

**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 m 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 m 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 m 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	1.73	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: ≤7 min.	2009	7.85	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019						
			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	53.31%	45.38	55.42%	43.81	53.51%	45.98	55.96%	48.29	58.15%	47.65	57.04%	50.07	59.45%	52.16	61.58%	0.5162	60.52%
Marginal 28-66 pts	9.53	11.67%	10.22	12.48%	10.54	12.87%	10.54	12.83%	14.56	17.53%	16.47	19.72%	18.44	21.89%	18.19	21.48%	0.1915	22.45%
Failed 0-28 pts	28.70	35.15%	26.04	31.80%	27.53	33.62%	25.65	31.22%	20.20	24.32%	19.41	23.24%	15.72	18.66%	14.35	16.94%	0.1453	17.03%
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	
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	

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	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
ratio	0	0.0192	0	0.0192	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Goal: 0	actual #	0 per 5189	1 per 5199	0 per 5197	1 per 5220	0 per 5247	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 I & I) in 2012 and 2013 than previous years

Water Quality MPCA violations (764 parameters tested annually)

Goal: 0	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
	0	0	1*	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	1108	1143
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	2368	2288
Youth Special Events (No Registration Required)					2,525	2,730	3,268	4600	5055
Adult Athletics	723	863	864	1,349	1,400	1,122	1,083	850	870
Adult Fitness Class Participants	11,932	12,602	17,112	12,813	11,333	13,922	15,652	16158	15982
Totals	14,427	15,430	19,978	16,915	17,325	20,632	26,089	26,344	26,483

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.

**#12 How would you rate the overall quality of city recreational facilities (i.e. parks, trails, park facilities, etc.)?**

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	3	1.33	1	0.44
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	4	1.77
3 Satisfactory	17	9.88	26	9.88	21	8.64	29	11.93	22	9.61	15	6.17	12	5.31	36	15.93	28	12.39
4 Good	78	45.35	76	45.35	70	28.81	73	30.04	64	27.95	80	32.92	60	26.55	100	44.25	103	45.58
5 Excellent	66	38.37	67	38.37	59	24.28	68	27.98	54	23.58	65	26.75	67	29.65	101	44.69	92	40.71
Avg. rating	4.13		4.11		4.16		4.18		4.17		4.20		4.40		4.18		4.23	
% change	-		-0.48%		1.22%		0.48%		-0.24%		0.72%		4.76%		-5.00%		1.20%	
# of Facilities/Parks	41		42		42		42		43		43		43		43		43	
Recreational facilities	177,343 sq ft		177,343 sq ft		177,343 sq ft		177,343 sq ft		177,343 sq ft		177,343 sq ft		177,343 sq ft		177,343 sq ft		177,343 sq ft	
Park Area in acres	319		319		319		319		319		319		319		319		319	
Park Area mowed	143		143		143		143		143		143		143		143		143	
Trail miles	6.3		6.3		6.3		6.3		6.3		6.3		6.3		6.3		6.3	

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.

**#13 How would you rate the library services in the city?**

Scale	2011	%	2012	%	2013	%	2014	%	2015	%	2016	%	2017	%	2018	%	2019	%
1 Poor	3	1.79	1	1.79	1	0.42	0	0.00	1	0.44	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	0.46
2 Fair	2	1.19	2	1.19	1	0.42	0	0.00	1	0.44	0	0.00	1	0.46	3	1.37	0	0.00
3 Satisfactory	15	8.93	28	8.93	17	7.08	24	10.00	15	6.55	13	5.42	8	3.65	29	13.24	30	13.70
4 Good	74	44.05	67	44.05	65	27.08	72	30.00	58	25.33	66	27.50	55	25.11	92	42.01	86	39.27
5 Excellent	74	44.05	72	44.05	68	28.33	75	31.25	63	27.51	86	35.83	72	32.88	116	52.97	102	46.58
Avg. rating	4.27		4.22		4.30		4.30		4.31		4.44		4.46		4.34		4.32	
% change	-		-1.17%		1.90%		0.00%		0.23%		3.02%		0.45%		-2.69%		-0.46%	
Circulation Children	72327	66640	71630	76853	72653	71546	55856	61438	62652	70568	72105							
Circulation Adult	95839	79399	80213	71208	69899	67295	59640	64849	67359	70312	71166							
Public Computer Use	16259	17173	15826	15939	18352	25956	20640	19383	18593	14966	13818							
Estimated Visits	76830	82433	79031	85723	75414	80717	70637	65738	78414	116745	114286							
# of Cardholders	6929	6367	6374	6443	6302	5594	6391	6486	6424	7452	7863							

NOTE: 2015 totals are lower due to migration of automataion system in February. Total for January/February 2015 not accounted for. 2016 will be more accurate.

**#14 How would you rate the quality of licensing, permitting and building inspection services in the city?**

Scale	2011	%	2012	%	2013	%	2014	%	2015	%	2016	%	2017	%	2018	%	2019	%
1 Poor	4	2.42	8	2.42	4	1.72	2	0.86	4	1.75	0	0.00	2	0.91	4	1.83	2	0.91
2 Fair	10	6.06	12	6.06	5	2.16	8	3.45	8	3.49	8	3.45	4	1.83	15	6.85	9	4.11
3 Satisfactory	41	24.85	47	24.85	50	21.55	46	19.83	39	17.03	45	19.40	26	11.87	68	31.05	62	28.31
4 Good	78	47.27	66	47.27	61	26.29	79	34.05	59	25.76	76	32.76	67	30.59	98	44.75	98	44.75
5 Excellent	32	19.39	35	19.39	32	13.79	35	15.09	30	13.10	36	15.52	35	15.98	47	21.46	48	21.92
Avg. rating	3.75		3.64		3.74		3.81		3.74		3.85		3.96		3.73		3.83	
% change	-		-2.93%		2.75%		1.87%		-1.84%		2.94%		2.86%		-5.81%		2.68%	
Total Building Permits	Goal	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019						
	N/A	546	2,051	1,213	528	410	431	370	375	339	269	303						

**#15 How would you rate the quality and programming of the Community Access Channel also known as NUCAT?**

Scale	2011	%	2012	%	2013	%	2014	%	2015	%	2016	%	2017	%	2018	%	2019	%
1 Poor	0	0	6	0	5	2.34	3	1.40	2	0.87	2	0.93	2	0.98	3	1.47	4	1.96
2 Fair	0	0	16	0	10	4.67	14	6.54	7	3.06	11	5.14	5	2.45	18	8.82	13	6.37
3 Satisfactory	0	0	60	0	49	22.90	55	25.70	49	21.40	57	26.64	32	15.69	92	45.10	77	37.75
4 Good	0	0	54	0	54	25.23	61	28.50	46	20.09	53	24.77	54	26.47	76	37.25	71	34.80
5 Excellent	0	0	32	0	26	12.15	28	13.08	22	9.61	31	14.49	32	15.69	25	12.25	39	19.12
Avg. rating	0		3.54		3.60		3.60		3.63		3.65		3.87		3.48		3.63	
% change	-		100.00%		1.69%		0.00%		0.83%		0.55%		6.03%		-10.08%		4.31%	
Edit Suite use (hours)	2,239		3,247		4,092		3,713 est		3,120		3,312		4,016		3,500		3,200	
Studio use (hours)	125		156		271		268 est		144		192		340		47		38	
City meetings produced	154		147		145		145 est		175		240		245		165		159	
County meetings produced	0		0		30		36 est		36		36		28		10		36	
Live production events	45		66		67		61 est		63		58		60		47		84	
MACTA PEG Award	no entries		YES		no entries		YES		N/A		N/A		N/A		no entries		no entries	

**#16 How would you rate the utility billing/finance department services in the city?**

Scale	2011	%	2012	%	2013	%	2014	%	2015	%	2016	%	2017	%	2018	%	2019	%
1 Poor	0	0	5	0	5	2.03	4	1.63	8	3.49	4	1.63	8	3.52	5	2.20	3	1.32
2 Fair	0	0	18	0	10	4.07	10	4.07	6	2.62	7	2.85	7	3.08	8	3.52	8	3.52
3 Satisfactory	0	0	40	0	35	14.23	40	16.26	22	9.61	30	12.20	23	10.13	55	24.23	42	18.50
4 Good	0	0	64	0	64	26.02	76	30.89	71	31.00	80	32.52	64	28.19	115	50.66	104	45.81
5 Excellent	0	0	48	0	41	16.67	48	19.51	37	16.16	48	19.51	35	15.42	63	27.75	70	30.84
Avg. rating	0		3.75		3.81		3.87		3.85		3.95		3.81		3.91		4.01	
% change	-		100.00%		1.60%		1.57%		-0.52%		2.60%		-3.54%		2.62%		2.56%	
Bond Rating (* upgraded):	A1		Aa2*		Aa2		Aa2		Aa2		Aa2		Aa2		Aa2		Aa2	
Annual Audit (unqualified opinion)	yes		yes		yes		yes		yes		N/A		N/A		N/A		N/A	

#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																		