


STATE OF MINNESOTA)
)
COUNTY OF HENNEPIN) ss
)
CITY OF RICHFIELD)

I, Theresa Schyma, being the duly qualified deputy clerk of the City of Richfield, Hennepin County, Minnesota, do hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and exact copy of Resolution No. 10799.

And that the same is on file and on record in my office.

Given under my hand and seal

This 12th day of June, 2013.



Theresa Schyma
Deputy City Clerk
City of Richfield
Hennepin County, Minnesota

RESOLUTION NO. 10799

RESOLUTION ADOPTING AND IMPLEMENTING MODEL PERFORMANCE MEASURES FOR CITIES AS ESTABLISHED BY THE COUNCIL ON LOCAL RESULTS AND INNOVATION, CREATING A COMPREHENSIVE PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT SYSTEM, REPORTING THE RESULTS OF SUCH REPORT TO THE LOCAL PUBLIC, AUTHORIZING THE SURVEY OF RESIDENTS, AND REPORTING RESULTS TO THE OFFICE OF THE STATE AUDITOR

WHEREAS, in 2010, the Legislature created the Council on Local Results and Innovation; and

WHEREAS, in February 2011, the Council released a standard set of performance measures for cities that will aid residents, taxpayers, and state and local elected officials in determining the efficacy of cities in providing services, and measure resident's opinions of those services; and

WHEREAS, in February 2012, the Council created a comprehensive performance measurement system for cities to implement in 2012; and

WHEREAS, cities that choose to participate in the new standards measure program may be eligible for reimbursement in LGA, and exemption from levy limits; and

WHEREAS, participation in the standard measures program by a city is voluntary; and

WHEREAS, cities that choose to participate in the standard measures program must officially adopt the performance benchmarks developed by the Council, and implement them; and

WHEREAS, the following performance measures were adopted;

- Percent change in the taxable property market value
- Part I and II crime rates
- Police response time
- Insurance industry rating of fire services
- Fire response time
- Average city street pavement condition rating
- Operation cost per 1,000,000 gallons of water pumped/produced
- Number of sanitary sewer back-ups for public sanitary sewer system

WHEREAS, the results of the citizen survey conducted were also released and the following areas were reviewed and commented on;

- Overall appearance
- Overall safety
- Fire protection
- Overall street conditions


- Snowplowing
- Sanitary sewer
- Park and recreation
- Overall quality of service

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the City Council of the City of Richfield, Minnesota hereby certifies that;

1. The city had adopted and implemented the performance measures as developed by the Council on Local Results and Innovation; and
2. The city has implemented a local performance measurement system as developed by the Council on Local Results and Innovation; and
3. The city will report the results of the adopted measures to its residents before the end of the calendar year through publication, direct mail, posting on its website, or through a public hearing at which the budget and levy will be discussed and public input allowed; and
4. The city has surveyed its residents on the services included in the performance benchmarks; and


BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the actual results of the performance measures adopted by the city for the program in 2012 shall be reported to the Office of the State Auditor by July 1, 2013.

Adopted by the City Council of the City of Richfield, Minnesota this 11th day of June, 2013.



Debbie Goettel, Mayor

ATTEST:



Nancy Gibbs, City Clerk

Model Performance Measures for Cities Results for the City of Richfield

General:

1. Rating of the overall quality of services provided by your city (*Citizen Survey: excellent, good, fair, poor*)

86% of respondents rated quality of services as excellent or good.

2. Percent change in the taxable property market value

The taxable property market value from 2012 to 2013 decreased by 5.71%.

3. Citizens' rating of the overall appearance of the city (*Citizen Survey: excellent, good, fair, poor*)

43% of residents rated the overall appearance of the City as excellent or good.

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.*)

	<u>2011</u>	<u>2012</u>
Part I	949	1,001
Part II	2,300	2,418

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

86% rated the safety of the City as very safe or somewhat safe.

Output Measure:

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

Average Police response time in minutes – 4:45

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.)

City of Richfield Fire Insurance Industry Rate – 3.

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

100% rated the quality of fire protection services as excellent or good.

Output Measure:

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

Average Fire response time in minutes – 3:45

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)*)

	<u>2010</u>	<u>2011</u>	<u>2012</u>
PCI	82	N/A	70

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

89% rated the conditions of city roads being in good condition or mostly good condition.

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

82% rated the quality of snowplowing on city streets as excellent or good.

Water:

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

97% rated the dependability and quality of city water services as excellent or good.

Output Measure:

Operating cost per 1,000,000 gallons of water pumped/produced (centrally-provided system) (*Actual operating expense for water utility / (total gallons pumped/1,000,000)*)

The operating cost per 1,000,000 gallons of water pumped/produced is \$2,717.

Sanitary Sewer:

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

96% rate the dependability and quality of city sanitary sewer service as excellent or good.

Output Measure:

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

Number of sewer blockages on city system is .001 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*)

71% rated the quality of city recreational programs and facilities as excellent or good.