City of New Hope

Resolution No. 2018 - 45

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 2018, 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 transportation
7.   Citizens' rating of the quality of code enforcement
8.   Citizens' rating of communication/distribution of information
9.   Part I and II crime rates
10. Citizens' rating of police protection in the community
11. Average police response time
12. Insurance industry rating of fire services
13. Citizens' rating of the fire protection services
14. Fire calls per 1,000 population
15. Average city pavement rating index
16. Citizens' rating of overall condition of city streets
17. Citizens' rating of overall condition of county roads
18. Citizens' rating of the quality of snowplowing on city streets
19. Citizens' rating of the dependability and overall quality of city water supply
20. Citizens' rating of the dependability and overall quality of city sanitary sewer service
21. Number of sewer blockages on city system per 100 connections

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 March, 2018.

Attest: City Clerk

Mayor

City of New Hope Performance Measures
Quantifiable performance measures are shaded and Summaries of Survey Questions are attached

Category	#	Measure	Comparison of Results between: 2015 community wide phone survey (400 randomly selected residents), 2016 online and paper City Services Survey (646 responses), and 2017 online and paper City Services Survey (632 responses)
General	1.	Rating of the overall quality of city services	2015: City-wide survey addressed satisfaction with specific city services not overall satisfaction 2016: 22% excellent; 65% good; 10% fair; 1% poor; 3% don't know (87% excellent or good) 2017: 21% excellent; 63.5% good; 10.5% fair; 1% poor; 4% don't know (84.5% excellent or good)
	2.	Percent change in the taxable property market value	2015: 7.23% (total taxable market value: $1,430,939,117) 2016: 7.28% (total taxable market value: $1,535,054,114) 2017: 10.59% (total taxable market value: $1,697,691,840)
	3.	Citizens' rating of the overall appearance of the city	2015: (Specifies "Appearance of your neighborhood") 28% excellent; 66% good; 5% fair; 1% poor; 0% don't know (94% excellent or good) 2016: 14% excellent; 64% good; 20% fair; <2% poor; <1% don't know (78% excellent or good) 2017: 16% excellent; 66% good; 15% fair; 2% poor; <1% don't know (82% excellent or good)
	4.	Bond rating	2015: AA 2016: AA 2017: AA
	5.	Citizens' rating of the quality of city recreational programs and facilities	2015: Recreation Facilities: 21% excellent; 69% good; 9% fair; 1% poor; 1% don't know 90% excellent or good); Programs (participants only): 98% satisfied; 2% dissatisfied; 0% don't know 2016: 26% excellent; 48% good; 10% fair; 1% poor; 16% don't know (74% excellent or good) 2017: 26% excellent; 47% good; 8% fair; 2% poor; 17% don't know (73% excellent or good)
	6.	Would use public transit if readily available	2015: "Use public transit on a regular basis?": 17% yes; 82% no; 1% don't know/refused 2016: 11% very likely; 18% somewhat likely; 20% somewhat unlikely; 42% very unlikely 8% don't know (29% very likely or somewhat likely) 2017: 9% very likely; 20% somewhat likely; 17% somewhat unlikely; 47% very unlikely 7% don't know (29% very likely or somewhat likely)
Police Services	7.	Part I and II crime rates	2015: Part 1 – 548; Part 2 – 1,188 2016: Part 1 – 543; Part 2 – 1,265 (as of 11/2/16) 2017: Part 1 – 470; Part 2 – 649 (as of 10/31/17)
	8.	Citizens' rating of safety in the community	2015: "Do you generally feel safe walking in your neighborhood": 94% yes; 5% no; 1% don't know 2015: "Police protection": 40% excellent; 51% good; 8% fair; 1% poor; 1% don't know 2016: 46% very safe; 47% somewhat safe: 6% somewhat unsafe; 1% very unsafe; <1% don't know (93% very safe or somewhat safe) 2017: 48% very safe; 43% somewhat safe: 6% somewhat unsafe; <2% very unsafe; <2% don't know (91% very safe or somewhat safe)
	9.	Average police response time	2015: 4.36 minutes for priority 1 calls 2016: 4.34 minutes for priority 1 calls 2017: Unavailable

Fire & EMS Services	10.	Insurance industry rating of fire services	2015: 3 2016: 3 2017: 3
	11.	Citizens' rating of the quality of fire protection services	2015: 43% excellent; 49% good; 5% fair; 0% poor; 3% don't know (92% excellent or good) 2016: 39% excellent; 29% good; 2% fair; 0% poor; 30% don't know (68% excellent or good) 2017: 33% excellent; 34% good; 2% fair; 0% poor; 31% don't know (67% excellent or good)
	12.	Fire calls per 1,000 population	2015: 37.27 (758 calls for service; population 20,339) 2016: 39.87 (795 calls for service; population 20,339) 2017: 40.66 (827 calls through 10/31/17)
Streets	13.	Average city pavement condition rating	2015: 73 2016: 75 2017: 76 (as of 10/31/17)
	14.	Citizens' rating of county roads	2015: Not available 2016: 9% excellent; 59% good; 25% fair; 5% poor; 2% don't know (68% excellent or good) 2017: 12% excellent, 62% good, 20% fair, 4% poor, 2% don't know (74% excellent or good)
	15.	Citizens' rating of city roads	2015: 13% excellent; 57% good; 22% fair; 9% poor; 0% don't know (70% excellent or good) 2016: 8% excellent; 55% good; 30% fair; 6% poor; 1% don't know (63% excellent or good) 2017: 11% excellent, 65% good, 20% fair, 4% poor, <1% don't know (75% excellent or good)
	16.	Citizens' rating of the quality of snowplowing on city streets	2015: 28% excellent; 60% good; 12% fair; 1% poor; 0% don't know (88% excellent or good) 2016: 36% excellent; 48% good; 10% fair; 4% poor; 2% don't know (84% excellent or good) 2017: 35% excellent; 49% good; 12% fair; 2% poor; 2% don't know (84% excellent or good)
Water	17.	Citizens' rating of the dependability and quality of city water supply	2015: 16% excellent; 65% good; 18% fair; 1% poor; 1% don't know (81% excellent or good) 2016: 38% excellent; 50% good; 7% fair; 2% poor; 3% don't know (88% excellent or good) 2017: 42% excellent; 48% good; 6% fair; 2% poor; 2% don't know (90% excellent or good)
Sanitary Sewer	18.	Citizens' rating of the dependability and quality of city sanitary sewer service	2015: 15% excellent; 67% good; 8% fair; 1% poor; 9% don't know (82% excellent or good) 2016: 28% excellent; 56% good; 6% fair; <1% poor; 10% don't know (84% excellent or good) 2017: 30% excellent; 56% good; 5% fair; <1% poor; 8% don't know (86% excellent or good)
	19.	Number of sewer blockages on city system per 1000 connections	2015: 0 (backups in 5400 connections) 2016: 0 2017: 0 (as of 10/31/17)
Code Enforcement	20.	Citizens' rating of the quality of code enforcement services	2015: "building inspection" 13% excellent; 56% good; 11% fair; 1% poor; 20% don't know (69% excellent or good) 2016: 8% excellent; 37% good; 16% fair; 9% poor; 30% don't know (42% excellent or good) 2017: 7% too tough; 47% about right; 36% not tough enough; 10% don't know
Communi-cations	21.	Citizens' rating of the quality of communication/distribution of information	2015: 15% excellent; 71% good; 13% fair; 1% poor; 1% don't know (86% excellent or good) 2016: 19% excellent; 59% good; 16% fair; 1% poor; 5% don't know (78% excellent or good) 2017: 22% excellent; 55% good; 19% fair; 2% poor; 2% don't know (77% excellent or good)