

**City Council Agenda Item #14B  
Meeting of April 20, 2009**

**Brief Description:** Organizational Performance

**Recommended Action:** None required

**Background**

Each year, the city of Minnetonka is evaluated according to how well we are doing with achieving our strategic goals. By receiving ongoing feedback from our stakeholders, we can observe trends and track progress to guide policy making and budgeting. Measuring ongoing progress insures that we are responsive to the priorities of the community we serve.

Specific examples of actions taken in recent years in response to these annual evaluations include passage of the parks renewal and open space preservation referendum, implementation of the thin overlay program, implementation of a traffic safety program, and expansion of the natural resources program.

This report provides the results of this year’s evaluation and feedback about our collective performance as a city government. Grades are assigned for the individual components of each strategic goal, with one-third of the performance grades determined by (1) the city council, (2) applicable advisory boards and commissions, and (3) our residents, based on the results from the annual community survey.

**Results**

Minnetonka traditionally receives very high grades for performance in achieving each of our strategic goals, and this year is no exception.

<b>Goal</b>	<b>City Council</b>	<b>Advisory Boards</b>	<b>Survey/ Other</b>	<b>Combined</b>
Natural environment	A	A	A-	<b>A-</b>
Public safety	A	A	B+	<b>A</b>
Transportation	A-	A-	A-	<b>A-</b>
Development	A-	A-	A-	<b>A-</b>
Building community	A-	A-	A-	<b>A-</b>
Public services	A	A-	A-	<b>A-</b>
Organizational excellence	A		A-	<b>A</b>
Quality of life			A-	<b>A-</b>
<b>Overall Grade</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>A-</b>	<b>A-</b>	<b>A-</b>

- **Natural environment (A-).** This year's grade dipped to an A- after two consecutive years at an A. This is generally due to a decrease in ratings from the community. Excellent ratings on protection of wetlands, ponds and streams saw a dramatic decline, from 35% in 2008 to 17% this year. Ratings for protection of open space remained consistent with last year, with over 80% feeling the amount is just right.

On a more positive note, nine in ten residents surveyed feel the overall quality of the natural environment is excellent or good. Meanwhile, the city council is generally very satisfied with the city's efforts on protection of the natural environment, as are the advisory boards. Of note, several council and planning commission members pointed to challenges with the new tree ordinance.

- **Public Safety (A).** This community value consistently remains at an A rating. Particularly high grades were assigned by the city council and police advisory committee, who cite the professionalism of the police and fire departments.

Residents surveyed are slightly less positive about public safety this year compared to last year. A notable decrease in excellent ratings for how police handled a situation, from 48% in 2008 to 24% in 2009, may be correlated to the decrease over time in the number of interactions respondents had with police. In 2004, 37% had interacted with police, while only 20% did in 2009.

Survey respondents continue to be concerned about residential speeding, but those seriously concerned has leveled off over the past several years. This likely relates to the concerted focus of resources on traffic control.

- **Transportation (A-).** All groups rating transportation are consistent in giving a grade of A. Community survey results for pavement repair, snow plowing and trail maintenance remain relatively unchanged from 2008 and are some of the most positive in the metro area. EDA members gave lower ratings for enhancement of mobility with quality roads and transit, and several council comments point to a desire for more transit options.
- **Development (A-).** As with transportation, all groups consistently rated development with an A-. This trend has been steady over the last several years. The city council diverges on their ratings for guiding development, with four members giving a grade of A and three a B. The council and advisory groups agree that more could be done to promote use of green technology and sustainable development. The planning commission seems particularly concerned about the availability of affordable housing.

The community's opinion of how successful the city has been in maintaining the balance between property rights and the public interest has shifted. In 2008,

22% felt the city was very successful and 61% thought the city was somewhat successful; in 2009, these numbers moved to 9% and 80%, respectively.

- **Building Community (A-).** This grade has consistently been an A- for the last four years. Residents are generally favorable, as are the city council and advisory board members. Nearly 90% of community respondents felt residents have appropriate opportunities in the development decision-making process, an increase over past years. The *Minnetonka Memo*, recreation brochure and web site ratings are also quite positive.

Comments from planning commission members indicate they are most in tune with the wide variety of communication outreach to residents, citing examples like web streaming and My Minnetonka. One council member requested greater transparency in the budget and TNT process. The council and planning commission noted more clarification is needed on how the value of diversity translates into action.

- **Public Services (A-).** After holding at an A for the last several years, this grade dipped to an A- in 2009. The council, however, continues to score a solid A. Nine of ten residents rated the value of city services based on the taxes they pay as excellent or good.

Customer service ratings by residents decreased noticeably, from 22% excellent in 2008 to 12% in 2009. On a more positive note, community ratings for staff courtesy and efficiency improved with 99% rating these as excellent or good.

The city's grade for its tax rate slipped from an A to A-, as Minnetonka is no longer among the lowest tax rates in its comparison group of cities. However, the city does remain below the average, despite the fact that other cities special assess for projects while we include these costs in our levy. Regarding innovative service delivery, the council and most advisory boards provided high ratings, with the exception of the planning commission which graded a B+.

- **Organizational Excellence (A).** This grade remains an A for 2009, with a solid A in all categories from the city council. One council member stated that Minnetonka is well run and there is a strong sense of community among employees. As in past years, employees most highly rated their performance on the shared values of outcome focused teamwork and healthy human relationships. Ninety six percent of employees agree that Minnetonka is a great place to work.
- **Quality of Life (A-).** Ninety eight percent of residents rated the quality of life in Minnetonka as excellent (50%) or good (48%). When asked if they feel welcomed in the community, 98% of respondents said they did. Minnetonka

continues to be a desirable place to live, supported by the fact that two-thirds of survey respondents have lived in the community for over ten years and 36% for more than 20.

### **Summary**

Combined ratings of each of the seven strategic goals and the Quality of Life rating result in an overall organizational grade of A- for this year, consistent with last year's grade. The city's actual "grade point average" is 3.745, slightly lower than last year. An overview of the results will be presented at the April 20 city council meeting.

Submitted through:  
John Gunyou, City Manager

Originated by:  
Geraldyn Barone, Assistant City Manager



<b>Organizational Performance</b>													
<b>Council &amp; Board Survey Results, April 2009</b>													
(Overall grades include community survey results)													
		A+	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	C-	SCORE	LETTER GRADE	
<b>NATURAL ENVIRONMENT</b>											<b>3.766</b>	<b>A-</b>	
<i>All categories:</i>													
Council											3.889	A	
Park Bd, Plng Comm											3.843	A	
Community survey											3.565	A-	
<b>Protect &amp; improve our water resources &amp; woodlands</b>											<b>3.776</b>	<b>A-</b>	
City Council											3.953	A	
Park Board											4.000	A	
Planning Commission											3.778	A-	
Community survey											3.487	B+	
<b>Facilitate open space preservation</b>											<b>3.763</b>	<b>A-</b>	
City Council											3.953	A	
Park Board											3.918	A	
Planning Commission											3.557	A-	
Community survey											3.599	A-	
<b>Respect the natural environment while managing growth</b>											<b>3.758</b>	<b>A-</b>	
City Council											3.761	A-	
Park Board											3.918	A	
Planning Commission											3.890	A	
Community survey											3.608	A-	
<b>PUBLIC SAFETY</b>													
<i>All categories:</i>											<b>3.843</b>	<b>A</b>	
Council											3.984	A	
PAC, Ngrbrhd cptns											3.853	A	
Community survey											3.466	B+	
<b>Foster community involvement &amp; individual responsibility</b>											<b>3.755</b>	<b>A-</b>	
City Council											4.000	A	
Police Adv. Comm.											3.890	A	
Ngbhrd. Cptns.											3.795	A-	
Community survey											3.424	B+	
<b>Enhance personal &amp; business safety</b>											<b>3.775</b>	<b>A-</b>	
City Council											3.953	A	
Police Adv. Comm.											4.000	A	
Ngbhrd. Cptns.											3.725	A-	
Community survey											3.509	A-	
<b>Ensure hometown security by collaborating with others</b>											<b>4.000</b>	<b>A</b>	
City Council											4.000	A	
Police Adv. Com.											4.000	A	



<b>Organizational Performance</b>													
<b>Council &amp; Board Survey Results, April 2009</b>													
(Overall grades include community survey results)													
													<b>LETTER GRADE</b>
		<b>A+</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>A-</b>	<b>B+</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>B-</b>	<b>C+</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>C-</b>	<b>SCORE</b>		
<b>BUILDING COMMUNITY</b>											<b>3.682</b>	<b>A-</b>	
<i>All categories:</i>													
Council											3.800	A-	
B&C, NW											3.676	A-	
Community survey											3.586	A-	
<b>Foster open communication within the community</b>											<b>3.756</b>	<b>A-</b>	
City Council											3.953	A	
Park Board											3.418	B+	
Planning Comm.											3.888	A	
EDA											3.890	A	
Senior Adv. Bd.											3.778	A-	
Community Comm.											3.778	A-	
Police Adv. Comm.											4.000	A	
Ngbhrd. Cptns.											3.755	A-	
Community survey											3.528	A-	
<b>Promote activities that encourage understanding &amp; involvement</b>											<b>3.671</b>	<b>A-</b>	
City Council											3.669	A-	
Park Board											3.668	A-	
Senior Adv. Bd.											3.778	A-	
Community Comm.											3.500	A-	
Police Adv. Comm.											3.890	A	
EDA											3.667	A-	
Community survey											3.643	A-	
<b>Embrace our proud history while valuing diversity &amp; inclusiveness</b>											<b>3.620</b>	<b>A-</b>	
City Council											3.778	A-	
EDA											3.780	A-	
Community Comm.											3.110	B	
Senior Adv. Bd.											3.734	A-	
<b>PUBLIC SERVICES</b>											<b>3.808</b>	<b>A-</b>	
<i>All categories:</i>													
Council											3.941	A	
B&C, NW											3.809	A-	
Other factors											3.890	A	
Community survey											3.546	A-	
<b>Provide value: quality services at a reasonable price</b>											<b>3.738</b>	<b>A-</b>	
City Council											3.953	A	
Park Board											3.583	A-	
Planning Comm.											3.778	A-	
EDA											3.780	A-	
Senior Adv. Bd.											3.778	A-	
Community Comm.											3.835	A	
Police Adv. Comm.											4.000	A	
Ngbhrd. Cptns.											3.608	A-	
Community survey											3.494	B+	

<b>Organizational Performance</b>													
<b>Council &amp; Board Survey Results, April 2009</b>													
(Overall grades include community survey results)													
													<b>LETTER GRADE</b>
		<b>A+</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>A-</b>	<b>B+</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>B-</b>	<b>C+</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>C-</b>	<b>SCORE</b>		
<b>Manage for the long term</b>											<b>3.909</b>	<b>A</b>	
City Council		4	2	1							3.953		A
Park Board			4								4.000		A
Planning Comm.		1	4								4.000		A
EDA		2	1								4.000		A
Senior Adv. Bd.		1	3	1		1					3.778		A-
Community Comm.		3	2		1						3.888		A
Police Adv. Comm.		1	1	1							3.890		A
Ngbhrd. Cptns.		6	10	6	3	3	2	1			3.635		A-
Aaa bond rating											4.000		A
GFOA Certificate											4.000		A
Tax rate											3.670		A-
<b>Provide excellent customer service</b>											<b>3.806</b>	<b>A-</b>	
City Council		3	3	1							3.953		A
Park Board		1	3								4.000		A
Planning Comm.		2	1	2		1					3.723		A-
EDA		1	1	1							3.890		A
Senior Adv. Bd.		1	4			1					3.833		A-
Community Comm.		2	2	2							3.890		A
Police Adv. Comm.		1	1								4.000		A
Ngbhrd. Cptns.		8	12	5	7	1	1				3.745		A-
Community survey											3.598		A-
<b>Promote innovative service delivery</b>											<b>3.781</b>	<b>A-</b>	
City Council		2	3	2							3.906		A
Park Board			2	2							3.835		A
Planning Comm.		1			1	2	1				3.200		B+
EDA		1	1	1							3.890		A
Senior Adv. Bd.		1	4			1					3.833		A-
Community Comm.			2	3		1					3.668		A-
Police Adv. Comm.		1	1	1							3.890		A
Ngbhrd. Cptns.		3	13	8	5	2	1				3.709		A-
<b>ORGANIZATIONAL EXCELLENCE</b>											<b>3.873</b>	<b>A</b>	
<i>All categories:</i>													
Council											3.986		A
Employees											3.755		A-
<b>Set the high standard that others emulate</b>											<b>4.000</b>	<b>A</b>	
City Council		2	5								4.000		A
<b>Provide a great place to work</b>											<b>3.906</b>	<b>A</b>	
City Council		5	2								4.000		A
Employees			106	44		6		1			3.859		A

<b>Organizational Performance</b>													
<b>Council &amp; Board Survey Results, April 2009</b>													
(Overall grades include community survey results)													
													<b>LETTER GRADE</b>
		<b>A+</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>A-</b>	<b>B+</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>B-</b>	<b>C+</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>C-</b>	<b>SCORE</b>		
<b>Live our shared values</b>											<b>3.787</b>	<b>A-</b>	
City Council		3	4								4.000		A
Employees			1545	2133	609			118		50	3.680		A-
<b>Do the right thing at the right time for the right reason</b>											<b>3.798</b>	<b>A-</b>	
City Council		2	3	1							3.945		A
Employees			304	334	74			20		4	3.725		A-
<b>QUALITY OF LIFE</b>													
Community survey											<b>3.745</b>		<b>A-</b>
<b>FINAL GRADE</b>											<b>3.745</b>	<b>A-</b>	