

City of New Hope

Resolution No. 2020 - 28

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 2020, 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 streets
16. Citizens' rating of overall condition of city roads
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

WHEREAS, the city is utilizing the services of The Morris Leatherman Company to conduct a professional city survey in 2020 to evaluate residents' satisfaction with city services.

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 9th day of March, 2020.

Lacie Leone

Attest: City Clerk

Kathi Hemker  
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 online and paper city services surveys from 2017 (632 responses), 2018 (679 responses), and 2019 (610 responses)
<b>General</b>	1.	Rating of the overall quality of city services	2017: 21% excellent; 63.5% good; 10.5% fair; 1% poor; 4% don't know (84.5% excellent or good) 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)
	2.	Percent change in the taxable property market value	Payable 2017: 7.28% (total taxable market value: \$1,535,054,114) Payable 2018: 10.56% (total taxable market value: \$1,697,092,365) Payable 2019: 7.92% (total taxable market value: \$1,831,436,951)
	3.	Citizens' rating of the overall appearance of the city	2017: 16% excellent; 66% good; 15% fair; 2% poor; <1% don't know (82% excellent or good) 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)
	4.	Bond rating	2017: AA 2018: AA 2019: AA
	5.	Citizens' rating of the quality of city recreational programs and facilities	2017: 26% excellent; 47% good; 8% fair; 2% poor; 17% don't know (73% excellent or good) 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)
	6.	Would use public transit if readily available	2017: 9% very likely; 20% somewhat likely; 17% somewhat unlikely; 47% very unlikely 7% don't know (29% very likely or somewhat likely) 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)
	7.	Citizens' support of funding home repair and improvement programs	2019: 50% Yes; 48% No; 2% Blank
<b>Police Services</b>	8.	Part I and II crime rates	2016: Part 1: 583; Part 2: 814 2017: Part 1: 581; Part 2: 628 2018: Part 1: 682; Part 2: 721 <i>*Full crime stats for current year compiled after January 1 to ensure accuracy</i>
	9.	Citizens' rating of safety in the community	2017: 48% very safe; 43% somewhat safe: 6% somewhat unsafe; <2% very unsafe; <2% don't know (91% very safe or somewhat safe) 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)
	10.	Average police response time	2016: 4.34 minutes for priority 1 calls 2017: 4.32 minutes for priority 1 calls 2018: 4.36 minutes for priority 1 calls <i>*Full police stats for current year compiled after January 1 to ensure accuracy</i>

<b>Fire &amp; EMS Services</b>	11.	Insurance industry rating of fire services	2017: 3 2018: 3 2019: 3
	12.	Citizens' rating of the quality of fire protection services	2017: 33% excellent; 34% good; 2% fair; 0% poor; 31% don't know (67% excellent or good) 2018: 36% excellent; 43% good; 16% neutral; 1% fair; <1% poor; <4% don't know/blank (79% excellent or good) 2019: 39% excellent; 41% good; 17% neutral; <1% fair, <1% poor; 2% don't know/blank (80% excellent or good)
	13.	Fire calls per 1,000 population	2017: 48.13 (979 calls for service; population 20,339) 2018: 47.79 (972 calls for service; population 20,339) 2019: 696 calls for service through 8/31/19; population 20,339)
<b>Streets</b>	14.	Average city pavement condition rating	2017: 76 2018: 76 2019: 76
	15.	Citizens' rating of county roads	2017: 12% excellent; 62% good; 20% fair; 4% poor; 2% don't know (74% excellent or good) 2018: 11% excellent; 60% good; 16% neutral; 10% fair; 3% poor (71% excellent or good) 2019: 8% excellent; 54% good; 15% neutral; 16% fair, 6% poor; 1% don't know/blank (62% excellent or good)
	16.	Citizens' rating of city streets	2017: 11% excellent; 65% good; 20% fair; 4% poor; <1% don't know (75% excellent or good) 2018: 10% excellent; 60% good; 13% neutral; 10% fair; 2% poor; 5% don't know/blank (70% excellent or good) 2019: 9% excellent; 57% good; 14% neutral; 17% fair, 3% poor; <1% don't know/blank (64% excellent or good)
	17.	Citizens' rating of the quality of snowplowing on city streets	2017: 35% excellent; 49% good; 12% fair; 2% poor; 2% don't know (84% excellent or good) 2018: 30% excellent; 50% good; 6% neutral; 9% fair; 4% poor; 1% don't know/blank (80% excellent or good) 2019: 33% excellent; 45% good; 8% neutral; 10% fair, 4% poor; 0% don't know/blank (78% excellent or good)
<b>Water</b>	18.	Citizens' rating of the dependability and quality of city water supply	2017: 42% excellent; 48% good; 6% fair; 2% poor; 2% don't know (90% excellent or good) 2018: 42% excellent; 44% good; 8% neutral; 4% fair; 1% poor; 1% don't know/blank (86% excellent or good) 2019: 39% excellent; 48% good; 8% neutral; 3% fair, 1% poor; 1% don't know/blank (87% excellent or good)
	19.	Citizens' rating of the quality of stormwater management in the city	2019: 20% excellent; 50% good; 20% neutral; 6% fair, 3% poor; 1% don't know/blank (70% excellent or good)
<b>Sanitary Sewer</b>	20.	Citizens' rating of the dependability and quality of city sanitary sewer service	2017: 30% excellent; 56% good; 5% fair; <1% poor; 8% don't know (86% excellent or good) 2018: 30% excellent; 50% good; 13% neutral; 3% fair; 1% poor; 3% don't know/blank (80% excellent or good) 2019: 28% excellent; 53% good; 14% neutral; 3% fair, 1% poor; 1% don't know/blank (81% excellent or good)
	21.	Number of sewer blockages on city system per 1000 connections	2017: 0 2018: 0 2019: 0 (as of 8/31/19)
<b>Code Enforcement</b>	22.	Citizens' rating of the quality of code enforcement services	2017: 7% too tough; 47% about right; 36% not tough enough; 10% don't know 2018: 7% too tough; 53% about right; 34% not tough enough; 6% don't know/blank 2019: 7% too tough; 58% about right; 34% not tough enough; 1% don't know/blank
<b>Communi-cations</b>	23.	Citizens' rating of the quality of communication/distribution of information	2017: 22% excellent; 55% good; 19% fair; 2% poor; 2% don't know (77% excellent or good) 2018: 24% excellent; 52% good; 14% neutral; 6% fair; 3% poor; 1% don't know/blank (77% excellent or good) 2019: 17% excellent; 55% good; 16% neutral; 8% fair, 3% poor; 1% don't know/blank (72% excellent or good)