Comm of the Whole - Your Committee, having under consideration the adoption of performance measures developed by the State of Minnesota Council on Local Results and Innovation, now recommends passage of the accompanying resolution declaring the City of Minneapolis' commitment to a) using and reporting out to the public the ten city performance measures created by the State of Minnesota Council on Local Results and Innovation; b) continued usage of a performance measurement system; and c) continued surveying of residents on key services as defined by the State of Minnesota Council on Local Results and Innovation.

		······································			RECORD C	OF COUNCIL V	OTE (X INDICATES					City Council	
COUNCIL MEMBER	AYE	NAY	ABSTAIN	ABSENT	VOTE TO OVERRIDE	VOTE TO SUSTAIN	COUNCIL MEMBER	AYE	NAY	ABSTAIN	ABSENT	VOTE TO OVERRIDE	VOTE TO SUSTAIN
Reich	X						Glidden	χ					
Gordon	X						Schiff	Ϋ́					
Hofstede	X						Tuthill	X					
Johnson	X						Quincy	X					
Samuels	X	İ					Colvin Roy	V					
Lilligren	Τχ						Hodges	X			<u> </u>		
Goodman	TX			<u> </u>					<u> </u>			1	1

JUN 2 9 2012 ADOPTED	APPROVED NOT APPRO	VED VETOED
DATE		
ATTEST		JUN 29 2012
CITY CLERK .	MAYOR RYBAK	DATE

2012R-353 RESOLUTION of the CITY OF MINNEAPOLIS

By Lilligren

Adopting continued commitment to a performance measurement system that collects and reports the performance measures developed by the State of Minnesota Council on Local Results and Innovation.

Whereas, the City of Minneapolis has previously adopted the Performance Measures developed by the State of Minnesota Council on Local Improvements and Innovation in Resolution 2011R-297; and

Whereas, the Council on Local Improvements and Innovation has created a comprehensive performance measurement system for cities to implement in 2012;

Now, Therefore, Be It Resolved by The City Council of The City of Minneapolis:

That it has implemented a local performance measurement system (Results
 Minneapolis) as developed by the State of Minnesota Council on Local Results and
 Innovation,

That it has historically and will survey its residents by the end of the calendar year on the services included in the performance benchmarks,

That the City has adopted, implemented and will report the results of the 10 performance measures developed by the State of Minnesota Council on Local Results and Innovation before the end of the year via the City's website:

General

- 1. Rating of the overall quality of services provided by your city
- 2. Percent change in the taxable property market value
- 3. Citizens' rating of the overall appearance of the city

Police Services

4. Part I and II crime rates

Fire Services

5. Citizens' rating of the quality of fire protection services

Streets

- 6. Average city street pavement condition rating
- 7. Citizens' rating the quality of snowplowing on city streets

Water

8. Citizens' rating of the dependability and quality of city water supply

Sanitary Sewer

9. Citizens' rating of the dependability and quality of city sanitary sewer service

Parks and Recreation

10. Citizens' rating of the quality of city recreational programs and facilities (parks, trails, park buildings).

Certified as an official action of the City Council:

2010100			40074	.narur	LIGHT TO	WATE TO	COLINGIA	43/5		1007111	ADOCUT	VOTE TO	VOTE TO
COUNCIL MEMBER	AYE	NAY	ABSTAIN	ABSENT	VOTE TO OVERRIDE	VOTE TO SUSTAIN	COUNCIL MEMBER	AYE	NAY	ABSTAIN	ABSENT	VOTE TO OVERRIDE	VOTE TO SUSTAIN
Reich	χ						Glidden	Χ					
Gordon	X						Schiff	Χ					
Hofstede	X						Tuthill	χ					
Johnson	X						Quincy	Χ			and the second s		
Samuels	X						Colvin Roy	Χ					
Lilligren	χ						Hodges	X					
Goodman	Ty												

ADOPTED	JUN 2 9 2012	APPROVED NOT APPROVE	D VETOE
ATTEST	CITY CLERK	MAYOR RYBAK	DATE



Performance Measure Review 2012

Minneapolis, Minnesota

July 1st, 2012

Results Minneapolis

Results Minneapolis is a management tool the City uses to systematically track performance toward achieving the City's five-year goals and 2020 vision.

A review panel of City leaders meets with a different department head each week to track progress and discuss strategies on key performance measures. By regularly tracking performance data at these "progress conferences," City leaders identify areas where the City is excelling, as well as opportunities for improvement

Overall Quality of City	Services		
	2005	2008	2011
Average Percentage of Residents	82.2%	81.4%	81.5%

who answered "Satisfied" or "Very Satisfied" to Individual Services Provided by the City

Source: 2011 City of Minneapolis Resident Survey*

Change in Taxable Property Market Value

	2005	2008	2011
Percent Change in Taxable	34.765% ↑	9.712% ↑	11.992% $\sqrt{}$
Property Market* Value			

Source: City of Minneapolis Assessor

Rating of Overall Appearance of Minneapolis

	2005	2008	2011
Percentage of Residents who answered "Agree" or "Strongly Agree" to the statement: "My neighborhood Is clean and well maintained."	85%	84%	83%

Source: 2011 City of Minneapolis Resident Survey

^{*}For a complete list of questions, notes and calculations please see page 4.

^{*}Property Market includes *Residential, Apartment, Commercial, Industrial* and *Other* properties.

^{**}Change was calculated using the previous residential survey year, except in the case of 2005, in which 2002 data was used.

Public Safety				
	2005	2008	2011	
Part I* Crimes	28,324	25,894	23,256	
Part II** Crimes	36,676	35,135	30,053	
Total Number of Crimes	65,000	61,029	53,309	

Source: Minneapolis Police Department

- *Part I crimes are the eight serious crimes including homicide, rape, aggravated assault, burglary, robbery, auto theft, theft and arson. All major cities report these measures to the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI).
- **Part II crimes include the following crime categories: simple assault, curfew offenses and loitering, embezzlement, forgery and counterfeiting, disorderly conduct, driving under the influence, drug offenses, fraud, gambling, liquor offenses, offenses against the family, prostitution, public drunkenness, runaways, sex offenses, stolen property, vandalism, vagrancy and weapons offenses.

Quality of Fire Protection Services 2005 2008 2011 Percentage of Residents 97% 97% 97% who answered "Satisfied" or "Very Satisfied" Source: 2011 City of Minneapolis Resident Survey

Question read "Please tell me how satisfied or dissatisfied you are with the new way the city provides the service: Fire Protection and emergency medical response."

	2005	2008	2011
Percentage of Residents who answered "Satisfied" or "Very Satisfied"	91%	92%	92%

Question read "Please tell me how satisfied or dissatisfied you are with the new way the city provides the service: Providing park and recreation services."

2011*

66%

2011

88%

2011

96%

2008

NA

2008

87%

2008

94%

Quality of Snowplowing

Percentage of Residents who answered "Satisfied" or "Very Satisfied"

Source 2011 City of Minneapolis Resident Survey

Question read "Please tell me how satisfied or dissatisfied you are with the new way the city provides the service: Snow Removal."

2005

NA

*Please note that this question was added to the Resident Survey in 2011 and is the only

2005

86%

Quality of Water

Percentage of Residents
who answered "Satisfied"
or "Very Satisfied"

Source 2011 City of Minneapolis Resident Survey

Question read "Please tell me how satisfied or dissatisfied you are with the new way the city provides the service: Providing quality drinking water."

Quality of Sanitary Sewer Services

	2005
Percentage of Residents	94%
who answered "Satisfied"	
or "Very Satisfied"	

Source 2011 City of Minneapolis Resident Survey

Question read "Please tell me how satisfied or dissatisfied you are with the new way the city provides the service: Providing sewer services."

Pavement Condition Rating

	2005	2000	2011	
	2005	2008	2011	
Pavement Condition Index (PCI)	75	72	71	

Source Minneapolis Department of Public Works

Table 1: City Services Quality Ratings Compared Over Time

Table 1. City Services Quality Natings compared Sver Time					
Please tell me how satisfied or dissatisfied you are with the new way	Year of Survey				
the City provides the service.	2011	2008	2005	2003	2001
Fire protection and emergency medical response	97%	97%	97%	96%	99%
Providing sewer services	96%	94%	94%	NA	NA
Providing park and recreation services	92%	92%	91%	NA	91%
Animal control service	91%	88%	92%	NA	92%
Garbage collection and recycling programs	90%	91%	92%	93%	94%
Protecting health and well-being of residents	90%	88%	84%	NA	NA
Preparing for disasters	88%	87%	78%	NA	89%
Providing quality drinking water	88%	87%	86%	84%	NA
Police Services	88%	86%	81%	84%	89%
Keeping streets clean	85%	87%	89%	86%	83%
Revitalizing Downtown	84%	80%	83%	NA	79%
Protecting the environment, including air, water and land	83%	81%	77%	79%	77%
Cleaning up graffiti	80%	77%	74%	NA	79%
Revitalizing neighborhoods	77%	76%	81%	76%	74%
Dealing with problem businesses and unkempt properties	71%	68%	73%	67%	69%
Affordable housing development	69%	66%	55%	51%	40%
Snow removal	66%	NA	NA	NA	NA
Mortgage foreclosure assistance	61%	64%	NA	NA	NA
Repairing alleys*	64%	56%	70%	83%	68%
Repairing streets*	40%				
rehaiting streets.	40%				

Percent reporting "satisfied" or "very satisfied"

Question wording differed between survey years. In 2003 and 2001, residents were asked how satisfied they were with the City's efforts at providing the service. Also, "affordable housing development" was worded as "preserving and providing affordable housing for low-income residents" in 2001 and 2003 and "Revitalizing neighborhoods" was worded as "revitalizing neighborhood commercial areas" in 2001 and 2003.

"Repairing streets" and "Repairing alleys" were combined in survey years previous to 2011 and *averaged prior to calculating overall quality average; "snow removal" was added in 2011.