

MUNICIPALITY

Municipal Performance Measurement Program (MPMP) • 2010 RESULTS

Questions about MPMP results should be addressed to:

Name: James Hepburn	Phone: 613-476-2148 ext. 288
Title: Treasurer	
Municipality: Corporation of the County of Prince Edward	
Email: jhepburn@pecounty.on.ca	

Related documents and links:

2010 Financial Information Return located at www.pecounty.on.ca

Local Government

CONTACT PERSON FOR LOCAL GOVERNMENT:

1.1 GENERAL GOVERNMENT - EFFICIENCY

	2010	2009
1.1 a) Operating costs for governance and corporate management as a percentage of total municipal operating costs.	4.9%	8.7%
1.1 b) Total costs for governance and corporate management as a percentage of total municipal costs.	4.4%	

OBJECTIVE:

Efficient local government.

NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:

REFERENCE:

• 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.

MUNICIPALITY

Municipal Performance Measurement Program (MPMP) • 2010 RESULTS

Fire Services

CONTACT PERSON FOR FIRE SERVICES:

2.1 FIRE SERVICES – EFFICIENCY

	2010	2009
2.1 a) Operating costs for fire services per \$1,000 of assessment.	\$ 0.62	\$ 0.61
2.1 b) Total costs for fire services per \$1,000 of assessment.	\$ 0.70	

OBJECTIVE:

Efficient fire services.

NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:

REFERENCE:

- 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.

2.2 & 2.3 CIVILIAN FIRE RELATED INJURIES – EFFECTIVENESS

	2010	2009
2.2 Number of residential fire related civilian injuries per 1,000 persons.	0.047	0.135
2.3 Number of residential fire related civilian injuries averaged over 5 years per 1,000 persons.	0.140	0.225

OBJECTIVE:

Minimize the number of civilian injuries in residential fires.

NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:

MUNICIPALITY

Municipal Performance Measurement Program (MPMP) • 2010 RESULTS

2.4 & 2.5 CIVILIAN FIRE RELATED FATALITIES - EFFECTIVENESS

	2010	2009	
2.4 Number of residential fire related civilian fatalities per 1,000 persons.	0.000	0.000	
2.5 Number of residential fire related civilian fatalities averaged over 5 years per 1,000 persons.	0.047	0.045	

OBJECTIVE:

Minimize the number of civilian fatalities in residential fires.

NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:

2.6 NUMBER OF RESIDENTIAL STRUCTURAL FIRES – EFFECTIVENESS

	2010	2009	
2.6 Number of residential structural fires per 1,000 households.	2.607	1.432	

OBJECTIVE:

Minimize the number of residential structural fires.

NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:

Police Services

CONTACT PERSON FOR POLICE SERVICES:

3.1 POLICE SERVICES – EFFICIENCY

	2010	2009	
3.1 a) Operating costs for police services per person. ¹	\$ 220.16	\$ 186.49	
3.1 b) Total costs for police services per person.	\$ 220.16		

OBJECTIVE:
Efficient police services.

NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:

REFERENCE:

- 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.
- ¹ As of 2009, the efficiency measures for police services do not include expenses for prisoner transportation or court security since expenses for these services are being uploaded to the Province over a number of years. The efficiency measures for police services align with effectiveness measures based on crime rates.

MUNICIPALITY

Municipal Performance Measurement Program (MPMP) • 2010 RESULTS

3.2 VIOLENT CRIME RATE – EFFECTIVENESS

		2010	2009
3.2	Violent crime rate per 1,000 persons. ¹	15.312	9.728
OBJECTIVE: Safe communities.			
NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:			
REFERENCE: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ¹ Statistics Canada has expanded the definition of violent crime. Therefore, prior years are not comparable unless restated. 			

3.3 PROPERTY CRIME RATE – EFFECTIVENESS

		2010	2009
3.3	Property crime rate per 1,000 persons. ¹	25.133	27.113
OBJECTIVE: Safe communities.			
NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:			
REFERENCE: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ¹ Statistics Canada has expanded the definition of property crime. Therefore, prior years are not comparable unless restated. 			

MUNICIPALITY

Municipal Performance Measurement Program (MPMP) • 2010 RESULTS

3.4 TOTAL CRIME RATE – EFFECTIVENESS					
	2010	2009	2008	2007	2006
3.4 Total crime rate per 1,000 persons (<i>Criminal Code</i> offences, excluding traffic).	45.9	39.5	46.1	42.2	46.7
OBJECTIVE: Safe communities.					
NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:					

3.5 YOUTH CRIME RATE – EFFECTIVENESS					
	2010	2009	2008	2007	2006
3.5 Youth crime rate per 1,000 youths.	95.7	79.1	11.2	39.7	18.9
OBJECTIVE: Safe communities.					
NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:					

Roads

CONTACT PERSON FOR ROADS:

4.1 PAVED ROADS – EFFICIENCY

	2010	
4.1 a) Operating costs for paved (hard top) roads per lane kilometre. ¹	\$ 909.56	
4.1 b) Total costs for paved (hard top) roads per lane kilometre.	\$ 3,489.93	

OBJECTIVE:

Efficient maintenance of paved roads.

NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:

REFERENCE:

- ¹ The formulas for efficiency measures for paved roads were revised in 2010 to net out revenue received from utilities for utility cut repairs.
- 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.

4.2 UNPAVED ROADS – EFFICIENCY

	2010	2009	
4.2 a) Operating costs for unpaved (loose top) roads per lane kilometre.	\$ 1,617.41	\$ 1,593.27	
4.2 b) Total costs for unpaved (loose top) roads per lane kilometre.	\$ 1,639.43		

OBJECTIVE:

Efficient maintenance of unpaved roads.

NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:

REFERENCE:

- 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.

MUNICIPALITY

Municipal Performance Measurement Program (MPMP) • 2010 RESULTS

4.3 BRIDGES AND CULVERTS – EFFICIENCY

	2010	2009
4.3 a) Operating costs for bridges and culverts per square metre of surface area.	\$ 51.33	\$ 52.41
4.3 b) Total costs for bridges and culverts per square metre of surface area.	\$ 221.17	

OBJECTIVE:

Efficient maintenance of bridges and culverts.

NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:

REFERENCE:

- 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.

4.4 WINTER MAINTENANCE OF ROADS – EFFICIENCY

	2010	2009
4.4 a) Operating costs for winter maintenance of roadways per lane kilometre maintained in winter.	\$ 997.59	\$ 1,225.86
4.4 b) Total costs for winter maintenance of roadways per lane kilometre maintained in winter.	\$ 1,003.18	

OBJECTIVE:

Efficient winter maintenance of roads.

NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:

REFERENCE:

- 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.

MUNICIPALITY

Municipal Performance Measurement Program (MPMP) • 2010 RESULTS

4.5 ADEQUACY OF PAVED ROADS– EFFECTIVENESS					
	2010	2009	2008	2007	2006
4.5 Percentage of paved lane kilometres where the condition is rated as good to very good. ¹	66.6%	68.0%	65.9%	65.9%	65.5%
OBJECTIVE: Pavement condition meets municipal objectives.					
NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:					
REFERENCE: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ¹ 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). 					

4.6 ADEQUACY OF BRIDGES AND CULVERTS – EFFECTIVENESS			
	2010	2009	
4.6 Percentage of bridges and culverts where the condition is rated as good to very good. ¹	17.4%	17.4%	
OBJECTIVE: Safe bridges and culverts.			
NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:			
REFERENCE: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The effectiveness measure for bridges and culverts was introduced in 2009. ¹ A bridge or culvert is rated 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. 			

MUNICIPALITY

Municipal Performance Measurement Program (MPMP) • 2010 RESULTS

4.7 WINTER EVENT RESPONSES – EFFECTIVENESS					
	2010	2009	2008	2007	2006
4.7 Percentage of winter events where the response met or exceeded locally determined municipal service levels for road maintenance.	80.0%	79.1%	78.0%	87.1%	82.1%
OBJECTIVE: Response to winter storm events meets locally determined service levels for winter road maintenance.					
NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:					

Conventional Transit

CONTACT PERSON FOR TRANSIT:

5.1 CONVENTIONAL TRANSIT – EFFICIENCY

	2010	2009	
5.1 a) Operating costs for conventional transit per regular service passenger trip.	n/a	n/a	
5.1 b) Total costs for conventional transit per regular service passenger trip.	n/a		

OBJECTIVE:
Efficient conventional transit services.

NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:

REFERENCE:

- 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.

5.2 CONVENTIONAL TRANSIT RIDERSHIP – EFFECTIVENESS

	2010	2009	2008	2007	2006
5.2 Number of conventional transit passenger trips per person in the service area in a year.	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a

OBJECTIVE:
Maximum utilization of municipal transit services.

NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:

Wastewater (Sewage)

CONTACT PERSON FOR WASTEWATER:

6.1 WASTEWATER COLLECTION/CONVEYANCE – EFFICIENCY

	2010	2009	
6.1 a) Operating costs for the collection/conveyance of wastewater per kilometre of wastewater main.	\$ 3,881.10	\$ 6,301.04	
6.1 b) Total costs for the collection/conveyance of wastewater per kilometre of wastewater main.	\$ 5,982.41		

OBJECTIVE:

Efficient municipal wastewater collection/conveyance.

NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:

REFERENCE:

- 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.

6.2 WASTEWATER TREATMENT AND DISPOSAL – EFFICIENCY

	2010	2009	
6.2 a) Operating costs for the treatment and disposal of wastewater per megalitre.	\$ 775.51	\$ 605.61	
6.2 b) Total costs for the treatment and disposal of wastewater per megalitre.	\$ 790.58		

OBJECTIVE:

Efficient municipal wastewater treatment and disposal.

NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:

REFERENCE:

- 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.

MUNICIPALITY

Municipal Performance Measurement Program (MPMP) • 2010 RESULTS

6.3 WASTEWATER INTEGRATED SYSTEM – EFFICIENCY		
	2010	2009
6.3 a) Operating costs for the collection/conveyance, treatment, and disposal of wastewater per megalitre (integrated system).	\$ 926.07	\$ 816.99
6.3 b) Total costs for the collection/conveyance, treatment, and disposal of wastewater per megalitre (integrated system).	\$ 1,022.64	
OBJECTIVE: Efficient municipal wastewater system (integrated system).		
NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:		
REFERENCE: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 		

6.4 WASTEWATER MAIN BACKUPS – EFFECTIVENESS					
	2010	2009	2008	2007	2006
6.4 Number of wastewater main backups per 100 kilometres of wastewater main in a year.	0.00	0.00	0.00	7.10	9.50
OBJECTIVE: Municipal sewage management practices prevent environmental and human health hazards.					
NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:					

MUNICIPALITY

Municipal Performance Measurement Program (MPMP) • 2010 RESULTS

6.5 WASTEWATER BYPASSES TREATMENT – EFFECTIVENESS					
	2010	2009	2008	2007	2006
6.5 Percentage of wastewater estimated to have by-passed treatment.	2.068%	0.000%	0.001%	0.385%	0.017%
OBJECTIVE: Municipal sewage management practices prevent environmental and human health hazards.					
NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:					

MUNICIPALITY

Municipal Performance Measurement Program (MPMP) • 2010 RESULTS

Storm Water

CONTACT PERSON FOR STORM WATER:

7.1 URBAN STORM WATER MANAGEMENT – EFFICIENCY

	2010	2009
7.1 a) Operating costs for urban storm water management (collection, treatment, disposal) per kilometre of drainage system.	X.XX	X.XX
7.1 b) Total costs for urban storm water management (collection, treatment, disposal) per kilometre of drainage system.	X.XX	

OBJECTIVE:

Efficient urban storm water management.

NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:

REFERENCE:

- 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.

MUNICIPALITY

Municipal Performance Measurement Program (MPMP) • 2010 RESULTS

7.2 RURAL STORM WATER MANAGEMENT – EFFICIENCY		
	2010	2009
7.2 a) Operating costs for rural storm water management (collection, treatment, disposal) per kilometre of drainage system.	X.XX	X.XX
7.2 b) Total costs for rural storm water management (collection, treatment, disposal) per kilometre of drainage system.	X.XX	
OBJECTIVE: Efficient rural storm water management.		
NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:		
REFERENCE: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 		

Drinking Water

CONTACT PERSON FOR DRINKING WATER:

8.1 DRINKING WATER TREATMENT – EFFICIENCY

	2010	2009
8.1 a) Operating costs for the treatment of drinking water per megalitre.	\$ 351.42	\$ 560.46
8.1 b) Total costs for the treatment of drinking water per megalitre.	\$ 537.34	

OBJECTIVE:

Efficient municipal water treatment services.

NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:

REFERENCE:

- 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.

8.2 DRINKING WATER DISTRIBUTION/TRANSMISSION – EFFICIENCY

	2010	2009
8.2 a) Operating costs for the distribution/transmission of drinking water per kilometre of water distribution pipe.	\$ 10,032.38	\$ 9,576.93
8.2 b) Total costs for the distribution/transmission of drinking water per kilometre of water distribution pipe.	\$ 16,588.33	

OBJECTIVE:

Efficient municipal water distribution/transmission services.

NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:

REFERENCE:

- 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.

MUNICIPALITY

Municipal Performance Measurement Program (MPMP) • 2010 RESULTS

8.3 DRINKING WATER INTEGRATED SYSTEM – EFFICIENCY				
	2010	2009		
8.3 a) Operating costs for the treatment and distribution/transmission of drinking water per megalitre (integrated system).	\$ 685.74	\$ 1,222.45		
8.3 b) Total costs for the treatment and distribution/transmission of drinking water per megalitre (integrated system).	\$ 1,090.13			
OBJECTIVE: Efficient municipal water system (integrated system).				
NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:				
REFERENCE: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 				

8.4 BOIL WATER ADVISORIES – EFFECTIVENESS					
	2010	2009	2008	2007	2006
8.4 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.	0.0387	0.0141	0.0064	0.0020	0.0060
OBJECTIVE: Water is safe and meets local needs.					
NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:					

MUNICIPALITY

Municipal Performance Measurement Program (MPMP) • 2010 RESULTS

8.5 BREAKS IN WATER MAINS – EFFECTIVENESS					
	2010	2009	2008	2007	2006
8.5 Number of water main breaks per 100 kilometres of water distribution pipe in a year.	9.35	14.95	11.20	11.50	11.70
OBJECTIVE: Improve system reliability.					
NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:					

Solid Waste Management (Garbage)

CONTACT PERSON FOR SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT:

9.1 GARBAGE COLLECTION – EFFICIENCY

	2010	2009
9.1 a) Operating costs for garbage collection per household.	\$ 43.16	\$ 39.68
9.1 b) Total costs for garbage collection per household.	\$ 43.27	

OBJECTIVE:

Efficient municipal garbage collection services.

NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:

REFERENCE:

- 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.

9.2 GARBAGE DISPOSAL – EFFICIENCY

	2010	2009
9.2 a) Operating costs for garbage disposal per household.	\$ 91.23	\$ 97.82
9.2 b) Total costs for garbage disposal per household.	\$ 91.60	

OBJECTIVE:

Efficient municipal garbage disposal services.

NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:

REFERENCE:

- 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.

MUNICIPALITY

Municipal Performance Measurement Program (MPMP) • 2010 RESULTS

9.3 SOLID WASTE DIVERSION (RECYCLING) – EFFICIENCY		
	2010	2009
9.3 a) Operating costs for solid waste diversion per household.	\$ 63.68	\$ 59.46
9.3 b) Total costs for solid waste diversion per household.	\$ 65.33	
OBJECTIVE: Efficient solid waste diversion (recycling) services.		
NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:		
REFERENCE: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 		

9.4 SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT (INTEGRATED SYSTEM)– EFFICIENCY		
	2010	2009
9.4 a) Average operating costs for solid waste management (collection, disposal and diversion) per household.	\$ 198.07	\$ 196.96
9.4 b) Average total costs for solid waste management (collection, disposal and diversion) per household.	\$ 200.20	
OBJECTIVE: Efficient solid waste management (integrated system).		
NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:		
REFERENCE: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 		

MUNICIPALITY

Municipal Performance Measurement Program (MPMP) • 2010 RESULTS

9.5 COMPLAINTS – COLLECTION OF GARBAGE AND RECYCLED MATERIALS EFFECTIVENESS

		2010	2009	2008	2007	2006
9.5	Number of complaints received in a year concerning the collection of garbage and recycled materials per 1,000 households.	7.3	5.6	7.4	4.8	3.1

OBJECTIVE:

Improved collection of garbage and recycled materials.

NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:

9.6 NUMBER OF MUNICIPAL SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT FACILITIES EFFECTIVENESS

		2010	2009	2008	2007	2006
9.6	Total number of solid waste management facilities owned by the municipality with a Ministry of Environment certificate of approval.	4	4	4	4	7

OBJECTIVE:

Context for solid waste management facility compliance measure.

NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:

MUNICIPALITY

Municipal Performance Measurement Program (MPMP) • 2010 RESULTS

9.7 FACILITY COMPLIANCE – EFFECTIVENESS

9.7 Number of days per year when a Ministry of Environment compliance order for remediation concerning an air or groundwater standard was in effect for a municipally owned solid waste management facility, by facility.

FIR line #	Facility Name	Days 2010	Days 2009	Days 2008	Days 2007	Days 2006
3553	Ameliasburgh Landfill Site	0	0	0	0	0
3554	Hillier Landfill Site	0	0	0	0	0
3555	South Marysburgh Landfill Site	0	0	0	0	0
3556	Wellington Landfill Site	0	0	0	0	0

List facilities in the order they appear in the 2010 Financial Information Return (FIR).

OBJECTIVE:

Municipal solid waste services do not have an adverse impact on environment.

MUNICIPALITY

Municipal Performance Measurement Program (MPMP) • 2010 RESULTS

9.8 DIVERSION OF RESIDENTIAL SOLID WASTE EFFECTIVENESS					
	2010	2009	2008	2007	2006
9.8 Percentage of residential solid waste diverted for recycling.					
OBJECTIVE: Municipal solid waste reduction programs divert waste from landfills and/or incinerators.					
NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:					

9.9 DIVERSION OF RESIDENTIAL SOLID WASTE (Based on Combined Residential and Industrial/Commercial/Institutional Tonnage) EFFECTIVENESS					
	2010	2009	2008	2007	2006
9.9 Percentage of residential solid waste diverted for recycling (based on combined residential and ICI tonnage).	31.0%	34.7%	29.8%	23.8%	27.6%
OBJECTIVE: Municipal solid waste reduction programs divert waste from landfills and/or incinerators.					
NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ICI means Industrial/Commercial/Institutional. 					

Parks and Recreation

CONTACT PERSON FOR PARKS AND RECREATION:

10.1 PARKS – EFFICIENCY

	2010	2009	
10.1 a) Operating costs for parks per person.	\$ 32.74	\$ 33.51	
10.1 b) Total costs for parks per person.	\$ 38.93		

OBJECTIVE:
Efficient operation of parks.

NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:

REFERENCE:

- 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.

10.2 RECREATION PROGRAMS – EFFICIENCY

	2010	2009	
10.2 a) Operating costs for recreation programs per person.	\$ 23.71	\$ 19.11	
10.2 b) Total costs for recreation programs per person.	\$ 23.74		

OBJECTIVE:
Efficient operation of recreation programs.

NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:

REFERENCE:

- 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.

MUNICIPALITY
Municipal Performance Measurement Program (MPMP) • 2010 RESULTS

10.3 RECREATION FACILITIES – EFFICIENCY		
	2010	2009
10.3 a) Operating costs for recreation facilities per person.	\$ 82.72	\$ 67.42
10.3 b) Total costs for recreation facilities per person.	\$ 86.72	
OBJECTIVE: Efficient operation of recreation facilities.		
NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:		
REFERENCE: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 		

10.4 RECREATION PROGRAMS AND RECREATION FACILITIES (SUBTOTAL) EFFICIENCY		
	2010	2009
10.4 a) Operating costs for recreation programs and recreation facilities per person (Subtotal)	\$ 106.43	\$ 86.53
10.4 b) Total costs for recreation programs and recreation facilities per person (Subtotal)	\$ 110.47	
OBJECTIVE: Efficient operation of recreation programs and facilities.		
NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:		
REFERENCE: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 		

MUNICIPALITY

Municipal Performance Measurement Program (MPMP) • 2010 RESULTS

10.5 TRAILS – EFFECTIVENESS					
	2010	2009	2008	2007	2006
10.5 Total kilometres of trails	54	49	49	49	49
10.5 Total kilometres of trails per 1,000 persons	2.51	2.21	2.18	2.18	2.15
OBJECTIVE: Trails provide recreation opportunities.					
NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:					

10.6 OPEN SPACE – EFFECTIVENESS					
	2010	2009	2008	2007	2006
10.6 Hectares of open space (municipally owned)	147	147	147	147	147
10.6 Hectares of open space per 1,000 persons (municipally owned)	6.84	6.6	6.5	6.6	6.5
OBJECTIVE: Open space is adequate for population.					
NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:					

MUNICIPALITY

Municipal Performance Measurement Program (MPMP) • 2010 RESULTS

10.7 PARTICIPANT HOURS FOR RECREATION PROGRAMS EFFECTIVENESS					
	2010	2009	2008	2007	2006
10.7 Total participant hours for recreation programs per 1,000 persons.	13,020.1	12,599.6	12,170.0	11,004.0	12,140.0
OBJECTIVE: Recreation programs serve needs of residents.					
NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:					

10.8 INDOOR RECREATION FACILITY SPACE – EFFECTIVENESS					
	2010	2009	2008	2007	2006
10.8 Square metres of indoor recreation facilities (municipally owned)	8,320	8,320	8,320	8,320	8,320
10.8 Square metres of indoor recreation facilities per 1,000 persons (municipally owned)	387.2	374.7	369.9	371.0	
OBJECTIVE: Indoor recreation facility space is adequate for population.					
NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:					

MUNICIPALITY

Municipal Performance Measurement Program (MPMP) • 2010 RESULTS

10.9 OUTDOOR RECREATION FACILITY SPACE – EFFECTIVENESS					
	2010	2009	2008	2007	2006
10.9 Square metres of outdoor recreation facility space (municipally owned)	xx	xx	xx	xx	xx
10.9 Square metres of outdoor recreation facility space per 1,000 persons (municipally owned)	xx	xx	xx	xx	xx
OBJECTIVE: Outdoor recreation facility space is adequate for population.					
NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:					

Libraries

CONTACT PERSON FOR LIBRARIES:

11.1 LIBRARY COSTS PER PERSON – EFFICIENCY

	2010	2009
11.1 a) Operating costs for library services per person.	\$ 43.77	\$ 47.98
11.1 b) Total costs for library services per person.	\$ 49.16	

OBJECTIVE:
Efficient library services.

NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:

REFERENCE:

- 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.

11.2 LIBRARY COSTS PER USE – EFFICIENCY

	2010	2009
11.2 a) Operating costs for library services per use. ¹	\$ 1.89	\$ 2.33
11.2 b) Total costs for library services per use.	\$ 2.13	

OBJECTIVE:
Efficient library services.

NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:

REFERENCE:

- 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.

- ¹ Also, the calculation of electronic library uses was updated in 2009 to include the number of people using the public library wireless connection.

MUNICIPALITY

Municipal Performance Measurement Program (MPMP) • 2010 RESULTS

11.3 LIBRARY USES – EFFECTIVENESS			
		2010	2009
11.3	Library uses per person. ¹	23.12	20.60
OBJECTIVE: Increased use of library services.			
NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:			
REFERENCE: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ¹ In the 2009 FIR, the definition of library uses was changed to add the number of people using the library's wireless connection. Therefore, this effectiveness measure, library uses per person, is not comparable to prior years. 			
Line numbers for prior years: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The FIR reference for the measure, library uses per person, did not change in 2009. 			

11.4 ELECTRONIC LIBRARY USES – EFFECTIVENESS			
		2010	2009
11.4	Electronic library uses as a percentage of total library uses. ¹	28%	27%
OBJECTIVE: Better information on library usage.			
NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:			
REFERENCE: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ¹ In the 2009 FIR, the definition of library uses was changed to add the number of people using the library's wireless connection. Therefore, the effectiveness measure for the percentage of electronic library uses is not comparable to prior years. 			

MUNICIPALITY

Municipal Performance Measurement Program (MPMP) • 2010 RESULTS

11.5 NON - ELECTRONIC LIBRARY USES – EFFECTIVENESS			
		2010	2009
11.5	Non-electronic library uses as a percentage of total library uses. ¹	72%	73%
OBJECTIVE: Better information on library usage.			
NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:			
REFERENCE: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ¹ In the 2009 FIR, the definition of electronic library uses was changed to add the number of people using the library's wireless connection. Therefore, the effectiveness measure for the percentage of non-electronic library uses is not comparable to prior years. 			
Line numbers for prior years: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The FIR reference for the measure, non-electronic library uses as a percentage of total library uses, did not change in 2009. 			

MUNICIPALITY

Municipal Performance Measurement Program (MPMP) • 2010 RESULTS

Land Use Planning

CONTACT PERSON FOR LAND USE PLANNING:

12.1 LOCATION OF NEW RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT – EFFECTIVENESS

	2010	2009	2008	2007	
12.1 Percentage of new residential units located within settlement areas	20.5%	42.2%	40.8%	35.4%	

OBJECTIVE:

New residential development is occurring within settlement areas.

NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:

12.2 PRESERVATION OF AGRICULTURAL LAND DURING REPORTING YEAR EFFECTIVENESS

	2010	2009	2008	2007	2006
12.2 Percentage of land designated for agricultural purposes which was not re-designated for other uses during the reporting year.	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

OBJECTIVE:

Preservation of agricultural land.

NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:

MUNICIPALITY

Municipal Performance Measurement Program (MPMP) • 2010 RESULTS

12.3 PRESERVATION OF AGRICULTURAL LAND RELATIVE TO 2000 EFFECTIVENESS

	2010	2009	2008	2007	2006
12.3 Percentage of land designated for agricultural purposes which was not re-designated for other uses relative to the base year of 2000.	99.8%	99.8%	99.8%	99.8%	99.8%

OBJECTIVE:
Preservation of agricultural land.

NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:

12.4 CHANGE IN NUMBER OF AGRICULTURAL HECTARES DURING REPORTING YEAR EFFECTIVENESS

	2010	2009	2008	2007	2006
12.4 Number of hectares of land originally designated for agricultural purposes which was re-designated for other uses during the reporting year.	-17	0	0	61	0

OBJECTIVE:
Preservation of agricultural land.

NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:

MUNICIPALITY

Municipal Performance Measurement Program (MPMP) • 2010 RESULTS

12.5 CHANGE IN NUMBER OF AGRICULTURAL HECTARES SINCE 2000 EFFECTIVENESS

	2010	2009	2008	2007	2006
12.5 Number of hectares of land originally designated for agricultural purposes which was re-designated for other uses since January 1, 2000.	63	80	80	19	19

OBJECTIVE:

Preservation of agricultural land.

NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS: