## City of New Hope

## Resolution No. 2022 - 46

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 2022, 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 life in New Hope
  - 2. Percent change in the taxable property market value
  - 3. Bond rating
  - 4. Citizens' rating of the quality of city recreational programs and facilities
  - 5. Part I and II crime rates
  - 6. Citizens' rating of safety in the community
  - 7. Average police response time
  - 8. Insurance industry rating of fire services
  - 9. Citizens' rating of the fire protection services
  - 10. Fire calls per 1,000 population
  - 11. Average city pavement rating index
  - 12. Citizens' rating of overall condition of city streets
  - 13. Citizens' rating of the quality of snowplowing on city streets
  - 14. Citizens' rating of the dependability and overall quality of city water supply
  - 15. Citizens' rating of the quality of stormwater management in the city
  - 16. Citizens' rating of the dependability and overall quality of city sanitary sewer service
  - 17. Number of sewer blockages on city system per 1,000 connections
  - 18. Citizens' rating of the quality of code enforcement
  - 19. Citizens' rating of communication/distribution of information
- WHEREAS, the city of New Hope is contracting with The Morris Leatherman Company to conduct a professional city survey in 2022, and the results of the survey will be submitted in addition to the statistical information outlined above.
- 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, I | Hennepin County, Minnesota, the 11th day of April, |
|--|--|
| 2022.  | 1/1/1/1  |
| 0 8  | Lathe Hember                                       |
| January 1  | - Jacka Janview                                    |
| facul Leone  | Mayor  |

Attest: City Clerk

## 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 2019 (610 responses), 2020 (839 responses) and 2021 (663 responses) |
|----------|----|---------------------------|---|
| General  | 1. | Rating of the overall     | 2019: 20% excellent; 61% good; 12% neutral; 5% fair, 1% poor; 1% don't know/blank   |
| -        |    | quality of city services  | (81% excellent or good)   |
|          |    |                           | 2020: 20% excellent; 61% good; 10% neutral; 6% fair, 1% poor; 2% don't know/blank   |
|          |    |                           | (81% excellent or good)   |
|          |    |                           | 2021: 18% excellent; 64% good; 12% neutral; 5% fair, 1% poor; 0% don't know/blank   |
|          |    |                           | (82% excellent or good)   |
|          | 2. | Percent change in the     | Payable 2019: 7.92% (total taxable market value: \$1,831,436,951)   |
|          |    | taxable property market   | Payable 2020: 10.37% (total taxable market value: \$2,021,382,123)  |
|          |    | value                     | Payable 2021: 7.72% (total taxable market value: \$2,177,389,934)   |
| 3.       | 3. | Citizens' rating of the   | 2019: 15% excellent; 64% good; 9% neutral; 10% fair, 1% poor; 1% don't know/blank   |
|          |    | overall appearance of the | (79% excellent or good)   |
|          |    | city                      | 2020: 15% excellent; 65% good; 11% neutral; 7% fair, 1% poor; 1% don't know/blank   |
|          |    |                           | (80% excellent or good)   |
|          |    |                           | 2021: 16% excellent; 63% good; 11% neutral; 8% fair, 1% poor; 1% don't know/blank   |
|          |    |                           | (79% excellent or good)   |
|          | 4. | Citizens' rating of       | 2021: 50% excellent; 32% good; 15% neutral; 1% fair, 0% poor; 2% don't know/blank   |
|          |    | appearance and function   | (82% excellent or good)   |
|          |    | of Civic Center Park      |   |
|          | 5. | Bond rating               | 2019: AA  |
|          |    |                           | 2020: AA  |
|          |    |                           | 2021: AA  |
|          | 6. | Citizens' rating of the   | 2019: 25% excellent; 49% good; 17% neutral; 7% fair, 1% poor; 1% don't know/blank   |
|          |    | quality of city           | (74% excellent or good)   |
|          |    | recreational programs     | 2020: 23% excellent; 49% good; 19% neutral; 5% fair, 1% poor; 2% don't know/blank   |
|          |    | and facilities            | (72% excellent or good)   |
|          |    |                           | 2021: 23% excellent; 52% good; 18% neutral; 4% fair, 2% poor; 1% don't know/blank   |
|          | _  |                           | (75% excellent or good)   |
|          | 7. | Citizens' rating of       | 2019: N/A   |
|          |    | opportunity to provide    | 2020: 15% excellent; 47% good; 24% neutral; 8% fair, 4% poor; 2% don't know/blank   |
|          |    | input and feedback about  | (62% excellent or good)   |
|          |    | issues                    | 2021: 14% excellent; 44% good; 29% neutral; 7% fair, 4% poor; 1% don't know/blank   |
|          |    |                           | (58% excellent or good)   |

|            | To    | TAT 11 17' . '   | 2010 100/ Lil du 200/ consulat libely 260/ comovibat unlikely 420/ years unlikely 00/    |
|------------|-------|--|--|
|            | 8.    | Would use public transit   | 2019: 10% very likely; 22% somewhat likely; 26% somewhat unlikely; 42% very unlikely; 0% |
|            |       | if readily available   | don't know/blank (32% very likely or somewhat likely)                                    |
|            |       |  | 2020: 8% very likely; 21% somewhat likely; 24% somewhat unlikely; 46% very unlikely; 2%  |
|            |       |  | don't know/blank (29% very likely or somewhat likely)                                    |
|            |       |  | 2021: 8% very likely; 19% somewhat likely; 26% somewhat unlikely; 47% very unlikely; <1% |
|            |       |  | don't know/blank (27% very likely or somewhat likely)                                    |
|            | 9.    | Citizens' support of   | 2019: 50% Yes; 48% No; 2% Blank  |
|            |       | funding home repair and  | 2020: 51% Yes; 46% No; 3% Blank  |
|            |       | improvement programs   | 2021: 56% Yes; 42% No; 2% Blank  |
| Police     | 10.   | Part I and II crime rates  | 2018: Part I: 682; Part II: 721  |
| Services   |       | Here was a second  | 2019: Part I: 611; Part II: 680  |
|            |       | and the state of the state of  | 2020: Part I: 600; Part II: 503  |
|            |       |  | *Full crime stats for current year compiled after January 1 to ensure accuracy           |
|            | 11.   | Citizens' rating of safety   | 2019: 39% very safe; 54% somewhat safe: 6% somewhat unsafe; <1% very unsafe; <1% don't   |
|            |       | in the community   | know/blank (93% very safe or somewhat safe)  |
|            |       |  | 2020: 45% very safe; 47% somewhat safe: 7% somewhat unsafe; 1% very unsafe; <1% don't    |
|            |       |  | know/blank (92% very safe or somewhat safe)  |
|            | 0     |  | 2021: 37% very safe; 51% somewhat safe: 11% somewhat unsafe; 0% very unsafe; <1% don't   |
|            |       |  | know/blank (88% very safe or somewhat safe)  |
|            | 12.   | Average police response  | 2018: 4.36 minutes for priority 1 calls  |
|            |       | time   | 2019: 4.35 minutes for priority 1 calls  |
|            | 1 1 Y |  | 2020: 4.03 minutes for priority 1 calls  |
|            |       | Company of the Compan | *Full police stats for current year compiled after January 1 to ensure accuracy          |
| Fire & EMS | 13.   | Insurance industry rating  | 2019: 3  |
| Services   |       | of fire services   | 2020: 3  |
|            | - 77  |  | 2021: 3  |
|            | 14.   | Citizens' rating of the  | 2019: 39% excellent; 41% good; 17% neutral; <1% fair, <1% poor; 2% don't know/blank      |
|            |       | quality of fire protection   | (80% excellent or good)  |
|            |       | services   | 2020: 36% excellent; 42% good; 18% neutral; 1% fair, 1% poor; 1% don't know/blank        |
|            |       |  | (78% excellent or good)  |
|            |       |  | 2021: 33% excellent; 43% good; 21% neutral; 1% fair, 0% poor; 2% don't know/blank        |
|            |       |  | (76% excellent or good)  |
|            | 15.   | Fire calls per 1,000   | 2018: 47.79 (1,097 calls for service, 20,339 pop)  |
|            |       | population   | 2019: 53.94 (1,097 calls for service, 20,339 pop)  |
|            |       | 1 1  | 2020: 48.33 (983 calls for service, 20,339 pop)  |
|            |       | Company of the Compan | *Full fire stats for current year compiled after January 1 to ensure accuracy            |
| Streets    | 16.   | Average city pavement  | 2019: 76   |
|            |       | condition rating   | 2020: 76   |
|            |       |  | 2021: 80   |
|            |       |  |  |

|          | 17.   | Citizens' rating of county | 2019: 8% excellent; 54% good; 15% neutral; 16% fair, 6% poor; 1% don't know/blank  |
|----------|-------|----------------------------|--|
|          | 17.56 | roads                      | (62% excellent or good)  |
|          |       | Todas                      | 2020: 5% excellent; 48% good; 18% neutral; 20% fair, 8% poor; 1% don't know/blank  |
| I        |       |                            | (53% excellent or good)  |
|          |       | 9                          | 2021: 10% excellent; 59% good; 15% neutral; 13% fair, 3% poor; 0% don't know/blank |
|          |       |                            | (69% excellent or good)  |
|          | 18.   | Citizens' rating of city   | 2019: 9% excellent; 57% good; 14% neutral; 17% fair, 3% poor; <1% don't know/blank |
|          | 10.   | streets                    | (64% excellent or good)  |
|          |       | Streets                    | 2020: 6% excellent; 58% good; 17% neutral; 15% fair, 3% poor; 1% don't know/blank  |
|          |       |                            | (64% excellent or good)  |
|          |       |                            | 2021: 9% excellent; 63% good; 15% neutral; 11% fair, 1% poor; <1% don't know/blank |
|          |       |                            | (72% excellent or good)  |
|          | 19.   | Citizens' rating of the    | 2019: 33% excellent; 45% good; 8% neutral; 10% fair, 4% poor; 0% don't know/blank  |
|          | 17.   | quality of snowplowing     | (78% excellent or good)  |
|          |       | on city streets            | 2020: 33% excellent; 48% good; 7% neutral; 9% fair, 2% poor; 1% don't know/blank   |
|          |       | off city streets           | (81% excellent or good)  |
|          |       |                            | 2021: 33% excellent; 49% good; 7% neutral; 7% fair, 3% poor; % don't know/blank    |
|          |       |                            | (82% excellent or good)  |
| Water    | 20.   | Citizens' rating of the    | 2019: 39% excellent; 48% good; 8% neutral; 3% fair, 1% poor; 1% don't know/blank   |
| VVater   | 20.   | dependability and          | (87% excellent or good)  |
|          |       | quality of city water      | 2020: 41% excellent; 47% good; 7% neutral; 3% fair, 1% poor; 1% don't know/blank   |
|          |       | supply                     | (88% excellent or good)  |
|          |       | Supply                     | 2021: 37% excellent; 50% good; 8% neutral; 4% fair, 0% poor; <1% don't know/blank  |
|          |       |                            | (87% excellent or good)  |
|          | 21.   | Citizens' rating of the    | 2019: 20% excellent; 50% good; 20% neutral; 6% fair, 3% poor; 1% don't know/blank  |
|          | 2     | quality of stormwater      | (70% excellent or good)  |
|          |       | management in the city     | 2020: 19% excellent; 53% good; 19% neutral; 6% fair, 2% poor; 1% don't know/blank  |
|          |       | I management at all easy   | (72% excellent or good)  |
|          |       |                            | 2021: 24% excellent; 51% good; 17% neutral; 5% fair, 1% poor; 1% don't know/blank  |
|          |       |                            | (75% excellent or good)  |
| Sanitary | 22.   | Citizens' rating of the    | 2019: 28% excellent; 53% good; 14% neutral; 3% fair, 1% poor; 1% don't know/blank  |
| Sewer    |       | dependability and          | (81% excellent or good)  |
|          |       | quality of city sanitary   | 2020: 27% excellent; 53% good; 16% neutral; 2% fair, 1% poor; 1% don't know/blank  |
|          |       | sewer service              | (80% excellent or good)  |
|          |       |                            | 2021: 27% excellent; 56% good; 15% neutral; 2% fair, 0% poor; 0% don't know/blank  |
|          |       |                            | (83% excellent or good)  |
|          | 23.   | Number of sewer            | 2019: 1  |
|          |       | blockages on city system   | 2020: 2  |
|          |       | per 1000 connections       | 2021: 0 total as of November 1, 2021   |

| Code          | 24. | Citizens' rating of the   | 2019: 7% too tough; 58% about right; 34% not tough enough; 1% don't know/blank          |
|---------------|-----|---------------------------|---|
| Enforcement   |     | quality of code           | 2020: 8% too tough; 63% about right; 28% not tough enough; 1% don't know/blank          |
|               |     | enforcement services      | 2021: 6% too tough; 62% about right; 31% not tough enough; 1% don't know/blank          |
| Communication | 25. | Citizens' rating of the   | 2019: 17% excellent; 55% good; 16% neutral; 8% fair, 3% poor; 1% don't know/blank       |
|               |     | quality of                | (72% excellent or good)   |
|               |     | communication/            | 2020: 18% excellent; 53% good; 16% neutral; 9% fair, 3% poor; 1% don't know/blank       |
|               |     | distribution of           | (71% excellent or good)   |
|               |     | information               | 2021: 20% excellent; 53% good; 18% neutral; 6% fair, 2% poor; 1% don't know/blank       |
|               |     |                           | (73% excellent or good)   |
|               | 26. | Citizens' source for city | 2021: 8% city website; 50% city publications; 19% social media; 11% Sun Post/CCX Media; |
|               |     | information               | 11% a combination of sources; 1% blank.   |
| COVID-19      | 27. | Citizens' rating of the   | Overall: 22% excellent; 45% good; 24% neutral; 4% fair, <1% poor; 4% don't know/blank   |
|               |     | city's reaction to the    | (67% excellent or good)   |
|               |     | COVID-19 Pandemic in      | Parks & Recreation: 20% excellent; 40% good; 29% neutral; 4% fair, 2% poor; 5% don't    |
|               |     | several areas.            | know/blank (60% excellent or good)  |
|               |     |                           | Elections: 30% excellent; 41% good; 21% neutral; 4% fair, 2% poor; 3% don't know/blank  |
|               |     |                           | (71% excellent or good)   |
|               |     |                           | Permits & Inspections: 19% excellent; 32% good; 39% neutral; 3% fair, 1% poor; 5% don't |
|               |     |                           | know/blank (51% excellent or good)  |