

STATE OF MINNESOTA)
COUNTY OF WASHINGTON) ss
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. 12-64, "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 2012.

WITNESS my hand and the seal of said City this 29th day of May 2012.



Kimberlee K. Blaeser
City Clerk

(SEAL)

Attachment: Resolution No. 12-64

RESOLUTION NO. 12 -64

**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, a voluntary performance measurement and reporting program has been established by the State of Minnesota; and

WHEREAS, participation in this program will provide the City of Woodbury with a reimbursement of \$0.14 (fourteen cents) per capita annually and relief from State levy limits when enacted; and

WHEREAS, this program is being implemented by the Council on Local Results and Innovation (CLRI) and the Minnesota State Auditor's Office; and


WHEREAS, the CLRI has established a set of performance measures for cities to adopt and report; and

WHEREAS, this set of measures must be formally adopted to meet the requirements set forth by the enacting legislation of this program; 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.

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 meet all other necessary requirements to participate in the performance measurement program.

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, 2012.



Mary Giuliani Stephens, Mayor

Attest:



Jody M. Vogl, Acting City Administrator

(SEAL)

Report on Model Performance Measures for Cities

City of Woodbury, MN

2011 Results

The City of Woodbury's report, on the recommended as model measures of performance outcomes for cities, is below:

General:

1. Rating of the overall quality of services provided by your city (*Citizen Survey: excellent, good, fair, poor*)
Excellent: 17%
Good: 60%
Fair: 14%
Poor: 1%
Don't know/refused: 9%
2. Percent change in the taxable property market value
-6.9%
3. Citizens' rating of the overall appearance of the city (*Citizen Survey: excellent, good, fair, poor*)

Woodbury did not survey on overall appearance but did on quality of life, I have provided these statistics because the outcome is likely comparable.

Excellent: 53%
Good: 46%
Fair: 1%
Poor: 0%
Don't know/refused: 0%

Police Services:

4. Part I and II crime rates (*Submit data as reported by the Minnesota Bureau of Criminal Apprehension. Part I crimes include murder, rape, aggravated assault, burglary, larceny, motor vehicle theft, and arson. Part II crimes include other assaults, forgery/counterfeiting, embezzlement, stolen property, vandalism, weapons, prostitution, other sex offenses, narcotics, gambling, family/children crime, D.U.I, liquor laws, disorderly conduct, and other offenses.*)

or

Citizens' rating of safety in their community (*Citizen Survey: very safe, somewhat safe, neither safe nor unsafe, somewhat unsafe, very unsafe*)

Very safe: 53%
Reasonably safe: 40%
Somewhat unsafe: 6%
Very unsafe: 1%
Don't know/Refused: 1%

Output Measure:

Police Response Time (*Time it takes on top priority calls from dispatch to the first officer on scene.*)

Average response time: 4.8 minutes (From 2010, currently updating software to more accurately measure response time).

Fire Services:

5. Insurance industry rating of Fire services (*The Insurance Service Office (ISO) issues ratings to Fire Departments throughout the country for the effectiveness of their fire protection services and equipment to protect their community. The ISO rating is a numerical grading system and is one of the primary elements used by the insurance industry to develop premium rates for residential and commercial businesses. ISO analyzes data using a Fire Suppression Rating Schedule (FSRS) and then assigns a Public Protection Classification from 1 to 10. Class 1 generally represents superior property fire protection and Class 10 indicates that the area's fire suppression program does not meet ISO's minimum criteria.*)

or

Citizens' rating of the quality of fire protection services (*Citizen Survey: excellent, good, fair, poor*)

Excellent: 53%

Good: 41%

Fair: 0%

Poor: 0%

Don't know/refused: 7%

Output Measure:

Fire Response Time (*Time it takes from dispatch to apparatus on scene for calls that are dispatched as a possible fire*).

Average response time: 7.03 minutes

Five firefighters on scene in less than 9 minutes 64% of the time; six additional firefighters on scene in less than 13 minutes 92% of the time.

Emergency Medical Services (EMS) Response Time (answer if applicable) (*Time it takes from dispatch to arrival of EMS*)

Average response time: 3.6 minutes

Streets:

6. Average city street pavement condition rating (*Provide average rating and the rating system program/type. Example: 70 rating on the Pavement Condition Index (PCI)*)

Residential Roads: 76.8 Pavement Condition Index (PCI)

Non-residential roads: 74.5 Pavement Condition Index (PCI)

or

Citizens' rating of the road condition in their city (*Citizen Survey: good condition, mostly good condition, many bad spots*)

7. Citizens' rating the quality of snowplowing on city streets (*Citizen Survey: excellent, good, fair, poor*)

Excellent: 31%

Good: 58%

Fair: 10%

Poor: 2%

Don't know/refused: 0%

Water:

8. Citizens' rating of the dependability and quality of city water supply (answer if applicable – centrally provided system) (*Citizen Survey: excellent, good, fair, poor*)

Excellent: 30%

Good: 64%

Fair: 3%
Poor: 1%
Don't know/refused: 2%

Output Measure:

Operating cost per 1,000,000 gallons of water pumped/produced (answer if applicable – centrally provided system)

(Actual operating expense for water utility / (total gallons pumped/1,000,000))
\$1,440.74

Sanitary Sewer:

9. Citizens' rating of the dependability and quality of city sanitary sewer service (answer if applicable – centrally provided system) *(Citizen Survey: excellent, good, fair, poor)*

Excellent: 29%
Good: 64%
Fair: 3%
Poor: 0%
Don't know/refused: 5%

Output Measure:

Number of sewer blockages on city system per 100 connections (answer if applicable – centrally provided system) *(Number of sewer blockages on city system reported by sewer utility / (population/100))*

0.009 blockages per 100 connections

Parks and Recreation:

10. Citizens' rating of the quality of city recreational programs and facilities (parks, trails, park buildings) *(Citizen Survey: excellent, good, fair, poor)*

Programs
Excellent: 29%
Good: 52%
Fair: 2%
Poor: 0%
Don't know/refused: 17%

Facilities
Excellent: 50%
Good: 47%
Fair: 2%
Poor: 0%
Don't know/refused: 2%