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. 16-101, “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 29TH day of June 2016.

WITNESS my hand and the seal of said City this 19th day of July 2016.

[Signature]
Kimberlee K. Blaeser
City Clerk

(SEAL)

Attachment: Resolution No. 16-101
RESOLUTION NO. 16-101

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

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 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/county’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 29th day of June 2016.

Mary Giuliani Stephens, Mayor

Attest:

Clinton P. Gridley, City Administrator

(SEAL)
MEMORANDUM

To: State of Minnesota – Council on Local Results and Innovation
From: Sarah Alig, Assistant to the City Administrator
Date: July 19, 2016
Re: 2015 Performance Measurement Report for the City of Woodbury

On June 29, 2016 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 2015 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 (500 responses)
   - Excellent: 26%
   - Good: 59%
   - Fair: 12%
   - Poor: 1%
   - Don’t Know/Refused: 3%

2. Percent change in the taxable property market value:
   a. 3.5 increase in taxable market value to total 7.6 billion in 2016.

3. Citizens’ rating of the overall appearance of the city (499 responses)
   - Excellent: 36%
   - Good: 51%
   - Fair: 10%
   - Poor: 0%
   - Don’t Know/Refused: 3%

4. Code enforcement cases per 1,000 population: $781 / 67,875 \times 1,000 = 11.5$
5. Number of library visits per 1,000 population: $360,683 / 67,875 \times 1,000 = 5,313.9$
6. Bond rating: AAA
7. Citizens’ rating of the quality of city recreational programs and facilities (499 responses)
   - Excellent: 26%
   - Good: 42%
   - Fair: 9%
   - Poor: 1%
   - Don’t Know/Refused: 21%
8. Accuracy of post election audit (% of ballots counted correctly): NA

Public Safety (Police, Fire, and EMS)
9. Part I and II crime rate:
   a. Part I – 1,313
   b. Part II – 2,215
10. Part I and II crime clearance rate: 47% of crimes cleared
11. Citizens’ rating of safety in their community (499 responses)
    Excellent: 49%
    Good: 45%
    Fair: 5%
    Poor: 1%
    Don’t Know/Refused: 0%
12. Average police response time: Not collected
13. Insurance industry rating of fire services: NA
14. Citizens’ rating of the quality of fire protection services (499 responses)
    Excellent: 39%
    Good: 34%
    Fair: 1%
    Poor: 0%
    Don’t Know/Refused: 10%
15. Average fire response time:
    a. 5 firefighters on scene in less than 9 minutes: 80%
    b. 6 additional firefighters on scene in less than 13 minutes: 72%
16. Fire calls per 1,000 population: 784 / 67,875 x 1,000 = 11.5
17. Number of fires with loss resulting in investigation: 41
18. EMS calls per 1,000 population: 3,225 / 67,875 x 1,000 = 47.5
19. EMS average response time: 3.8

Public Works
20. Average city pavement condition rating:
    a. Average PCI of non-residential streets: 76
    b. Average PCI of residential streets: 69
21. Citizens’ rating of the road conditions in their city (“quality of pavement repair and patching” – 492 responses)
    Excellent: 8%
    Good: 31%
    Fair: 41%
    Poor: 18%
    Don’t Know/Refused: 1%
22. Expenditures for road rehabilitation per paved lane mile rehabilitated: $1,245
23. Percentage of all jurisdiction lane miles rehabilitated in the year: 28%
24. Average hours to complete road system during snow event: 6.3
25. Citizens' rating of snowplowing on city streets:
   Excellent: 24%
   Good: 48%
   Fair: 21%
   Poor: 7%
   Don't Know/Refused: 0%

26. Citizens' rating of the dependability and quality of the city water supply:
   Excellent: 28%
   Good: 43%
   Fair: 15%
   Poor: 10%
   Don't Know/Refused: 5%

27. Average cost of operation and maintenance and repair per mile of water main: $5,600

28. Citizens' rating of the dependability and quality of the city sanitary sewer service:
   Excellent: 35%
   Good: 45%
   Fair: 5%
   Poor: 1%
   Don't Know/Refused: 14%

29. Number of sewer blockages on city system per 100 connections: 4 blockages / 21,660 x 100 = 0.018