



# *City of New Ulm*

*City Manager*

*100 North Broadway*

*Telephone: (507) 359-8233*

*New Ulm, Minnesota 56073*

*Fax: (507) 359-9752*

*Email: [chrisd@newulmmn.gov](mailto:chrisd@newulmmn.gov)*

*Website: [www.newulmmn.gov](http://www.newulmmn.gov)*

---

June 18, 2020

Office of the State Auditor  
525 Park Street - Suite 500  
St. Paul, MN 55103

**Re: Performance Measurement Program Survey**

To Whom It May Concern:

Enclosed please find the results of the Performance Measurement Program survey. A copy of the survey is included as well as Resolution No. 2020-48 adopted by the New Ulm City Council at their regular meeting on June 16, 2020.

If you have any questions, please contact our office.

Respectfully submitted,

CITY OF NEW ULM, MINNESOTA

Chris W. Dalton  
City Manager

CWD:lap

Enclosures

**RESOLUTION NO. 2020 - 48**

**CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF NEW ULM, MINNESOTA**

Councilor Fischer offered the following resolution and moved its adoption:

**WHEREAS**, the benefits to the City of New Ulm, Brown County 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**, 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 Council of the City of New Ulm 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; and

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED**, that the City Council of the City of New Ulm 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 New Ulm will submit to the Office of the State Auditor the actual results of the performance measures adopted by the city.

The motion for the adoption of the foregoing resolution was duly seconded by Councilor Mack and, the roll being called, the following vote was recorded:

Voting Aye: Councilors Fischer, Mack, Schultz and President Schmitz.

Voting Nay: None.

Not Voting: Councilor Christian.

Whereupon said resolution was declared to have been duly adopted this 16<sup>th</sup> day of June 2020.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
President of the City Council

Attest:

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Finance Director

The above resolution approved June 16, 2020.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Mayor

# State Report City Wide Totals

6/18/2020

Page 1 of 2

<i>Item</i>	<i>Description</i>	<i>Percent</i>	<i>Scale</i>	<i>Count</i>
1	Indicate the number of years you lived in New Ulm.	5.43%	1-9 Years	10
		13.04%	10-19 Years	24
		11.96%	20-29 Years	22
		13.59%	30-39 Years	25
		15.76%	40-49 Years	29
		13.04%	50-59 Years	24
		10.87%	60-69 Years	20
		2.72%	70-79 Years	5
		0.54%	80-89 Years	1
2	How would you rate the overall appearance of the city?	0.87%	Poor	2
		0.87%	Fair	2
		29.69%	Satisfactory	68
		110.92%	Good	254
		57.64%	Excellent	132
3	How would you describe your overall feeling of police protection services in the city?	2.61%	Fair	6
		19.13%	Satisfactory	44
		89.57%	Good	206
		88.70%	Excellent	204
4	How would you rate the overall quality of fire protection services in the city?	3.52%	Fair	8
		9.69%	Satisfactory	22
		68.72%	Good	156
		118.06%	Excellent	268
5	How would you rate the overall condition of city streets?	7.83%	Poor	18
		25.22%	Fair	58
		79.13%	Satisfactory	182
		78.26%	Good	180
		9.57%	Excellent	22
6	How would you rate the overall quality of snowploweing on city streets?	8.73%	Poor	20
		17.47%	Fair	40
		42.79%	Satisfactory	98
		95.20%	Good	218
		35.81%	Excellent	82
7	How would you rate the dependability and overall quality of city sanitary sewer services?	0.88%	Poor	2
		20.35%	Satisfactory	46
		93.81%	Good	212
		84.96%	Excellent	192
8	How would you rate the dependability and overall quality of city water services?	2.62%	Poor	6
		4.37%	Fair	10
		24.45%	Satisfactory	56
		89.96%	Good	206
		78.60%	Excellent	180
9	How would you rate the dependability and overall quality of city gas services?	0.88%	Poor	2

# State Report City Wide Totals

6/18/2020

Page 2 of 2

<i>Item</i>	<i>Description</i>	<i>Percent</i>	<i>Scale</i>	<i>Count</i>
9	How would you rate the dependability and overall quality of city gas services?	16.67%	Satisfactory	38
		92.11%	Good	210
		90.35%	Excellent	206
10	How would you rate the dependability and overall quality of city electricity services?	0.87%	Poor	2
		0.87%	Fair	2
		19.21%	Satisfactory	44
		89.96%	Good	206
		89.08%	Excellent	204
11	How would you rate the overall quality of city recreational programs?	1.77%	Poor	4
		1.77%	Fair	4
		34.51%	Satisfactory	78
		92.04%	Good	208
		69.91%	Excellent	158
12	How would you rate the overall quality of city recreational facilities? (e.g. parks, trails, park facilities, etc.)	0.88%	Poor	2
		3.51%	Fair	8
		24.56%	Satisfactory	56
		90.35%	Good	206
		80.70%	Excellent	184
13	How would you rate the library services in the city?	0.91%	Poor	2
		27.40%	Satisfactory	60
		78.54%	Good	172
		93.15%	Excellent	204
14	How would you rate the quality of licensing, permitting and building inspection services in the city?	1.83%	Poor	4
		8.22%	Fair	18
		56.62%	Satisfactory	124
		89.50%	Good	196
		43.84%	Excellent	96
15	How would you rate the overall programming of the Community Access Channel also known as NUCAT (Comcast channel 14 and NHI Telecom channel 20)?	3.92%	Poor	8
		12.75%	Fair	26
		75.49%	Satisfactory	154
		69.61%	Good	142
		38.24%	Excellent	78
16	How would you rate the utility billing/finance department services?	2.64%	Poor	6
		7.05%	Fair	16
		37.00%	Satisfactory	84
		91.63%	Good	208
		61.67%	Excellent	140
17	How would you rate the overall quality of services provided by the city?	0.88%	Poor	2
		26.32%	Satisfactory	60
		121.05%	Good	276
		51.75%	Excellent	118

**City Wide Survey of Public Services for 2019**  
**Report to the State Auditor**  
**April 2020**

**#1 - Indicate the number of years you lived in New Ulm.**

	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
01-09 yr	23	25	15	27	19	22	18	42	34
10-19 yr	19	25	17	29	15	23	19	38	24
20-29 yr	24	18	15	18	20	18	22	23	22
30-39 yr	23	18	13	13	22	28	13	23	25
40-49 yr	21	22	27	24	13	19	11	23	29
50-59 yr	18	17	15	18	10	11	17	24	24
60-69 yr	10	11	10	12	13	9	7	15	20
70-79 yr	3	6	2	5	4	10	3	9	5
80-89 yr	3	0	4	2	1	2	2	5	1
90-99 yr	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0
Avg.	32.40	32.09	35.72	32.09	33.07	33.23	31.7	31.91	33.27
% change		-0.96%	11.31%	-10.16%	3.05%	0.48%	-4.60%	0.66%	4.26%

NOTE: 2011-2017 300 surveys mailed; 2018 500 surveys mailed

**#2 - How would you rate the overall appearance of the city?**

Scale	2011	%	2012	%	2013	%	2014	%	2015	%	2016	%	2017	%	2018	%	2019	%
1 Poor	2	1.14	0	1.14	0	0.00	1	0.40	2	0.87	1	0.40	1	0.44	1	0.44	1	0.44
2 Fair	2	1.14	6	1.14	2	0.81	1	0.40	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	0.87	1	0.44
3 Satisfactory	15	8.57	24	8.57	15	6.07	20	8.10	13	5.68	22	8.91	8	3.49	29	12.66	34	14.85
4 Good	89	53.71	110	53.71	76	30.77	101	40.89	77	33.62	98	39.68	85	37.12	150	65.50	127	55.46
5 Excellent	67	35.43	40	35.43	60	24.29	55	22.27	51	22.27	50	20.24	44	19.21	65	28.38	66	28.82
Avg. rating	4.21		4.02		4.27		4.17		4.22		4.15		4.24		4.12		4.12	
% change			-4.51%		6.22%		-2.34%		1.20%		-1.66%		2.17%		-2.83%		0.00%	

**#3 - How would you describe your overall feeling of police protection services in the city?**

Scale	2011	%	2012	%	2013	%	2014	%	2015	%	2016	%	2017	%	2018	%	2019	%
1 Poor	1	0.57	1	0.57	2	0.80	3	1.20	2	0.87	1	0.40	2	0.87	3	1.30	0	0.00
2 Fair	5	2.84	8	2.84	7	2.81	4	1.61	4	1.75	2	0.80	0	0.00	5	2.17	3	1.30
3 Satisfactory	14	7.95	19	7.95	22	8.84	16	6.43	21	9.17	18	7.23	15	6.52	29	12.61	22	9.57
4 Good	89	50.57	79	50.57	65	26.10	81	32.53	52	22.71	72	28.92	47	20.43	108	46.96	103	44.78
5 Excellent	67	38.07	71	38.07	59	23.69	72	28.92	65	28.38	77	30.92	74	32.17	104	45.22	102	44.35
Avg. rating	4.23		4.19		4.11		4.22		4.21		4.31		4.38		4.22		4.32	
% change			-0.95%		-1.91%		2.68%		-0.24%		2.38%		1.62%		-3.65%		2.37%	

Part I Crime statistics:	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Homicide	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Rape	3	2	1	0	2	4	5	0	6	10	4
Robbery	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	2	0
Agg Assault	3	9	6	3	4	11	4	6	9	11	5
Burglary	52	82	67	89	61	41	58	29	25	43	13
Theft	199	175	153	176	171	131	194	135	98	121	144
Auto Theft	9	9	7	2	3	13	11	7	5	10	5
Arson	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	2
Human Trafficking	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	12	1
Total	267	277	235	270	241	200	275	177	149	210	174

Part II Crime Statistics:	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Other Assault	67	84	85	88	61	79	65	64	74	67	52
Forgery	2	7	4	7	6	10	7	6	4	7	9
Fraud	42	39	38	34	34	27	23	44	28	57	32
Embezzlement	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Stolen Property	3	1	2	3	2	2	4	1	2	1	4
Vandalism	145	150	107	113	102	91	85	87	94	66	75
Weapons	6	0	4	0	5	7	4	4	1	1	3
Prostitution	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	1	0
Sex Offenses	13	7	4	14	11	8	7	14	18	15	10
Narcotics	48	33	43	32	46	37	47	31	56	48	28
Gambling	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0
Family & Children	24	16	8	3	1	5	6	12	6	11	4
DUI	66	78	71	61	62	64	41	44	55	36	30
Liquor Laws	46	45	46	38	25	23	21	15	11	10	8
Drunkenness	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Disorderly Conduct	137	142	106	95	140	96	88	76	65	70	28
Vagrancy	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other Ex-Traffic	258	105	100	92	119	180	216	253	268	319	154
Total	857	708	618	580	615	629	615	653	686	709	437

Priority Police average response time:

	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Domestics	2 minutes	2 min 21 s	2 min 20 sec	3 minutes	6 min 31 sec	5 min 11 sec	3 min 2 sec	2 min 41 sec	4 min 23 sec
Medical Assists	3 min. 30 sec.	2 min 27 s	3 min 20 sec	2 min 42 sec	2 min 51 sec	1 min 23 sec	3 min 24 sec	2 min 46 sec	3 min 35 sec
Personal Injury Acc.	2 min. 30 sec.	2 min 30 s	2 min 30 sec	1 min 38 sec	3 min 6 sec	2 min 5 sec	3 min 23 sec	3 min 50 sec	5 min 31 sec
Calls for Service:	9,799	9,803	9,753	9,521	11,013	N/A	11,178	10,048	10,532
Criminal Investigation clearance rate:	68.80%	64.21%	67.00%	67.00%	70.00%	74.00%	72.00%	62.00%	

**#4 - How would you rate the overall quality of fire protection services in the city?**

Scale	2011	%	2012	%	2013	%	2014	%	2015	%	2016	%	2017	%	2018	%	2019	%
1 Poor	3	1.73	0		1	0.40	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
2 Fair	3	1.73	1	1.73	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	0.44	4	1.76
3 Satisfactory	5	2.89	13	2.89	7	2.82	7	2.82	8	3.49	8	3.23	5	2.20	16	7.05	11	4.85
4 Good	56	32.37	66	32.37	54	21.77	81	32.66	46	20.09	66	26.61	45	19.82	89	39.21	78	34.36
5 Excellent	106	61.27	96	61.27	93	37.50	89	35.89	89	38.86	94	37.90	88	38.77	142	62.56	134	59.03
Avg. rating	4.5		4.46		4.54		4.46		4.57	2.00	4.51		4.60		4.50		4.51	
% change	-		-0.89%		1.79%		-1.76%		2.47%		-1.31%		2.00%		-2.17%		0.22%	

Insurance Service Office (ISO) Fire rating: 3 in town  
9 rural

Average response time (dispatch to scene) in-town:	Goal	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
≤7 min.	7.85	6.57	5.44	5.42	5.51	5.73	5.17	4.73	4.91	4.36	5.14	

Number of fire calls per population - (# of calls/population)x1,000=calls per 1,000 population:

Number of fire calls	116
Population (2018 State Demographer)	13,645
Fire calls/population	9

Rental Inspections	607	N/A	N/A	832	748	647	550	889	647	924	659	884
--------------------	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----

**#5 - How would you rate the overall condition of city streets?**

Scale	2011	%	2012	%	2013	%	2014	%	2015	%	2016	%	2017	%	2018	%	2019	%
1 Poor	6	3.43	8	3.43	3	1.20	4	1.61	3	1.31	4	1.61	2	0.87	10	4.35	9	3.91
2 fair	14	8	20	8	16	6.43	18	7.23	15	6.55	27	10.84	10	4.35	31	13.48	29	12.61
3 Satisfactory	74	42.29	72	42.29	60	24.10	79	31.73	55	24.02	62	24.90	39	16.96	94	40.87	91	39.57
4 Good	63	36	63	36	60	24.10	60	24.10	58	25.33	62	24.90	71	30.87	100	43.48	90	39.13
5 Excellent	18	10.29	16	10.29	17	6.83	17	6.83	13	5.68	16	6.43	16	6.96	14	6.09	11	4.78
Avg. rating	3.42		3.33		3.46		3.38		3.44		3.35		3.64		3.31		3.28	
% change	-		-2.63%		3.90%		-2.31%		1.78%		-2.62%		8.66%		-9.07%		-0.91%	

Pavement Condition Index in miles of street:

Rating:	Score:	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Adequate	66-100 pts	43.52	45.38	43.81	45.98	48.29	47.65	50.07	52.16	52.162
Marginal	28-66 pts	9.53	10.22	10.54	10.54	14.56	16.47	18.44	18.19	0.1915
Failed	0-28 pts	28.70	26.04	27.53	25.65	20.20	19.41	15.72	14.35	0.1453
Total miles		81.75	81.64	81.88	82.17	83.05	83.53	84.23	84.7	85.3

**#6 - How would you rate the overall quality of snowplowing on city streets?**

Scale	2011	%	2012	%	2013	%	2014	%	2015	%	2016	%	2017	%	2018	%	2019	%
1 Poor	8	4.6	8	4.6	10	4.00	6	2.40	5	2.18	6	2.40	7	3.06	18	7.86	10	4.37
2 Fair	12	6.9	16	6.9	18	7.20	13	5.20	5	2.18	12	4.80	11	4.80	29	12.66	20	8.73
3 Satisfactory	56	32.18	44	32.18	35	14.00	41	16.40	33	14.41	51	20.40	27	11.79	58	25.33	49	21.40
4 Good	70	40.23	72	40.23	63	25.20	79	31.60	67	29.26	68	27.20	59	25.76	100	43.67	109	47.60
5 Excellent	28	16.09	38	16.09	29	11.60	39	15.60	33	14.41	34	13.60	33	14.41	45	19.65	41	17.90
Avg. rating	3.56		3.65		3.54		3.74		3.83		3.65		3.73		3.50		3.66	
% change	-		2.53%		-3.01%		5.65%		2.41%		-4.70%		2.19%		-6.17%		4.57%	

Number of miles of city streets:	81.75	83.21	83.48	85.52	88.8	88.8	88.8	89.08	89.08
Snow removal equipment:	13 units	14 units	14 units	14 units	14 units	14 units	14 units	14 units	14 units
Snow removal operators:	13 FTE's	14 FTE's	14 FTE's	14 FTE's	14 FTE's	14 FTE's	14 FTE's	14 FTE's	14 FTE's

Figures represent 2012 and 2013

**#7 - How would you rate the dependability and overall quality of city sanitary sewer services?**

Scale	2011	%	2012	%	2013	%	2014	%	2015	%	2016	%	2017	%	2018	%	2019	%
1 Poor	2	1.14	0	1.14	1	0.40	0	0.00	1	0.44	0	0.00	2	0.88	2	0.88	1	0.44
2 Fair	1	0.57	2	0.57	0	0.00	2	0.81	1	0.44	2	0.81	3	1.33	3	1.33	0	0.00
3 Satisfactory	19	10.8	27	10.8	16	6.48	25	10.12	17	7.42	20	8.10	8	3.54	30	13.27	23	10.18
4 Good	81	46.02	85	46.02	68	27.53	94	38.06	68	29.69	85	34.41	70	30.97	117	51.77	106	46.90
5 Excellent	73	41.48	63	41.48	68	27.53	56	22.67	55	24.02	63	25.51	56	24.78	95	42.04	96	42.48
Avg. rating	4.26		4.18		4.32		4.15		4.23		4.23		4.26		4.21		4.31	
% change	-		-1.88%		3.35%		-3.94%		1.93%		0.00%		0.71%		-1.17%		2.38%	

Number of sewage blockages per 100 connections:

Goal: 0	ratio	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Goal: 0	actual #	0 per 5189	0 per 5199	0 per 5197	0 per 5220	0 per 5247	0 per 5252	0 per 5252	0 per 5297	0 per 5300	5,358	0 per 5364	0 per 5412

\$ Cost /Million Gallons treated:	\$3,557	\$3,800	\$4,061	\$3,958	\$4,721	\$4,406	\$4,196	\$4,249	\$4,318	\$4,342	\$4,358	\$4,452
-----------------------------------	---------	---------	---------	---------	---------	---------	---------	---------	---------	---------	---------	---------

Note: Increase in cost to treat; flows were significantly lower (drought; less 1 & 1) in 2012 and 2013 than previous years

Water Quality MPCA violations (764 parameters tested annually)

Goal: 0	0	0	1*	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
---------	---	---	----	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

\* minor chlorine residue

**#8 How would you rate the dependability and overall quality of city water services?**

Scale	2011	%	2012	%	2013	%	2014	%	2015	%	2016	%	2017	%	2018	%	2019	%
1 Poor	3	1.7	0	1.7	3	1.20	3	1.20	1	0.44	2	0.80	3	1.31	1	0.44	3	1.31
2 Fair	2	1.14	12	1.14	1	0.40	4	1.61	4	1.75	7	2.81	4	1.75	5	2.18	5	2.18
3 Satisfactory	22	12.5	27	12.5	17	6.83	25	10.04	16	6.99	22	8.84	10	4.37	36	15.72	28	12.23
4 Good	76	43.18	71	43.18	65	26.10	86	34.54	59	25.76	72	28.92	65	28.38	117	51.09	103	44.98
5 Excellent	73	41.48	69	41.48	68	27.31	60	24.10	63	27.51	67	26.91	56	24.45	90	39.30	90	39.30
Avg. rating	4.22		4.22		4.26		4.10		4.25		4.15		4.21		4.16		4.19	
% change	-		0.00%		0.95%		-3.76%		3.66%		-2.35%		1.45%		-1.19%		0.72%	

Storage capacity: 8.5 million gallons in four facilities

	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
\$ cost per 1,000,000 of water produced:	\$3,333	\$3,274	\$4,090	\$4,065	\$3,491	\$3,730	\$3,539	\$4,128	\$3,629	\$3,860	\$4,570	\$4,860
Gallons produced (in millions):	785.1	756.9	632.7	655.3	765.3	729.0	772.7	720.9	726.5	750.7	626	625.3

Water Quality: No contaminants were detected at levels that violated federal drinking water standards for the 5 year review period 2010-2015.

\* Preliminary figures

**#9 How would you rate the dependability and overall quality of city gas services?**

Scale	2011	%	2012	%	2013	%	2014	%	2015	%	2016	%	2017	%	2018	%	2019	%
1 Poor	3	1.71	1	1.71	1	0.41	0	0.00	1	0.44	0	0.00	2	0.88	1	0.44	1	0.44
2 Fair	1	0.57	2	0.57	1	0.41	3	1.22	4	1.75	2	0.81	4	1.75	2	0.88	0	0.00
3 Satisfactory	14	8	23	8	13	5.28	17	6.91	13	5.68	15	6.10	7	3.07	26	11.40	19	8.33
4 Good	72	41.14	75	41.14	69	28.05	83	33.74	53	23.14	77	31.30	55	24.12	110	48.25	105	46.05
5 Excellent	85	48.57	78	48.57	69	28.05	73	29.67	72	31.44	75	30.49	67	29.39	107	46.93	103	45.18
Avg. rating	4.34		4.27		4.33		4.28		4.34		4.33		4.34		4.30		4.36	
% change	-		-1.61%		1.41%		-1.15%		1.40%		-0.23%		0.23%		-0.92%		1.40%	

	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Dist. Syst. Gas Leaks	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	2	0
Supply Gas Interruption	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Volume of Gas sold (millions):	1.540 Mcf	1.192 Mcf	1.259 Mcf	1.160 Mcf	1.348 Mcf	1.335 MCF	1.172 MCF	1.21 MCF	1.246 MCF	1.33 MCF	1.38 MCF

**#10 How would you rate the dependability and overall quality of city electricity services?**

Scale	2011	%	2012	%	2013	%	2014	%	2015	%	2016	%	2017	%	2018	%	2019	%
1 Poor	3	1.17	1	1.17	2	0.81	0	0.00	3	1.31	1	0.40	0	0.00	2	0.87	1	0.44
2 Fair	2	1.14	5	1.14	4	1.61	2	0.81	4	1.75	3	1.21	5	2.18	8	3.49	1	0.44
3 Satisfactory	17	9.66	26	9.66	17	6.85	20	8.06	12	5.24	15	6.05	8	3.49	26	11.35	22	9.61
4 Good	82	46.59	75	46.59	64	25.81	84	33.87	61	26.64	81	32.66	65	28.38	115	50.22	103	44.98
5 Excellent	72	40.91	70	40.91	68	27.42	72	29.03	62	27.07	71	28.63	60	26.20	97	42.36	102	44.54
Avg. rating	4.24		4.18		4.24		4.27		4.23		4.27		4.30		4.20		4.33	
% change	-		-1.42%		1.44%		0.71%		-0.94%		0.95%		0.70%		-2.33%		3.10%	

	2006 US Average	Goal	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
SAIFI 1.49 interruptions/cust.			0	0.18	2.13	0.18	0.32	0.52	0.65	0.066	0.09	0.2632	0.0304
SAIDI 244 minutes			0	1.73	78.6	9.7	2.84	14.95	64.39	3.38	8.04	11.22	3.186
CAIDI 164 minutes			0	9.42	36.94	53.8	88.62	28.75	99.67	51.2	88.65	42.61	104.913

SAIFI = Total number of interruptions divided by total number of customers  
 SAIDI= Sum of total interruption durations in minutes divided by total number of customers  
 CAIDI= Sum of total interruption durations divided by total number of interruptions

**#11 How would you rate the overall quality of city recreational programs?**

Scale	2011	%	2012	%	2013	%	2014	%	2015	%	2016	%	2017	%	2018	%	2019	%
1 Poor	4	2.33	2	2.33	1	0.41	0	0.00	1	0.44	2	0.82	0	0.00	2	0.88	2	0.88
2 Fair	7	4.07	8	4.07	5	2.06	4	1.65	2	0.87	5	2.06	0	0.00	6	2.65	2	0.88
3 Satisfactory	17	9.88	26	9.88	21	8.64	29	11.93	22	9.61	15	6.17	12	5.31	41	18.14	39	17.26
4 Good	78	45.35	76	45.35	70	28.81	73	30.04	64	27.95	80	32.92	60	26.55	99	43.81	104	46.02
5 Excellent	66	38.37	67	38.37	59	24.28	68	27.98	54	23.58	65	26.75	67	29.65	95	42.04	79	34.96
Avg. rating	4.13		4.11		4.16		4.18		4.17		4.20		4.40		4.15		4.13	
% change	-		-0.48%		1.22%		0.48%		-0.24%		0.72%		4.76%		-5.68%		-0.48%	

Recreation Program Participants	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Swim Lessons							1,346	1,108	1,143
Youth Athletics							906	700	600
Camps							791	560	545
Youth Athletics, Swim Lessons/Camps		1,772	1,965	2,002	2,753	2,067	2,858	3,043	2,368
Youth Special Events (No Registration Required)							2,525	2,730	3,268
Adult Athletics		723	863	864	1,349	1,400	1,122	1,083	850
Adult Fitness Class Participants		11,932	12,602	17,112	12,813	11,333	13,922	15,652	16,158
Totals		14,427	15,430	19,978	16,915	17,325	20,632	26,089	26,344

NOTE: 2011-2017 totals reflect overall quality of city recreational programs and facilities combined. In 2018, question was divided into two separate questions by program and facilities.





#17 How would you rate the overall quality of services provided by the city?

Scale	2011	%	2012	%	2013	%	2014	%	2015	%	2016	%	2017	%	2018	%	2019	%
1 Poor	1	0.58	1	0.58	1	0.41	0	0.00	3	1.31	0	0.00	3	1.32	2	0.88	1	0.44
2 Fair	3	1.75	7	1.75	1	0.41	1	0.41	0	0.00	1	0.41	2	0.88	2	0.88	0	0.00
3 Satisfactory	26	15.2	32	15.2	27	11.07	29	11.89	17	7.42	24	9.84	14	6.14	36	15.79	30	13.16
4 Good	98	57.31	89	57.31	84	34.43	98	40.16	81	35.37	93	38.11	81	35.53	151	66.23	138	60.53
5 Excellent	43	25.15	45	25.15	43	17.62	47	19.26	40	17.47	47	19.26	38	16.67	53	23.25	59	25.88
Avg. rating	4.05		3.98		4.07		4.09		4.1		4.13		4.08		4.03		4.11	
% change					2.26%		0.49%		0.24%		0.73%		-1.21%		-1.23%		1.99%	
			2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020				
Tax Levy			\$5,363,923	\$5,401,056	\$5,629,543	\$5,682,219	\$5,924,827	\$6,102,572	\$6,596,406	\$6,897,246	\$7,104,578	\$7,223,672	\$7,693,527	\$7,896,725				
Taxable Market Value (millions):			\$763.20	\$769.30	\$742.60	\$653.80	\$649.60	\$662.10	\$679.40	\$703.03	\$721.24	\$746.01	\$808.25	\$828.24				
Taxable Market Value Percentage Change:				0.79%	-3.60%	-13.58%	-0.65%	1.89%	2.55%	3.36%	2.52%	3.32%	7.70%	2.41%				
MVC to MVE state law change																		

# PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT PROGRAM CITY OF NEW ULM CITIZEN SURVEY



1. Please indicate the **number of years** you have lived in New Ulm \_\_\_\_\_ years

For each item identified below, circle the number to the right that best fits your judgment of its quality. Use the scale to select the quality number.

Description/Identification of Survey Item	Scale				
	P o o r				E x c e l l e n t
2. How would you rate the overall <b>appearance</b> of the city?	1	2	3	4	5
3. How would you rate the overall <b>feeling of police protection services</b> in the city?	1	2	3	4	5
4. How would you rate the overall <b>quality of fire protection services</b> in the city?	1	2	3	4	5
5. How would you rate the overall <b>condition of city streets</b> ?	1	2	3	4	5
6. How would you rate the overall <b>quality of snowplowing on city streets</b> ?	1	2	3	4	5
7. How would you rate the <b>dependability and overall quality of city sanitary sewer service</b> ?	1	2	3	4	5
8. How would you rate the <b>dependability and overall quality of the city water service</b> ?	1	2	3	4	5
9. How would you rate the <b>dependability and overall quality of the city gas service</b> ?	1	2	3	4	5
10. How would you rate the <b>dependability and overall quality of city electricity service</b> ?	1	2	3	4	5
11. How would you rate the overall <b>quality of city recreational programs</b> ?	1	2	3	4	5
12. How would you rate the overall <b>quality of city recreational facilities?</b> (e.g. parks, trails, park facilities, etc.)	1	2	3	4	5
13. How would you rate the <b>library services</b> in the city?	1	2	3	4	5
14. How would you rate the <b>quality of licensing, permitting and building inspection services</b> in the city?	1	2	3	4	5
15. How would you rate the overall <b>programming of the Community Access Channel</b> also known as NUCAT (Comcast channel 14 and NU-Telecom channel 3)?	1	2	3	4	5
16. How would you rate the <b>utility billing/finance department services</b> ?	1	2	3	4	5
17. How would you rate the <b>overall</b> quality of services provided by the city?	1	2	3	4	5

Comments: \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

Please use the enclosed self-addressed, postage paid envelope to return the survey to City Hall by  
Friday, March 13, 2020

**Thank you for your time and consideration in completing this survey**

