral; 3% fair, 1% poor; 1% don't know/blank (81% excellent or good)
		city sanitary sewer service	2020: 27% excellent; 53% good; 16% neutral; 2% fair, 1% poor; 1% don't know/blank (80% excellent or good)
	21.	Number of sewer blockages	2018: 0
		on city system per 1000	2019: 1
		connections	2020: <mark>0 (as of 9/29/20)</mark>
Code	22.	Citizens' rating of the	2018: 7% too tough; 53% about right; 34% not tough enough; 6% don't know/blank
Enforcement		quality of code enforcement	2019: 7% too tough; 58% about right; 34% not tough enough; 1% don't know/blank
		services	2020: 8% too tough; 63% about right; 28% not tough enough; 1% don't know/blank
Communi-	23.	Citizens' rating of the	2018: 24% excellent; 52% good; 14% neutral; 6% fair; 3% poor; 1% don't know/blank (77% excellent or good)
cations		quality of communication/	2019: 17% excellent; 55% good; 16% neutral; 8% fair, 3% poor; 1% don't know/blank (72% excellent or good)
		distribution of information	2020: 18% excellent; 53% good; 16% neutral; 9% fair, 3% poor; 1% don't know/blank (71% excellent or good)