
Study Methodology

APPENDIX A

This appendix explains the process we followed to conduct the best practices review of e-government services. It describes the steps we took, the timeline we followed, and the involvement of local government representatives.

BACKGROUND RESEARCH

To explore issues relevant to e-government services, we gathered information from a variety of sources. We began with an extensive review of literature and Web sites, reviewing materials from professional associations, academic and private research centers, and other groups with expertise in e-government, such as the Center for Technology in Government and the National Electronic Commerce Coordinating Council. We also researched state and federal laws about legal requirements, including those for data privacy and security.

At the beginning of the study in June 2001, we held a roundtable discussion to help define the scope of the review. We invited individuals representing a variety of viewpoints, including administrators and information technology managers from school districts, cities, and counties; state officials, including the Office of Technology; legislators and legislative staff; and others interested in e-government. At this meeting, 26 participants offered ideas.

We supplemented our background research with personal interviews and e-government seminars. This included interviewing state officials about the state's role in setting electronic government standards and providing a telecommunications infrastructure backbone. To understand what was already known about local e-government, we spoke with representatives of local government associations and intergovernmental computer collaborations. We also participated in seminars and on-line training, with a particular focus on digital security and Web site design. Seminars included a League of Minnesota Cities' conference, a National State Auditor Association conference on information technology, and the Minnesota Government Information Technology Symposium. Web-based events included sessions on e-government strategies and security.

The Minnesota departments of Commerce and Administration supplied data on the availability of cable, DSL, and other telecommunications infrastructure in the state. Although some of the data were not up-to-date, they gave us a better picture of what regions had infrastructure enabling computer users to gain high-speed access to the Internet.

For information on the extent of citizen access to the Internet, we analyzed data from the U.S. Department of Commerce and from the Minnesota Office of Strategic and Long Range Planning. To supplement that information, we

sponsored six questions on the 2001 Minnesota State Survey, an annual survey conducted by the Minnesota Center for Survey Research at the University of Minnesota. This was a telephone survey conducted in November 2001 of approximately 800 randomly selected individuals from randomly selected households around the state. The questions sponsored by our office asked about access to the Internet; high speed Internet access; whether respondents would use local government services on-line; the most important factors influencing use of local government services on-line; and whether respondents had ever made on-line purchases. Because those who participated in the survey were randomly selected from Minnesota's population, the results can be generalized to individuals in the entire state. No more than 1 time in 20 should the results vary by more than 3.5 percentage points from answers that would be obtained if all Minnesota residents were interviewed.

TECHNICAL ADVISORY PANEL

Early in the project we formed a technical advisory panel to provide expertise and comment on draft materials throughout the review. As shown in Table A.1, the 16-member panel consisted mainly of county, city, and school district staff who were either information technology professionals or otherwise involved in technology issues. They came from jurisdictions representing a mix of sizes and

Table A.1: Technical Advisory Panel Members, 2001-2002

Merton Auger , City Administrator, City of Buffalo
Jim Campbell , Information Technology Director, Dakota County
Barbara Gallo , Technology Services Director, League of Minnesota Cities
Mike Garris , Director, Local Government Information Systems (LOGIS)
Tom Hannon , Information Technology Director, City of St. Cloud
Bob Hanson , Information Technology Director, Hennepin County
Doug Johnson , Technology Administrator, Mankato Area Schools
Bob Knafla , Information Systems Director, Sherburne County
Fred Logman , Chief Information Director, Department of Information Services, Ramsey County
Marcia Love , Superintendent, Plainview Public Schools
Rhonda Lynch , Information Services Director, Carver County
Gail Miller , County Recorder, Renville County
Rae Montgomery , Extension Educator, University of Minnesota Extension Service
Patrick Plant , Director of Technology, Anoka-Hennepin Independent School District #11
Mike Ryan , System Architect, Office of Technology, Minnesota State Department of Administration
Lee Whitcraft , Co-Executive Director, Technology and Information in Education Services (TIES)

geographic regions. Other members represented the state's Office of Technology, the University of Minnesota Extension Services, intergovernmental computer collaboratives, and the League of Minnesota Cities.

Panelists volunteered their time for five meetings to offer their feedback as the study progressed. They reviewed and commented on the draft report. We are grateful to panel members for their advice and help. Panel members may or may not agree with the recommendations of our study, and the Legislative Auditor's Office remains responsible for the report's contents.

E-GOVERNMENT INDICATORS OF PERFORMANCE

To help identify effective e-government practices, we researched guidelines and standards recommended by organizations involved in e-government, Web site development, and Internet security. From this research, we compiled indicators of performance related to effectively planning, developing, and maintaining e-government services. In September 2001, our technical advisory panel reviewed the indicators, and we later modified some based on its feedback.

The performance indicators formed the basis of questions that we developed to survey local governments on their e-government practices (the surveys are discussed below). We used the indicators to compare local jurisdictions' involvement with e-government and to identify those reporting effective practices. The best practices for successful e-government services discussed in Chapter 2 evolved from the performance indicators. In November 2001 our technical advisory panel reviewed and commented on the best practices, and we modified them accordingly.

SURVEY METHODOLOGY

We surveyed counties, cities, and school districts to understand the degree to which they offer e-government, identify jurisdictions using e-government best practices, and gather information on obstacles to local e-government. Our surveys asked local jurisdictions about steps they have taken in planning, developing, and maintaining their Web sites, including security measures. Copies of the survey instruments and their aggregate results are available on our Web site at <http://www.auditor.leg.state.mn.us/ped/2002/pe0208.htm>.

We developed two formats for the survey and gave respondents the choice of either completing it on-line using the Internet or filling out a paper version and returning it by mail. The survey questions were identical in both formats. Before mailing the surveys, we pretested survey questions as well as the use of the on-line survey with members from our technical advisory panel and with other staff in our office.

In early October 2001, we mailed the questionnaires along with a cover letter explaining the study and requesting recipients' help. The surveys went to either information technology directors or county administrators (or their equivalent) in each of the 87 counties.

To survey cities and school districts, we selected random samples based on size and geographic region. First for cities and then school districts, we grouped the jurisdictions into six geographic regions. Within each region, we further grouped first cities and then school districts by size to achieve a balance of smaller, mid-sized, and larger jurisdictions. From within these groups divided by region and then by size, we randomly selected 521 of Minnesota's 854 cities and 310 of 345 school districts. We sent the city surveys to an information technology manager or other technology contact; where we did not have names for those individuals we mailed the survey to city managers, administrators, or clerk-treasurers and asked them to forward the survey to the appropriate persons. The school district surveys went to technology coordinators in districts where we had those coordinators' names; otherwise, the surveys went to the district superintendents with a request to forward the survey to the appropriate individuals.

The deadline for completing surveys was October 23, 2001. We mailed follow-up letters and surveys to counties, cities, and school districts that had not responded by the first due date and extended the deadline to November 6, 2001.

Seventy-eight of the 87 counties responded to the survey (with 44 of them responding on-line), for a response rate from counties of 89.7 percent. Table A.2 lists the counties that responded to the survey. We received responses from 429 of the 521 cities surveyed (with 117 responding on-line), for a city response rate of 82.3 percent. Table A.3 lists the cities receiving the survey and denotes those that

Table A.2: Counties Receiving Survey

*Aitkin County	*Freeborn County	*Meeker County	*Scott County
*Anoka County	*Goodhue County	*Mille Lacs County	*Sherburne County
Becker County	*Grant County	Morrison County	*Sibley County
*Beltrami County	*Hennepin County	Mower County	*Stearns County
*Benton County	Houston County	*Murray County	*Steele County
*Big Stone County	*Hubbard County	*Nicollet County	*Stevens County
*Blue Earth County	Isanti County	*Nobles County	*Swift County
*Brown County	*Itasca County	*Norman County	*Todd County
*Carlton County	*Jackson County	*Olmsted County	*Traverse County
*Carver County	*Kanabec County	Otter Tail County	*Wabasha County
*Cass County	*Kandiyohi County	Pennington County	*Wadena County
*Chippewa County	*Kittson County	*Pine County	*Waseca County
*Chisago County	*Koochiching County	*Pipestone County	*Washington County
Clay County	*Lac Qui Parle County	*Polk County	*Watsonwan County
*Clearwater County	*Lake County	*Pope County	*Wilkin County
*Cook County	*Lake of the Woods County	*Ramsey County	*Winona County
*Cottonwood County	Le Sueur County	*Red Lake County	*Wright County
*Crow Wing County	*Lincoln County	*Redwood County	*Yellow Medicine County
*Dakota County	*Lyon County	*Renville County	
*Dodge County	*Mahnommen County	*Rice County	
*Douglas County	*Marshall County	*Rock County	
*Faribault County	*Martin County	*Roseau County	
*Fillmore County	*McLeod County	*St. Louis County	

NOTE: Asterisks (*) depict counties from which we received completed surveys in time for analysis.

Table A.3: Cities Receiving Survey

*Ada	*Brooklyn Center	*Dayton	*Goodhue
*Adams	*Brookston	*De Graff	*Goodview
*Afton	*Brooten	*Deephaven	*Graceville
*Akeley	*Browerville	Deer River	*Granada
*Albert Lea	Browns Valley	Delhi	Grand Marais
*Alden	*Brownsdale	*Dellwood	*Grand Rapids
*Alexandria	*Bruno	*Denham	*Granite Falls
*Alpha	*Buckman	*Dennison	*Grasston
*Alvarado	*Buffalo	*Dent	*Green Isle
*Amboy	*Buffalo Lake	*Dodge Center	*Greenbush
*Andover	*Burnsville	*Doran	*Greenfield
*Anoka	*Burtrum	Dover	*Greenwald
*Arco	Butterfield	*Duluth	*Hadley
*Arden Hills	*Byron	*Dumont	*Hallock
Arlington	*Callaway	Dundee	*Halma
*Ashby	*Calumet	*Dunnell	*Ham Lake
*Atwater	Canby	Eagan	*Hamburg
*Audubon	*Carlos	*Eagle Bend	*Hammond
*Aurora	*Carlton	East Grand Forks	*Hampton
*Austin	*Cass Lake	¹ Easton	*Harding
¹ Avoca	*Cedar Mills	*Echo	¹ Hardwick
*Avon	*Center City	*Edgerton	*Harmony
*Backus	*Centerville	*Eitzen	*Hartland
¹ Barnesville	*Champlin	*Elgin	*Hastings
*Barnum	*Chandler	*Elkton	*Hawley
*Barry	*Chatfield	*Ellendale	Hayward
*Baxter	*Chisholm	*Ellsworth	*Hazel Run
*Bayport	Circle Pines	*Elmdale	*Hector
*Beardsley	*Claremont	*Ely	*Heidelberg
*Beaver Bay	*Clarissa	*Erskine	*Henderson
*Beaver Creek	*Clarkfield	Evan	*Hendricks
*Becker	*Cleveland	*Evansville	Hendrum
*Bejou	*Climax	*Eveleth	*Henning
*Belgrade	Clinton	*Excelsior	*Henriette
*Belle Plaine	Clontarf	*Fairmont	*Hermantown
Bellingham	*Cloquet	Faribault	¹ Heron Lake
*Beltrami	*Coates	*Farwell	Hillman
*Belview	*Cobden	*Fergus Falls	*Hills
*Bemidji	*Cohasset	*Fertile	*Hilltop
*Benson	*Cokato	Fifty Lakes	*Hinckley
Bertha	Coleraine	*Finlayson	*Hitterdal
Big Lake	*Columbia Heights	Fisher	*Hokah
*Bigelow	*Comfrey	*Flensburg	*Hollandale
*Bingham Lake	¹ Comstock	*Floodwood	*Holloway
*Birchwood	*Corcoran	Forest Lake	*Holt
*Bird Island	*Correll	*Foreston	*Hopkins
*Biscay	Cottage Grove	*Fosston	*Howard Lake
*Blackduck	Cottonwood	*Franklin	*Hoyt Lakes
*Blaine	Crookston	Frazee	*Hugo
Blomkest	*Crosslake	*Freeport	*Humboldt
*Bloomington	*Crystal	*Fridley	*Hutchinson
*Blue Earth	*Currie	*Garfield	*Ihlen
Bluffton	*Cyrus	*Garvin	*Inver Grove Heights
*Bock	*Dakota	*Gary	Iona
Borup	¹ Dalton	*Geneva	*Iron Junction
*Bovey	*Danube	*Georgetown	*Ironton
*Boyd	*Darfur	*Gibbon	*Ivanhoe
*Breckenridge	*Darwin	*Glencoe	*Jackson
*Bricelyn	*Dawson	Golden Valley	*Janesville

Table A.3: Cities Receiving Survey (continued)

*Jasper	*Mayer	*Owatonna	*Sargeant
*Jeffers	Maynard	*Palisade	*Sartell
*Karlstad	*Mazeppa	*Parkers Prairie	*Sauk Centre
*Kasota	*McIntosh	*Paynesville	*Sedan
*Kasson	Meadowlands	*Pelican Rapids	*Shafer
*Keewatin	*Meire Grove	*Pemberton	*Shelly
*Kennedy	*Menahga	*Perham	*Sherburn
¹ Kent	Mendota	Perley	*Shevlin
*Kenyon	*Mendota Heights	*Pierz	*Shoreview
*Kerkhoven	Middle River	*Pillager	Silver Bay
*Kilkenny	Miesville	*Pine City	¹ Silver Lake
*Kimball	*Milaca	*Pine Island	¹ Skyline
*Kinbrae	*Milan	*Pine River	*Sleepy Eye
*Kingston	*Millerville	*Pine Springs	Sobieski
Kinney	*Millville	*Plainview	*Solway
*La Crescent	*Milroy	*Plummer	*South Haven
*La Prairie	*Minneapolis	*Plymouth	*South St. Paul
*La Salle	Minneiska	Preston	*Spicer
*Lafayette	Minnetrista	*Princeton	*Spring Grove
Lake Benton	*Montevideo	Prinsburg	*Spring Hill
*Lake Bronson	*Montgomery	*Prior Lake	Spring Lake Park
*Lake City	*Monticello	*Proctor	*Spring Valley
*Lake Crystal	*Montrose	*Racine	*Springfield
*Lake Elmo	*Moorhead	*Ramsey	*Squaw Lake
¹ Lake Henry	Mora	Red Lake Falls	*Starbuck
*Lake Park	*Morristown	*Regal	*Steen
*Lake Shore	*Motley	Rice	Stephen
*Lake Wilson	*Mound	*Richmond	*Stewart
*Lakeland	*Mounds View	*Riverton	*Stewartville
*Lakeland Shores	Mountain Lake	*Rochester	Storden
*Lakeville	*Nevis	*Rockford	*Strandquist
*Lancaster	*New Hope	*Rockville	*Strathcona
*Lastrup	*New London	*Rollingstone	Sturgeon Lake
*Lauderdale	*New Market	Ronneby	*Sunfish Lake
*Le Roy	*New Prague	Roscoe	Swanville
*Le Sueur	New Trier	*Roseau	*Taconite
*Leonidas	*New Ulm	*Rosemount	*Tamarack
*Lester Prairie	*New York Mills	*Rothsay	*Taopi
*Lewisville	*Newport	*Round Lake	*Taylors Falls
*Litchfield	*Nicollet	*Royalton	Tenney
Little Canada	*Nimrod	*Rush City	*Thomson
*Littlefork	*Nisswa	*Rushford	*Tonka Bay
¹ Long Beach	*Norcross	*Rushford Village	*Tower
*Longville	*North Branch	¹ Rutledge	*Trail
*Lonsdale	North St. Paul	*Sabin	*Trommald
*Loretto	*Northfield	*St. Augusta	*Trosky
*Lowry	*Northrop	*St. Bonifacius	Twin Lakes
*Lucan	*Oak Park Heights	*St. Clair	*Tyler
¹ Luverne	*Oakdale	*St. Hilaire	*Ulen
*Lyle	*Odin	*St. Leo	*Underwood
*Madelia	*Ogilvie	*St. Louis Park	¹ Upsala
*Madison	*Onamia	*St. Martin	*Urbank
*Madison Lake	*Orono	St. Mary's Point	*Utica
*Manchester	*Oronoco	*St. Paul	Vadnais Heights
¹ Manhattan Beach	*Orr	*St. Rosa	¹ Vergas
*Maple Lake	*Osakis	*St. Stephen	*Vermillion
¹ Marble	*Oslo	*St. Vincent	*Verndale
*Marietta	Osseo	*Sanborn	*Vernon Center
*Marine On St. Croix	*Otertail	*Sandstone	*Victoria

Table A.3: Cities Receiving Survey (continued)

Villard	Watertown	*Willernie	*Wrenshall
*Vining	*Waterville	Williams	*Wykoff
Wabasha	*Watson	*Willmar	*Wyoming
*Wabasso	Waubun	*Willow River	*Zemple
*Wadena	*Waverly	*Wilmont	*Zimmerman
*Wahkon	*Wayzata	*Wilton	*Zumbro Falls
*Waite Park	*Wendell	*Windom	*Zumbrota
*Waldorf	*West St. Paul	*Winger	
*Walker	*West Union	*Winnebago	NOTE: Asterisks (*) depict cities from which we received completed surveys in time for analysis.
*Walnut Grove	*Westbrook	*Winton	
*Waltham	*Whalan	*Wolf Lake	
*Warren	Wheaton	*Woodland	
*Warroad	*White Bear Lake	*Woodstock	
*Waseca	*Wilder	*Worthington	¹ Returned survey too late to be included in our analysis.

responded. Of 310 school districts surveyed, we received responses from 272 (with 156 responding on-line), for a school district response rate of 87.7 percent. Table A.4 lists the school districts receiving the survey and denotes those that responded.

Based on the response rates and degree of variation in responses, the margin of error for the county survey is plus or minus 3.6 percentage points; for the city survey it is 3.3 percentage points; for the school district survey it is 2.9 percentage points. The margin of error may be larger for responses to particular questions where the number of respondents is low. Survey results may also reflect additional sources of error that cannot be measured. For example, the wording and order of the survey questions can affect results. We did not independently verify the accuracy of the information respondents provided.

SITE VISITS OF SELECT LOCAL JURISDICTIONS

Using data from our surveys, we identified counties, cities, and school districts that met various indicators of performance for e-government. From among the many local governments that met a majority of our performance indicators, we selected 12 to visit for in-depth interviews: four each of counties, cities, and school districts. We also gathered information while visiting other local jurisdictions for a study on managing local government computer systems, which was conducted at the same time as this study. The examples of best practices in Chapter 2 are based on information gathered during these visits.

We visited the sites in December 2001 and January 2002. On these visits, we asked about the advantages and disadvantages of specific practices, costs and savings associated with undertaking them, and circumstances under which a practice may be transferable to other local jurisdictions. The people we interviewed also offered suggestions and tips for other jurisdictions considering similar practices. To collect the information systematically, we used a standard

Table A.4: Independent and Special School Districts Receiving Survey

*A.C.G.C.	*Cyrus	*Inver Grove	*Monticello
*Ada-Borup	*Dassel-Cokato	*Isle	*Moose Lake
*Adrian	*Dawson-Boyd	*Ivanhoe	¹ Mora
*Aitkin	*Deer River	Jackson County Central	*Morris
*Albany	*Delano	*Janesville-Waldorf-Pemberton	*Mounds View
Albert Lea	*Detroit Lakes	*Jordan	*Mountain Iron-Buhl
¹ Alden	*Dilworth-Glyndon-Felton	*Kasson-Mantorville	*Mountain Lake
*Alexandria	*Dover-Eyota	*Kelliher	Murray County Central
*Annandale	*Duluth	*Kenyon-Wanamingo	*N.R.H.E.G.
*Anoka-Hennepin	*Eagle Valley	*Kerkhoven-Murdock-Sunburg	*Nashwauk-Keewatin
*Ashby	*East Grand Forks	*Kimball	*Nett Lake
*Austin	*Eden Prairie	Kingsland	*Nevis
*Badger	*Edgerton	*Kittson Central	*New London-Spicer
*Bagley	*Edina	*Lac Qui Parle Valley	*New Prague
*Balaton	*Elgin-Millville	La Crescent-Hokah	*New Ulm
*Barnesville	*Elk River	*Lake Benton	*New York Mills
Barnum	*Ellsworth	*Lake City	*Norman County East
*Battle Lake	*Ely	*Lake Crystal-Wellcome	*Norman County West
*Becker	*Evansville	Memorial	*North Branch
*Belgrade-Brooten-Elrosa	*Eveleth-Gilbert	*Lake Of The Woods	*North St. Paul-Maplewood
Belle Plaine	*Fairmont Area	Lake Park Audubon District	*Northfield
*Bemidji	*Faribault	*Lake Superior	*Norwood
*Benson	Farmington	*Lakeview	*Ogilvie
*Bertha-Hewitt	*Fillmore Central	*Lakeville	*Oklee
*Bird Island-Olivia-Lake Lillian	*Fisher	*Lancaster	*Onamia
*Blackduck	*Floodwood	*Lanesboro	Orono
*Blooming Prairie	*Foley	Laporte	*Ortonville
Bloomington	Forest Lake	*Le Center	*Osakis
*Blue Earth Area	*Fosston	*Le Roy	*Osseo
*Braham	*Franconia	*Lester Prairie	*Owatonna
*Brainerd	*Frazee	¹ Le Sueur-Henderson	*Park Rapids
*Brandon	Fridley	*Lewiston	*Parkers Prairie
*Breckenridge	*Fulda	*Litchfield	*Paynesville
*Brewster	G.F.W.	*Little Falls	*Pelican Rapids
Brooklyn Center	*Glencoe-Silver Lake	*Littlefork-Big Falls	*Pequot Lakes
*Browerville	*Glennville-Emmons	Long Prairie-Grey Eagle	*Perham
*Browns Valley	*Goodridge	*Luverne	Pierz
*Buffalo	*Granada Huntley-East Chain	*Lyle	*Pine City
*Buffalo Lake-Hector	*Grand Meadow	*Lynd	*Pine Island
*Burnsville	*Grand Rapids	*M.A.C.C.R.A.Y.	*Pine Point
*Butterfield	*Greenbush-Middle River	*Mabel-Canton	*Pine River-Backus
*Cambridge-Isanti	Greenway	*Madelia	¹ Pipestone-Jasper
*Campbell-Tintah	*Grygla	*Mahnomen	*Plainview
*Canby	*Hancock	*Mahtomedi	*Plummer
*Cannon Falls	*Hawley	*Maple Lake	*Princeton
*Carlton	*Hayfield	*Maple River	Prinsburg
*Cass Lake	*Hendricks	*Marshall	*Prior Lake
*Cedar Mountain	*Henning	*Marshall County Central	*Proctor
*Chaska	Herman-Norcross	*Martin County West	*Randolph
Chatfield	*Hermantown	*McGregor	*Red Lake
*Chisago Lakes	*Heron Lake-Okabena	*McLeod West	*Red Lake Falls
*Clearbrook-Gonvick	*Hibbing	*Melrose	*Red Rock Central
*Cleveland	*Hills-Beaver Creek	*Mesabi East	*Red Wing
*Clinton-Graceville-Beardsley	*Hinckley-Finlayson	*Milaca	*Redwood Falls
*Cloquet	*Holdingford	Milroy	*Renville County West
Columbia Heights	*Hopkins	*Minneapolis	*Richfield
*Comfrey	*Houston	*Minneota	*Robbinsdale
*Cook County	*Howard Lake-Waverly-Winsted	*Minnetonka	Rochester
*Cromwell	*Hutchinson	*Minnewaska	*Rockford
*Crookston	*International Falls	Montevideo	*Rocori

Table A.4: Independent and Special School Districts Receiving Survey (continued)

*Roseau	*St. Peter	*Truman	*Westbrook
*Rosemount-Apple Valley-Eagan	*Sartell	*Tyler	*Wheaton Area
*Roseville	*Sauk Centre	*Ulen-Hitterdal	*White Bear Lake
*Rothsay	Sebekka	*Underwood	*Willmar
*Round Lake	*Shakopee	*United South Central	*Windom
*Royalton	Sibley East	*Upsala	*Win-E-Mac
*Rush City	*Sleepy Eye	*Verndale	*Winona
*Rushford-Peterson	*South St. Paul	*Wabasha-Kellogg	*Worthington
*Russell	South Washington County	*Wabasso	*Wrenshall
*Ruthton	Southland	*Waconia	*Yellow Medicine East
*St. Anthony-New Brighton	*Spring Grove	*Wadena-Deer Creek	*Zumbrota-Mazeppa
*St. Charles	*Spring Lake Park	*Walker-Hackensack-Akeley	
*St. Clair	*Staples-Motley	*Warren-Alvarado-Oslo	
*St. Cloud	*Stephen-Argyle Central	*Warroad	NOTE: Asterisks (*) depict school districts from which we received completed surveys in time for analysis.
St. Francis	*Stewartville	*Watertown-Mayer	
*St. James	*Swanville	*Waterville-Elysian-Morristown	
St. Louis County	Thief River Falls	*Waubun	
St. Louis Park	*Tracy	*Wayzata	
*St. Michael-Albertville	*Tri-County	*West Central Area	
*St. Paul	*Triton	*West St. Paul-Mendota Heights-Eagan	¹ Returned survey too late to be included in our analysis.

questionnaire with nine open-ended questions. Those we interviewed had an opportunity to review and correct the summaries written for the report.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ADVISORY COUNCIL

In April 2001, this study was recommended by the Local Government Advisory Council. Table A.5 lists the individuals currently serving on the council. When the Minnesota Legislature established the best practices reviews program in 1994, it created the council and charged it with recommending local government

Table A.5: Local Government Advisory Council Members, 2001-2002

Charles Meyer (chair), St. Louis Park City Manager
Don Helmstetter, Spring Lake Park Schools Superintendent
Tim Houle, Morrison County Coordinator
Kay Kuhlmann, Red Wing City Council Administrator
Scott Neal, Northfield City Administrator
Jack Paul, Hubbard County Coordinator
Doug Reeder, South St. Paul City Administrator
Terry Schneider, Minnetonka City Councilman
Dave Unmacht, Scott County Administrator
Lothar Wolter, Jr., Norwood Young America Township Clerk

services for review. The Advisory Council recommended the topic of e-government services to the Legislative Audit Commission, which approved the council's recommendation in May 2001. Council members also reviewed and commented on a draft version of this report.