

RESOLUTION 2017-6-10

CITY OF LITTLE CANADA
RAMSEY COUNTY, MINNESOTA

A RESOLUTION DECLARING THE CITY'S PARTICIPATION IN THE OFFICE OF THE
STATE AUDITOR 2017 PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT PROGRAM

WHEREAS, Benefits to the City of Little Canada 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/county 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 Little Canada 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 LET IT BE RESOLVED THAT, the City Council of Little Canada 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 THAT, The City Council of Little Canada will submit to the Office of the State Auditor the actual results of the performance measures adopted by the city.

Passed and duly adopted this 14th day of June, 2017 by the City Council of the City of Little Canada, Minnesota.

Attest:


Joel Hanson, City Administrator

By:


John T. Keis, Mayor

AYES: 5
NAYS: 0

CITY OF LITTLE CANADA
PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT PROGRAM
May 26, 2017

In 2016, the City conducted a survey through the League of Minnesota Cities using the 10 standard measurements plus two additional dealing with fiscal health, and code enforcement. The survey was conducted from September through November of 2016. The results were reported to our residents in the June 2017 issue of our City Newsletter. They were also available on our City's website.

2016 Results:

The survey results relative to the Performance Measurement Program were as follows: There were only 12 responses to the survey.

1. How would you rate the overall appearance of the city?

Excellent – 25.0%
Good – 66.7%
Fair – 0%
Poor – 8.3%
Don't Know/Refused – 0%

Comments: 1) Lots of empty buildings, especially commercial; also three mobile home parks are getting old and do not enhance our city, 2) Too much spot zoning to benefit business, 3) Everything is very accessible.

2. How would you describe your overall feeling of safety in the city?

Very Safe – 50.0%
Somewhat Safe – 41.7%
Unsafe – 0%
Don't Know/Refused – 8.3%

Comments: 1) So much crime next door in Roseville - ? is it coming here?, 2) Live in the North Star Estates Mobile home Park. Would like to see a better presence of police. The reason being that we seem to have an influx of Hispanic people now and they do not get permits for rebuilding or have too many vehicles that crowd the roadways and make it sometimes hard to get around plus loud noises, such as music and dogs barking all the time. Have complained to sheriff's department twice but by the time they get here the people have turned down their music.

3. How would you rate the overall quality of fire protection services in the city?

Excellent – 66.6%
Good – 16.7%
Fair – 0%
Poor – 0%
Don't Know/Refused – 16.7%

Comments: None

4. How would you rate the overall condition of city streets?

Excellent – 33.3%
Good – 50.0%
Fair – 16.7%
Poor – 0%
Don't Know/Refused – 0%

Comments: 1) City owned streets are easy to get confused with county roads, 2) Thanks for finally repairing our street this year, 3) Did not do a good job of resurfacing County road D when Centerville Road was finished. It is very rough and needs to be smoothed out. Also the left turn signal on Little Canada Road to turn on Country Drive does not work anymore for about 15 years and have complained to the County numerous times but am ignored. Sometimes it can take forever to turn on there, 4) I think they could be swept more often.

5. How would you rate the overall quality of snow plowing on city streets?

Excellent – 66.7%
Good – 25.0%
Fair – 0%
Poor – 8.3%
Don't Know/Refused – 0%

Comments: 1) its improved quite a bit in the last few years. I think a bit more salt on the roads would be good after a freezing rain (like the season we had last year).

6. How would you rate the dependability and overall quality of city sanitary sewer service?

Excellent – 58.3%
Good – 41.7%
Fair – 0%
Poor – 0%
Don't Know/Refused – 0%

Comments: None

7. How would you rate the dependability and overall quality of the city water supply?

Excellent – 75.0%
Good – 25.0%
Fair – 0%
Poor – 0%
Don't Know/Refused – 0%

Comments: None

8. How would you rate the overall quality of city recreational programs and facilities? (e.g. parks, trails, park facilities, etc.)

Excellent – 41.7%
Good – 41.7%
Only Fair – 0%
Poor – 8.3%
Don't Know/Refused – 8.3%

Comments: 1) Only focused on east of 35E, 2) The parks are a lot cleaner this year than they have been in the past. The park crew is very friendly.

9. How would you rate the quality of environmental services in your city? (e.g. solid waste, garbage collection, recycling) services)

Excellent – 50.0%
Good – 50.0%
Fair – 0%
Poor – 0%
Don't Know/Refused – 0%

Comments: 1) Recycling every week would be preferred, 2) Sometimes the garbage collector dumps waste in the street and proceeds to drive over it. Occasionally, when the recycled product is dumped in the truck, it ends up blowing out as the truck goes down the road.

10. How would you rate the overall quality of code enforcement services in your city?

Excellent – 25.0%
Good – 16.7%
Fair – 16.7%
Poor – 25.0%
Don't Know/Refused – 16.6%

Comments: 1) It is improving, 2) Some dilapidated residences; snow often plowed across street in violation of statute in some locations; cars, boats, snowmobiles, trailers, parked in some yards, cars parked on street past 2AM winter weekends never tagged, 3) No routine code enforcement inspections for zoning or proper use for businesses. And no accountability, 4) I'm giving this a fair due to the amount of cats roaming in my area. If dog owner's need to pick up after, keep their dog on a leash and license the animal, why doesn't the same hold true for cat owners? I personally don't care for cat waste in my yard or any areas I walk my dog. I personally think "flower beds" should not be allowed on property easements. If you can't see coming out of your driveway, it's a hazard.

11. How would you rate the overall quality of services provided by the city?

Excellent – 41.7%

Good – 50%

Fair – 8.3%

Poor – 0%

Don't Know/Refused – 0%

Comments: 1) I've lived in dozens of communities and this one is by far one of the loveliest. I don't have any complaints and the city does a great job on all of its management/services.

12. How would you rate the fiscal management and health of your city?

Excellent – 33.3%

Good – 58.3%

Fair – 8.3%

Poor – 0%

Don't Know/Refused – 0%

Comments: 1) Bond rating says it all., 2) We would like some facts on the water level for Twin Lake. Our deck is now under water for the first time in at least 25 years. We used to mow lawn on the lake side. What's happening?

This report was prepared by: Joel Hanson, City Administrator (651-766-4040)