STATE OF MINNESOTA

COUNTY OF WASHINGTON

CITY OF WOODBURY

I, Kimberlee K. Blaeser, being the duly qualified and acting City Clerk of the City of Woodbury, Minnesota, DO HEREBY CERTIFY that I have compared the attached and foregoing Council Resolution No. 18-80 “AUTHORIZATION TO PARTICIPATE IN THE PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT PROGRAM ESTABLISHED BY THE STATE OF MINNESOTA AND THE COUNCIL ON LOCAL RESULTS AND INNOVATION” with the original thereof on file in my office, and that the same is a true and complete transcript of the resolution of the City Council of said municipality at a meeting duly called and held on the 23rd day of May 2018.

WITNESS my hand and the seal of said City this 31st day of May 2018.

[Signature]
Kimberlee K. Blaeser
City Clerk

(SEAL)

Attachment: Resolution No. 18-80
RESOLUTION NO. 18-80

RESOLUTION OF THE CITY OF WOODBURY,
WASHINGTON COUNTY, MINNESOTA

AUTHORIZATION TO PARTICIPATE IN THE PERFORMANCE
MEASUREMENT PROGRAM ESTABLISHED BY THE STATE OF MINNESOTA
AND THE COUNCIL ON LOCAL RESULTS AND INNOVATION

WHEREAS, benefits to the City of Woodbury 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, participation in this program will provide the City with a reimbursement of $0.14 (fourteen cents) per capita annually; 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 currently collects all needed data and has given permission by the State Auditor’s Office to use the biennial citizen survey to satisfy annual reporting requirements; and

WHEREAS, The City Council of Woodbury 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.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Woodbury, that the City has adopted the set of city measures established by the CLRI and that the City 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 the City of Woodbury will submit to the Office of the State Auditor the actual results of the performance measures adopted by the City.

This Resolution was declared duly passed and adopted and was signed by the Mayor and attested to by the City Administrator on the 23rd day of May 2018.

Attest:  Mary Giulian Stephens, Mayor

Clinton P. Gridley, City Administrator  (SEAL)
MEMORANDUM

To: State of Minnesota – Council on Local Results and Innovation
From: Angela Gorall, Assistant City Administrator
Date: June 4, 2018
Re: 2017 Performance Measurement Report for the City of Woodbury

On May 23, 2018, the Woodbury City Council adopted a resolution authorizing city staff to report on the following measures for the State of Minnesota Performance Measurement Program through the Council on Local Results and Innovation. A minimum of 10 performance measures, as suggested by the “standard measures for cities” document, will be submitted to the Office of the State Auditor.

The City of Woodbury performs a biennial survey, and the survey results included in the reporting are from the 2017 community survey.

Attached to this memorandum is the City Council resolution that authorized the City of Woodbury to participate in this program.

General
1. Rating of the overall quality of services provided by the city (453 responses)
   Excellent: 27%
   Good: 54%
   Fair: 8%
   Poor: 1%
   Don’t Know/Refused: 9%

2. Percent change in the taxable property market value:
   a. 8.1% increase in taxable market value to total 8.5 billion in 2018.

3. Citizens’ rating of the overall appearance (“image or reputation”) of the city (467 responses)
   Excellent: 45%
   Good: 46%
   Fair: 7%
   Poor: 2%
   Don’t Know/Refused: 1%

4. Nuisance code enforcement cases per 1,000 population: 707 / 69,245 x 1,000 = 10.2
5. Number of library visits per 1,000 population: Not collected
6. Bond rating: AAA
7. Citizens’ rating of the quality of city recreational programs and facilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recreation Programs</th>
<th>City Parks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excellent: 29%</td>
<td>Excellent: 37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good: 42%</td>
<td>Good: 50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair: 8%</td>
<td>Fair: 4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor: 1%</td>
<td>Poor: 1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t Know/Refused: 21%</td>
<td>Don’t Know/Refused: 9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(446 responses)</td>
<td>(451 responses)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. Accuracy of post-election audit (% of ballots counted correctly): NA

**Police Services**

9. Part I and II crime rates:
   a. Part I – 1,475
   b. Part II – 2,562

10. Part I and II crime clearance rates: 56% of crimes cleared

11. Citizens’ rating of safety in their community (467 responses):
    
    | Quality      |
    |--------------|
    | Excellent: 49% |
    | Good: 46%     |
    | Fair: 5%      |
    | Poor: 0%      |
    | Don’t Know: 0% |

12. Average police response times: Not collected

**Fire & EMS Services**

13. Insurance industry rating of fire services: NA

14. Citizens’ rating of the quality of fire protection services (448 responses):
    
    | Quality     |
    |--------------|
    | Excellent: 36% |
    | Good: 30%     |
    | Fair: 2%      |
    | Poor: 1%      |
    | Don’t Know/Refused: 32% |

15. Average fire response time:
   a. 5 firefighters on scene in less than 9 minutes: 64%
   b. 6 additional firefighters on scene in less than 13 minutes: 90%
16. Fire (and hazardous response) calls per 1,000 population: 540 / 69,245 x 1,000 = 7.8
17. Number of fires with loss resulting in investigation: 36
18. EMS calls per 1,000 population: 3,601 / 69,245 x 1,000 = 52.0
19. EMS average response time: 4.0

**Streets**
20. Average city street pavement condition rating:
   a. Average PCI of non-residential streets: 75.2
   b. Average PCI of residential streets: 78.2

   - Excellent: 10%
   - Good: 40%
   - Fair: 33%
   - Poor: 14%
   - Don’t Know/Refused: 3%

22. Expenditures for road rehabilitation per paved lane mile rehabilitated: $942
23. Percentage of all jurisdiction lane miles “requiring rehabilitation”: 21.3%
24. Average hours to complete road system during snow event: 6.22

25. Citizens’ rating of the quality of snowplowing on city streets (452 responses):
   - Excellent: 30%
   - Good: 43%
   - Fair: 22%
   - Poor: 6%
   - Don’t Know/Refused: 1%

**Water**
26. Citizens’ rating of the dependability and quality of the city water supply (446 responses):
   - Excellent: 28%
   - Good: 41%
   - Fair: 16%
   - Poor: 9%
   - Don’t Know/Refused: 6%

27. Operating cost of operation and maintenance and repair per 1,000 gallons of water pumped/produced-mile of water main: $5,878
Sanitary Sewer

28. Citizens’ rating of the dependability and quality of the city sanitary sewer service (442 responses)
   - Excellent: 32%
   - Good: 39%
   - Fair: 6%
   - Poor: 1%
   - Don’t Know/Refused: 21%

29. Number of sewer blockages on city system per 100 connections: 1 total blockage