

# MUNICIPALITY

Municipal Performance Measurement Program (MPMP) • 2013 RESULTS

Questions about MPMP results should be addressed to:

Name: Thomas Soderman	Phone: 519.769.2010
Title: Accounting Clerk	
Municipality: Township of Southwold	
Email: Accountingclerk@southwold.ca	

Related documents and links:


## Local Government

1.1 GENERAL GOVERNMENT - EFFICIENCY					
	2013	2012	2011	2010	2009
1.1 a) Operating costs for governance and corporate management as a percentage of total municipal operating costs.	8.3%	8.8%	8.5%	9.3%	10.9%
1.1 b) Total costs for governance and corporate management as a percentage of total municipal costs.	7.0%	7.2%	7.1%	7.5%	
<b>OBJECTIVE:</b> Efficient local government.					
<b>NOTES &amp; KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:</b> These are costs for Council and administration not specific to a particular service.					
<b>REFERENCE:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The formulas for efficiency measures were revised in 2009 to reflect changes in the reporting of expenses consistent with accrual accounting concepts. New total cost measures were introduced and revised in 2010. Total costs mean operating costs as defined in MPMP, plus amortization and interest on long term debt, less revenue received from other municipalities for tangible capital assets.</li> <li>Financial Information Return: 91 0206 35 (Operating costs measure) and 91 0206 45 (Total costs measure).</li> </ul>					

# MUNICIPALITY

Municipal Performance Measurement Program (MPMP) • 2013 RESULTS

## Fire Services

2.1 FIRE SERVICES – EFFICIENCY					
	2013	2012	2011	2010	2009
2.1 a) Operating costs for fire services per \$1,000 of assessment.	\$ 0.47	\$ 0.44	\$ 0.38	\$ 0.33	\$ 0.38
2.1 b) Total costs for fire services per \$1,000 of assessment.	\$ 0.58	\$ 0.55	\$ 0.57	\$ 0.44	
<b>OBJECTIVE:</b> Efficient fire services.					
<b>NOTES &amp; KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:</b>					
<b>REFERENCE:</b>					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The formulas for efficiency measures were revised in 2009 to reflect changes in the reporting of expenses consistent with accrual accounting concepts. New total cost measures were introduced and revised in 2010. Total costs mean operating costs as defined in MPMP, plus amortization and interest on long term debt, less revenue received from other municipalities for tangible capital assets.</li> <li>Financial Information Return: 91 1103 35 (Operating costs measure) and 91 1103 45 (Total costs measure).</li> </ul>					
2.2 & 2.3 CIVILIAN FIRE RELATED INJURIES – EFFECTIVENESS					
	2013	2012	2011	2010	2009
2.2 Number of residential fire related civilian injuries per 1,000 persons.	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
2.3 Number of residential fire related civilian injuries averaged over 5 years per 1,000 persons.	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
<b>OBJECTIVE:</b> Minimize the number of civilian injuries in residential fires.					
<b>NOTES &amp; KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:</b> There have been no civilian fire related injuries in several years.					
<b>REFERENCE:</b>					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Financial Information Return: 92 1151 07 (2.2) and 92 1152 07 (2.3).</li> </ul>					
2.4 & 2.5 CIVILIAN FIRE RELATED FATALITIES - EFFECTIVENESS					
	2013	2012	2011	2010	2009
2.4 Number of residential fire related civilian fatalities per 1,000 persons.	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
2.5 Number of residential fire related civilian fatalities averaged over 5 years per 1,000 persons.	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
<b>OBJECTIVE:</b> Minimize the number of civilian fatalities in residential fires.					
<b>NOTES &amp; KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:</b> There have been no civilian fire related injuries in several years.					
<b>REFERENCE:</b>					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Financial Information Return: 92 1155 07 (2.4) and 92 1156 07 (2.5).</li> </ul>					
2.6 NUMBER OF RESIDENTIAL STRUCTURAL FIRES – EFFECTIVENESS					
	2013	2012	2011	2010	2009
2.6 Number of residential structural fires per 1,000 households.	0.609	0.000	0.000	2.960	2.971
<b>OBJECTIVE:</b> Minimize the number of residential structural fires.					
<b>NOTES &amp; KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:</b> There was 1 residential structural fire in 2013. There were 5 fires in each of 2010 and 2009.					
<b>REFERENCE:</b>					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Financial Information Return: 92 1160 07.</li> </ul>					

# MUNICIPALITY

Municipal Performance Measurement Program (MPMP) • 2013 RESULTS

## Police Services

3.1 POLICE SERVICES – EFFICIENCY					
	2013	2012	2011	2010	2009
3.1 a) Operating costs for police services per person.	\$ 143.20	\$ 145.74	\$ 127.57	\$ 128.12	\$ 116.92
3.1 b) Total costs for police services per person.	\$ 143.20	\$ 145.74	\$ 127.57	\$ 128.12	
<b>OBJECTIVE:</b> Efficient police services.					
<b>NOTES &amp; KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:</b> Costs for policing are determined outside the responsibility of Council. 2012 and forward will see significant increases with new union contracts in place. 2014 policing costs have increased over 2013. Per-household costs have decreased as a result of the 2012 yearend policing reconciliation credit received in 2013 being double the 2011 yearend policing reconciliation credit received in 2012.					
<b>REFERENCE:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The formulas for efficiency measures were revised in 2009 to reflect changes in the reporting of expenses consistent with accrual accounting concepts. New total cost measures were introduced and revised in 2010. Total costs mean operating costs as defined in MPMP, plus amortization and interest on long term debt, less revenue received from other municipalities for tangible capital assets.</li> <li>Financial Information Return: 91 1204 35 (Operating costs measure) and 91 1204 45 (Total costs measure).</li> </ul>					
3.2 VIOLENT CRIME RATE – EFFECTIVENESS					
	2013	2012	2011	2010	2009
3.2 Violent crime rate per 1,000 persons.	6.9	4.7	4.8	4.2	na
<b>OBJECTIVE:</b> Safe communities.					
<b>NOTES &amp; KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:</b> Per OPP reports.					
<b>REFERENCE:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Financial Information Return: 92 1258 07.</li> </ul>					
3.3 PROPERTY CRIME RATE – EFFECTIVENESS					
	2013	2012	2011	2010	2009
3.3 Property crime rate per 1,000 persons.	17.1	16.0	13.3	17.8	na
<b>OBJECTIVE:</b> Safe communities.					
<b>NOTES &amp; KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:</b> Per OPP reports.					
<b>REFERENCE:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Financial Information Return: 92 1259 07.</li> </ul>					
3.4 TOTAL CRIME RATE – EFFECTIVENESS					
	2013	2012	2011	2010	2009
3.4 Total crime rate per 1,000 persons ( <i>Criminal Code</i> offences, excluding traffic).	25.6	23.1	19.6	24.3	na
<b>OBJECTIVE:</b> Safe communities.					
<b>NOTES &amp; KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:</b> Per OPP reports.					
<b>REFERENCE:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Financial Information Return: 92 1263 07.</li> </ul>					
3.5 YOUTH CRIME RATE – EFFECTIVENESS					
	2013	2012	2011	2010	2009
3.5 Youth crime rate per 1,000 youths.	0.9	1.8	1.8	2.3	na
<b>OBJECTIVE:</b> Safe communities.					
<b>NOTES &amp; KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:</b> Per OPP reports.					
<b>REFERENCE:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Financial Information Return: 92 1265 07.</li> </ul>					

## Building Permits & Inspection Services

4.1 BUILDING PERMITS & INSPECTION SERVICES – EFFICIENCY		
	2013	
4.1 a) Operating costs for building permits and inspection services per \$1,000 of construction activity, averaged over three years (based on permits issued).	\$ 11.12	
4.1 b) Operating costs for building permits and inspection services per \$1,000 of construction activity, averaged over three years (based on permits issued).	\$ 11.12	
<b>OBJECTIVE:</b> Efficient building permits and inspection services.		
<b>NOTES &amp; KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:</b> Fluctuates based on building activity.		
<b>REFERENCE:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In 2013, the formula for the denominator of the MPMP efficiency measures for building permits and inspection services was changed to a three year average for total construction activity, divided by \$1,000.</li> <li>• Financial Information Return: 91 1302 35 (Operating costs measure) and 91 1302 45 (Total costs measure).</li> </ul>		

4.2 REVIEW OF COMPLETE BUILDING PERMIT APPLICATIONS – EFFECTIVENESS				
	2013	2012	2011	
4.2 Median number of days to review a complete building permit application and issue a permit or not issue a permit, and provide all reasons for refusal:				
a) Category 1: Houses (houses not exceeding 3 storeys/600 square metres). Reference: provincial standard is 10 working days.	5	5	5	
b) Category 2: Small Buildings (small commercial/industrial not exceeding 3 storeys/600 square metres). Reference: provincial standard is 15 working days.	8	8	8	
c) Category 3: Large Buildings (large residential/commercial/ industrial/ institutional). Reference: provincial standard is 20 working days.	15	10	10	
d) Category 4: Complex buildings (post disaster buildings, including hospitals, power/water, fire/police/EMS, communications). Reference: provincial standard is 30 working days.	20	20	20	
<b>OBJECTIVE:</b> Complete building permit applications are processed quickly and accurately.				
<b>NOTES &amp; KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:</b>				
<b>REFERENCE:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The effectiveness measure reporting the number of working days to review complete building permit applications was introduced in 2011.</li> <li>• Financial Information Return:</li> </ul>				

# MUNICIPALITY

Municipal Performance Measurement Program (MPMP) • 2013 RESULTS

## Roads

5.1 PAVED ROADS – EFFICIENCY					
	2013	2012	2011	2010	
5.1 a) Operating costs for paved (hard top) roads per lane kilometre. <sup>1</sup>	\$ 1,035.56	\$ 1,477.09	\$ 676.81	\$ 730.98	
5.1 b) Total costs for paved (hard top) roads per lane kilometre.	\$ 2,463.54	\$ 3,935.68	\$ 2,617.48	\$ 2,411.86	
<b>OBJECTIVE:</b> Efficient maintenance of paved roads.					
<b>NOTES &amp; KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:</b> With 2013 calendar year winter being so harsh, less work was completed on paved roads.					
<b>REFERENCE:</b>					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <sup>1</sup> The formulas for efficiency measures for paved roads were revised in 2010 to net out revenue received from utilities for utility cut repairs.</li> <li>• The total cost measure was also revised in 2010. Total costs mean operating costs as defined in MPMP, plus amortization and interest on long term debt, less revenue received from other municipalities for tangible capital assets.</li> </ul>					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Financial Information Return: 91 2111 35 (Operating costs measure) and 91 2111 45 (Total costs measure).</li> </ul>					
5.2 UNPAVED ROADS – EFFICIENCY					
	2013	2012	2011	2010	2009
5.2 a) Operating costs for unpaved (loose top) roads per lane kilometre.	\$ 977.54	\$ 1,159.19	\$ 1,349.82	\$ 1,371.33	\$ 1,129.71
5.2 b) Total costs for unpaved (loose top) roads per lane kilometre.	\$ 2,084.04	\$ 1,766.61	\$ 1,939.14	\$ 2,119.90	
<b>OBJECTIVE:</b> Efficient maintenance of unpaved roads.					
<b>NOTES &amp; KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:</b>					
<b>REFERENCE:</b>					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The formulas for efficiency measures were revised in 2009 to reflect changes in the reporting of expenses consistent with accrual accounting concepts. New total cost measures were introduced and revised in 2010. Total costs mean operating costs as defined in MPMP, plus amortization and interest on long term debt, less revenue received from other municipalities for tangible capital assets.</li> </ul>					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Financial Information Return: 91 2110 35 (Operating costs measure) and 91 2110 45 (Total costs measure).</li> </ul>					
5.3 BRIDGES AND CULVERTS – EFFICIENCY					
	2013	2012	2011	2010	2009
5.3 a) Operating costs for bridges and culverts per square metre of surface area.	\$ 39.16	\$ 36.82	\$ 19.13	\$ 7.14	\$ 13.62
5.3 b) Total costs for bridges and culverts per square metre of surface area.	\$ 71.97	\$ 59.08	\$ 41.40	\$ 29.24	
<b>OBJECTIVE:</b> Efficient maintenance of bridges and culverts.					
<b>NOTES &amp; KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:</b> In 2013 additional culverts required repairs above the average amount					
<b>REFERENCE:</b>					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The formulas for efficiency measures were revised in 2009 to reflect changes in the reporting of expenses consistent with accrual accounting concepts. New total cost measures were introduced and revised in 2010. Total costs mean operating costs as defined in MPMP, plus amortization and interest on long term debt, less revenue received from other municipalities for tangible capital assets.</li> </ul>					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Financial Information Return: 91 2130 35 (Operating costs measure) and 91 2130 45 (Total costs measure).</li> </ul>					

# MUNICIPALITY

Municipal Performance Measurement Program (MPMP) • 2013 RESULTS

5.4 WINTER MAINTENANCE OF ROADS – EFFICIENCY					
	2013	2012	2011	2010	2009
5.4 a) Operating costs for winter maintenance of roadways per lane kilometre maintained in winter.	\$ 495.98	\$ 68.56	\$ 649.08	\$ 552.94	\$ 436.02
5.4 b) Total costs for winter maintenance of roadways per lane kilometre maintained in winter.	\$ 629.83	\$ 123.23	\$ 730.25	\$ 634.09	
<b>OBJECTIVE:</b> Efficient winter maintenance of roads.					
<b>NOTES &amp; KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:</b> 2013 calendar year winter was harsh and had high precipitation, requiring extensive winter maintenance activities.					
<b>REFERENCE:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The formulas for efficiency measures were revised in 2009 to reflect changes in the reporting of expenses consistent with accrual accounting concepts. New total cost measures were introduced and revised in 2010. Total costs mean operating costs as defined in MPMP, plus amortization and interest on long term debt, less revenue received from other municipalities for tangible capital assets.</li> <li>Financial Information Return: 91 2205 35 (Operating costs measure) and 91 2205 45 (Total costs measure).</li> </ul>					
5.5 ADEQUACY OF PAVED ROADS – EFFECTIVENESS					
	2013	2012	2011	2010	2009
5.5 Percentage of paved lane kilometres where the condition is rated as good to very good. <sup>1</sup>	78%	73%	73%	72%	72%
<b>OBJECTIVE:</b> Pavement condition meets municipal objectives.					
<b>NOTES &amp; KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:</b>					
<b>REFERENCE:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><sup>1</sup> Pavement condition is rated using a Pavement Condition Index (PCI) such as the Index used by the Ontario Good Roads Association (OGRA) or the Ministry of Transportation's Roads Inventory Management System (RIMS).</li> <li>Financial Information Return: 92 2152 07.</li> </ul>					
5.6 ADEQUACY OF BRIDGES AND CULVERTS – EFFECTIVENESS					
	2013	2012	2011	2010	2009
5.6 Percentage of bridges and culverts where the condition is rated as good to very good. <sup>1</sup>	85%	85%	95%	95%	95%
<b>OBJECTIVE:</b> Safe bridges and culverts.					
<b>NOTES &amp; KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:</b>					
<b>REFERENCE:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The effectiveness measure for bridges and culverts was introduced in 2009.</li> <li><sup>1</sup> A bridge or culvert is rated as being in good to very good condition if distress to the primary components is minimal, requiring only maintenance. Primary components are the main load carrying components of the structure, including the deck, beams, girders, abutments, foundations, etc.</li> <li>Financial Information Return: 92 2165 07.</li> </ul>					
5.7 WINTER EVENT RESPONSES – EFFECTIVENESS					
	2013	2012	2011	2010	2009
5.7 Percentage of winter events where the response met or exceeded locally determined municipal service levels for road maintenance.	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
<b>OBJECTIVE:</b> Response to winter storm events meets locally determined service levels for winter road maintenance.					
<b>NOTES &amp; KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:</b>					
<b>REFERENCE:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Financial Information Return: 92 2251 07.</li> </ul>					

# MUNICIPALITY

Municipal Performance Measurement Program (MPMP) • 2013 RESULTS

## Wastewater (Sewage)

7.1 WASTEWATER COLLECTION/CONVEYANCE – EFFICIENCY					
	2013	2012	2011	2010	2009
7.1 a) Operating costs for the collection/conveyance of wastewater per kilometre of wastewater main.	na	na	na	na	na
7.1 b) Total costs for the collection/conveyance of wastewater per kilometre of wastewater main.	\$ 718.44	\$ 718.44	\$ 718.44	\$ 718.44	
<b>OBJECTIVE:</b> Efficient municipal wastewater collection/conveyance.					
<b>NOTES &amp; KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:</b> This service is provided by the City of St Thomas for the Lynhurst and Ferndale subdivisions. The only cost reflected above is the annual amortization of the infrastructure.					
<b>REFERENCE:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The formulas for efficiency measures were revised in 2009 to reflect changes in the reporting of expenses consistent with accrual accounting concepts. New total cost measures were introduced and revised in 2010. Total costs mean operating costs as defined in MPMP, plus amortization and interest on long term debt, less revenue received from other municipalities for tangible capital assets.</li> <li>Financial Information Return: 91 3111 35 (Operating costs measure) and 91 3111 45 (Total costs measure).</li> </ul>					

# MUNICIPALITY

Municipal Performance Measurement Program (MPMP) • 2013 RESULTS

## Drinking Water

### 9.2 DRINKING WATER DISTRIBUTION/TRANSMISSION – EFFICIENCY

	2013	2012	2011	2010	2009
9.2 a) Operating costs for the distribution/ transmission of drinking water per kilometre of water distribution pipe.	\$ 3,166.12	\$ 3,009.79	\$ 4,158.10	\$ 4,030.52	\$ 3,815.79
9.2 b) Total costs for the distribution/ transmission of drinking water per kilometre of water distribution pipe.	\$ 5,137.87	\$ 5,072.31	\$ 6,261.04	\$ 6,078.55	

**OBJECTIVE:**

Efficient municipal water distribution/transmission services.

**NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:**

2012 Low water consumption costs due to closure of manufacturing plant (2012)

- Financial Information Return: 91 3312 35 (Operating costs measure) and 91 3312 45 (Total costs measure).

### 9.4 BOIL WATER ADVISORIES – EFFECTIVENESS

	2013	2012	2011	2010	2009
9.4 Weighted number of days when a boil water advisory issued by the medical officer of health, applicable to a municipal water supply, was in effect.	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.1131	0.0150

**OBJECTIVE:**

Water is safe and meets local needs.

**NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:**

**REFERENCE:**

- Financial Information Return: 92 3355 07.

### 9.5 BREAKS IN WATER MAINS – EFFECTIVENESS

	2013	2012	2011	2010	2009
9.5 Number of water main breaks per 100 kilometres of water distribution pipe in a year.	1.31	0.44	0.00	0.00	0.00

**OBJECTIVE:**

Improve system reliability.

**NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:**

There were 2 water main breaks in 2013.

**REFERENCE:**

- Financial Information Return: 92 3356 07.



# MUNICIPALITY

Municipal Performance Measurement Program (MPMP) • 2013 RESULTS

## Solid Waste Management (Garbage)

10.1 GARBAGE COLLECTION – EFFICIENCY					
	2013	2012	2011	2010	2009
10.1 a) Operating costs for garbage collection per tonne or per household. <b>(Specify)</b>	\$ 84.51	\$ 92.83	\$ 101.53	\$ 102.09	\$ 101.73
10.1 b) Total costs for garbage collection per tonne or per household. <b>(Specify)</b>	\$ 84.51	\$ 92.83	\$ 101.53	\$ 102.09	
<b>OBJECTIVE:</b> Efficient municipal garbage collection services.					
<b>NOTES &amp; KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:</b> Cost allocation between garbage and recycling corrected in 2012.					
<b>REFERENCE:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The formulas for efficiency measures were revised in 2009 to reflect changes in the reporting of expenses consistent with accrual accounting concepts. New total cost measures were introduced and revised in 2010. Total costs mean operating costs as defined in MPMP, plus amortization and interest on long term debt, less revenue received from other municipalities for tangible capital assets.</li> <li>Financial Information Return: 91 3404 35 (Operating costs measure) and 91 3404 45 (Total costs measure).</li> </ul>					

10.3 SOLID WASTE DIVERSION (RECYCLING) – EFFICIENCY					
	2013	2012	2011	2010	2009
10.3 a) Operating costs for solid waste diversion per tonne or per household.	\$ 47.21	\$ 23.62	\$ 17.00	\$ 16.11	\$ 15.73
10.3 b) Total costs for solid waste diversion per tonne or per household.	\$ 47.21	\$ 23.62	\$ 17.00	\$ 16.11	
<b>OBJECTIVE:</b> Efficient solid waste diversion (recycling) services.					
<b>NOTES &amp; KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:</b> Cost allocation between garbage and recycling corrected in 2012.					
<b>REFERENCE:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The formulas for efficiency measures were revised in 2009 to reflect changes in the reporting of expenses consistent with accrual accounting concepts. New total cost measures were introduced and revised in 2010. Total costs mean operating costs as defined in MPMP, plus amortization and interest on long term debt, less revenue received from other municipalities for tangible capital assets.</li> <li>Financial Information Return: 91 3606 35 (Operating costs measure) and 91 3606 45 (Total costs measure).</li> </ul>					

10.5 COMPLAINTS – COLLECTION OF GARBAGE AND RECYCLED MATERIALS EFFECTIVENESS					
	2013	2012	2011	2010	2009
10.5 Number of complaints received in a year concerning the collection of garbage and recycled materials per 1,000 households.	39.6	35.9	36.3	39.7	44.6
<b>OBJECTIVE:</b> Improved collection of garbage and recycled materials.					
<b>NOTES &amp; KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:</b>					
<b>REFERENCE:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Financial Information Return: 92 3452 07.</li> </ul>					

10.9 DIVERSION OF RESIDENTIAL SOLID WASTE (Based on Combined Residential and Industrial/Commercial/Institutional Tonnage) EFFECTIVENESS					
	2013	2012	2011	2010	2009
10.9 Percentage of residential solid waste diverted for recycling (based on combined residential and ICI tonnage).	19%	18%	16%	18%	16%
<b>OBJECTIVE:</b> Municipal solid waste reduction programs divert waste from landfills and/or incinerators.					
<b>NOTES &amp; KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:</b>					
<b>REFERENCE:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ICI means Industrial/Commercial/Institutional.</li> <li>Financial Information Return: 92 3656 07.</li> </ul>					

# MUNICIPALITY

Municipal Performance Measurement Program (MPMP) • 2013 RESULTS

## Parks and Recreation

11.1 PARKS – EFFICIENCY					
	2013	2012	2011	2010	2009
11.1 a) Operating costs for parks per person.	\$ 7.19	\$ 6.32	\$ 6.31	\$ 5.96	na
11.1 b) Total costs for parks per person.	\$ 8.09	\$ 7.22	\$ 8.08	\$ 7.76	
<b>OBJECTIVE:</b> Efficient operation of parks.					
<b>NOTES &amp; KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:</b>					
<b>REFERENCE:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The formulas for efficiency measures were revised in 2009 to reflect changes in the reporting of expenses consistent with accrual accounting concepts. New total cost measures were introduced and revised in 2010. Total costs mean operating costs as defined in MPMP, plus amortization and interest on long term debt, less revenue received from other municipalities for tangible capital assets.</li> <li>Financial Information Return: 91 7103 35 (Operating costs measure) and 91 7103 45 (Total costs measure).</li> </ul>					
11.3 RECREATION FACILITIES – EFFICIENCY					
	2013	2012	2011	2010	2009
11.3 a) Operating costs for recreation facilities per person.	\$ 30.82	\$ 30.58	\$ 26.43	\$ 26.28	\$ 18.96
11.3 b) Total costs for recreation facilities per person.	\$ 36.91	\$ 34.33	\$ 28.86	\$ 28.74	
<b>OBJECTIVE:</b> Efficient operation of recreation facilities.					
<b>NOTES &amp; KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:</b>					
<b>REFERENCE:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The formulas for efficiency measures were revised in 2009 to reflect changes in the reporting of expenses consistent with accrual accounting concepts. New total cost measures were introduced and revised in 2010. Total costs mean operating costs as defined in MPMP, plus amortization and interest on long term debt, less revenue received from other municipalities for tangible capital assets.</li> <li>Financial Information Return: 91 7306 35 (Operating costs measure) and 91 7306 45 (Total costs measure).</li> </ul>					
11.6 OPEN SPACE – EFFECTIVENESS					
	2013	2012	2011	2010	2009
11.6 Hectares of open space (municipally owned).	14	14	14	14	14
11.6 Hectares of open space per 1,000 persons (municipally owned).	3.1	3.1	2.9	3.0	3.0
<b>OBJECTIVE:</b> Open space is adequate for population.					
<b>NOTES &amp; KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:</b>					
<b>REFERENCE:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Financial Information Return: 92 7155 05 and 92 7155 07.</li> </ul>					
11.8 INDOOR RECREATION FACILITY SPACE – EFFECTIVENESS					
	2013	2012	2011	2010	2009
11.8 Square metres of indoor recreation facilities (municipally owned).	50	50	50	50	na
11.8 Square metres of indoor recreation facilities per 1,000 persons (municipally owned).	11.1	11.1	10.4	10.6	na
<b>OBJECTIVE:</b> Indoor recreation facility space is adequate for population.					
<b>NOTES &amp; KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:</b>					
<b>REFERENCE:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Financial Information Return: 92 7356 05 and 92 7356 07.</li> </ul>					

# MUNICIPALITY

Municipal Performance Measurement Program (MPMP) • 2013 RESULTS

## Land Use Planning

13.1 LOCATION OF NEW RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT – EFFECTIVENESS					
	2013	2012	2011	2010	2009
13.1 Percentage of new residential units located within settlement areas.	25%	0%	67%	na	100%
<b>OBJECTIVE:</b> New residential development is occurring within settlement areas.					
<b>NOTES &amp; KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:</b>					
<b>REFERENCE:</b> • Financial Information Return: 92 8170 07.					
13.2 PRESERVATION OF AGRICULTURAL LAND DURING REPORTING YEAR EFFECTIVENESS					
	2013	2012	2011	2010	2009
13.2 Percentage of land designated for agricultural purposes which was not re-designated for other uses during the reporting year.	100%	100%	100%	na	100%
<b>OBJECTIVE:</b> Preservation of agricultural land.					
<b>NOTES &amp; KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:</b>					
<b>REFERENCE:</b> • Financial Information Return: 92 8163 07.					
13.3 PRESERVATION OF AGRICULTURAL LAND RELATIVE TO 2000 EFFECTIVENESS					
	2013	2012	2011	2010	2009
13.3 Percentage of land designated for agricultural purposes which was not re-designated for other uses relative to the base year of 2000.	100%	100%	100%	na	100%
<b>OBJECTIVE:</b> Preservation of agricultural land.					
<b>NOTES &amp; KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:</b>					
<b>REFERENCE:</b> • Financial Information Return: 92 8164 07.					

# MUNICIPALITY

Municipal Performance Measurement Program (MPMP) • 2013 RESULTS

<b>13.4 CHANGE IN NUMBER OF AGRICULTURAL HECTARES DURING REPORTING YEAR EFFECTIVENESS</b>					
	2013	2012	2011	2010	2009
13.4 Number of hectares of land originally designated for agricultural purposes which was re-designated for other uses during the reporting year.	0	0	0	na	0
<b>OBJECTIVE:</b> Preservation of agricultural land.					
<b>NOTES &amp; KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:</b>					
<b>REFERENCE:</b> • Financial Information Return: 92 8165 07.					

<b>13.5 CHANGE IN NUMBER OF AGRICULTURAL HECTARES SINCE 2000 EFFECTIVENESS</b>					
	2013	2012	2011	2010	2009
13.5 Number of hectares of land originally designated for agricultural purposes which was re-designated for other uses since January 1, 2000.	0	0	0	na	0
<b>OBJECTIVE:</b> Preservation of agricultural land.					
<b>NOTES &amp; KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:</b>					
<b>REFERENCE:</b> • Financial Information Return: 92 8166 07.					