



City of
Peterborough

TO: Members of the Audit Committee

FROM: Brian W. Horton, Senior Director of Corporate Services

MEETING DATE: October 13, 2009

**SUBJECT: Report CPMRAS09-015
Report on Results of the 2008 Municipal Performance
Measurement Program**

PURPOSE

A report to provide information on the City of Peterborough's 2008 results of the Provincially mandated Municipal Performance Measurement Program.

RECOMMENDATION

That Council approve the recommendation outlined in report CPMRAS09-015, dated October 13, 2009 from the Senior Director of Corporate Services as follows:

That Report CPMRAS09-015 providing the City of Peterborough's 2008 results of the Provincially mandated Municipal Performance Measurement Program be received as information.

BUDGET AND FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

There are no budget or financial implications as this report is for information purposes only.

BACKGROUND

The Municipal Performance Measurement Program

The Municipal Performance Measurement Program (MPMP), introduced in 2000, requires municipalities to annually provide the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing with performance measurement information, and then report performance results to their taxpayers. The program promotes accountability back to the taxpayer, and encourages municipalities to provide a high-quality standard of service at the most efficient cost.

Objectives

Objectives of the program are:

- to provide a tool to assess how well municipal services are delivered
- to improve performance: measuring the efficiency (cost) and effectiveness (quality) of local services
- to strengthen local accountability to taxpayers and promote greater understanding of municipal responsibilities by the taxpayer, and
- to provide a systematic resource that allows municipalities to share information on performance and learn better/new practices from each other

Performance Measures

The MPMP currently consists of a number of performance measures, which are divided between efficiency and effectiveness measures incorporating twelve core municipal service areas.

The twelve service areas covered by the program include: Local Government, Fire, Police, Roadways, Transit, Wastewater, Storm Water, Drinking Water, Solid Waste, Parks and Recreation, Library Services and Land-Use Planning. Within each of these areas, the City collects data on measures that reveal something about the cost and quality of the service – how much it costs to deliver and how effectively it is being delivered.

Program Criteria

The services selected for the program meet the following criteria:

- Reflect major expenditure areas for municipalities
- Reflect areas of provincial-municipal interest
- Reflect high interest and value to the public
- Have data that is relatively easy to collect
- Fall under municipal responsibility

Comparison Caution

The intent is that over a period of time the program will help municipalities develop a common set of data to compare their own performances and costs year over year. Caution is required in comparing with other municipalities as each municipality is different and conditions vary from municipality to municipality. Accordingly, in some cases, the performance measurement data reported by a municipality will also vary and key differences may not be noted in the reported data (although the program allows municipalities to provide comments in their reports to taxpayers).

Operating Costs Used as Numerator

Operating costs are used as the numerator for all efficiency measures in the MPMP. MPMP defines operating costs as selected categories of operating costs less revenue received from other municipalities. Subtracting revenue received from other municipalities isolates expenditures pertaining to each specific municipality. The operating cost categories used are: salaries, wages and employee benefits, materials, contracted services, rents and financial expenses, interfunctional adjustments, external transfers and an allocation of general government referred to as program support. Long-term debt charges and transfers to reserves and reserve funds or capital are not included in the numerator so that the way a municipality finances its capital projects does not affect performance measurement results. User fees, Provincial grants and other forms of revenue are not netted from operating costs since the MPMP efficiency measures are based on gross operating costs. The denominator consists of total units, such as households, tonnes or kilometres. The resulting efficiency measure represents unit cost.

Government that Delivers Service Also Reports Performance Measure

Different levels of local government have different responsibilities for local services. The level of government that delivers the service is responsible for reporting the MPMP result.

Efficiency vs. Effectiveness

When reviewing results, consideration needs to be given to both the efficiency and effectiveness of municipal service delivery and realize that there is often a trade-off between the two. For instance, a municipality might be able to reduce its unit cost to one of the lowest levels in the province, but only by providing a level of service that its taxpayers would simply find unacceptable. Conversely, a municipality could provide the highest level of service in the province, but at a cost that is unsustainable year after year. Most would agree, the preferred method is increasing effectiveness while holding unit cost constant or even with slight reductions. That is a significant challenge for elected officials across the province.

The City of Peterborough performance results will be made available to taxpayers by posting this report, CPFAS09-015, on the City's web site.

SUMMARY

This report provides information on the City of Peterborough's 2008 Municipal Performance Measurement Program

Council may elect to use the information to benefit the City in several different ways: by helping to establish priorities, encourage innovation, improve accountability and set targets for service delivery.

Appendix A provides detailed information on each of the twelve service areas of the program.

Submitted by,

Brian W. Horton
Senior Director of Corporate Services

Contact Person

Richard Freymond
Manager, Financial Reporting and
Accounting Services
Phone: 705-742-7777 Ext 1660
Fax: 705-748-8839
E-mail Address: rfreymond@peterborough.ca

Attachment:

Appendix A – City of Peterborough – 2008 MPMP Report

Appendix A



CITY OF PETERBOROUGH

Municipal Performance Measurement For the year ending December 31, 2008

The Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing, pursuant to Section 299 of *The Municipal Act, 2001* requires all Ontario municipalities to provide information to their taxpayers on specific performance-related measures each year based on the previous year's activities.

The 2008 results for the City of Peterborough are provided herein. Where appropriate, the previous year's results have been included for comparison purposes. While the City of Peterborough's goal to improve upon the measures and to provide the highest quality of services in the most efficient and effective manner, some may have changed negatively compared to a year ago. Readers are cautioned that financial measures alone may not provide sufficient information to make an accurate assessment or comparison to either prior year results or other municipalities.

Questions concerning the City of Peterborough reported measures should be directed to the Manager of Financial Reporting and Accounting Services as follows:

Mail:	Richard Freymond Manager of Financial Reporting and Accounting Services City of Peterborough 500 George Street North Peterborough ON K9H 3R9	Phone:	705-742-7777 Extension 1660
E-mail:	rfreymond@peterborough.ca	Fax:	705-876-4615

Police Services

3.1 OPERATING COSTS

3.2 VIOLENT CRIME RATE

<u>Operating costs for Police Services</u> Total population	<u>Total # of actual incidents of violent crime</u> Population / 1,000
\$240.73 per person	9.763 violent crimes per 1,000 persons
<p>Efficiency Measure <i>Operating costs for police services per person.</i></p> <p>Objective <i>Efficient municipal police services.</i></p>	<p>Efficiency Measure <i>Violent crime rate per 1,000 persons.</i></p> <p>Objective <i>Safe communities.</i></p>
<p>Notes</p> <p>The 2007 comparative result for this measure was \$229.77 per person.</p> <p>For more information or to download the 2008 Annual Report, visit the Peterborough Lakefield's Community Police Service's web site at www.peterboroughpolice.com</p>	<p>Notes</p> <p>The 2007 comparative result for this measure was 9.211 violent crimes per 1,000 persons.</p> <p>In 2008 there were a total of 742 incidents of violent crime compared to 700 in 2007.</p>

3.3 PROPERTY CRIME RATE / 1,000

3.4 TOTAL CRIME RATE / 1,000

<u>Total # of actual incidents of property crime</u> Population / 1,000	<u>Total # of actual incidents of violent crime, property crime and other Criminal Code offences</u> Population / 1,000
38.461 property crimes per 1,000 persons	72.44 crimes per 1,000 persons
<p>Efficiency Measure <i>Property crime rate per 1,000 persons.</i></p> <p>Objective <i>Safe communities.</i></p>	<p>Efficiency Measure <i>Total crime rate per 1,000 persons (Criminal Code, excluding traffic.)</i></p> <p><i>Note that the definition used refers to Criminal Code crimes, excluding traffic.</i></p> <p>Objective <i>Safe communities</i></p>
<p>Notes</p> <p>The 2007 comparative result for this measure was 32.882 property crimes per 1,000 persons.</p> <p>In 2008 there were a total of 2,923 incidents of property crime compared to 2,499 in 2007.</p>	<p>Notes</p> <p>The 2007 comparative result for this measure was 66.579 crimes per 1,000 persons.</p> <p>In 2008 there were a total of 5,508 actual incidents of violent crime, property crime, and other Criminal Code offences, excluding traffic, compared to 5,060 in 2007.</p>

Police Services (continued)

3.5 YOUTH CRIME RATE / 1,000

Total # of youths cleared by charge or cleared otherwise
Youth Population / 1,000

90.768 youth crimes per 1,000 youths

Efficiency Measure

Youth crime rate per 1,000 youths.

Objective

Safe communities

Notes

In 2008, there were a total of 526 youths cleared by charge or cleared otherwise. This number includes 317 cases (2007 – 202 cases) handled by way of Extra Judicial Measures under the *Youth Criminal Justice Act*.

Youth population (ages 12 to 17) is estimated at 5,795 (2007 – 5,795) youths and is based on information provided by Statistics Canada.

The 2007 comparative result for this measure was 93.529 youth crimes per 1,000 youths.

In 2008 there were a total of 526 incidents of youth crimes per 1,000 youths compared to 542 in 2007.

Road Services

4.1 OPERATING COSTS FOR PAVED ROADS		4.2 OPERATING COSTS FOR UNPAVED ROADS	
<u>Operating costs for paved roads</u> Total paved lane kilometres		<u>Operating costs for unpaved roads</u> Total unpaved lane kilometres	
\$1,244.09 per paved lane kilometre		Not applicable	
<p>Efficiency Measure <i>Operating costs of paved (hard top) roads per lane kilometre.</i></p> <p>Objective <i>Efficient maintenance of paved roads.</i></p>		<p>Efficiency Measure <i>Operating costs for unpaved (loose top) roads per lane kilometre.</i></p> <p>Objective <i>Efficient maintenance of unpaved roads.</i></p>	
<p>Notes The 2007 comparative result for this measure was \$642.50 per paved lane kilometre.</p> <p>The reason for the increase was due to the repair of a greater number of potholes created by the more severe 2008 winter season together with a longer than normal Spring clean up of the winter de-icing materials.</p>		<p>Notes There are no unpaved lane kilometres of roads in the City.</p>	
4.3 OPERATING COSTS FOR WINTER CONTROL		4.4 CONDITION OF ROADS	
<u>Operating costs for winter control maintenance of roadways</u> Total lane kilometres maintained in winter		<u>Number of paved lane kilometres rated as good to very good</u> x 100 Total number of paved lane kilometres	
\$2,631.29 per lane kilometre		70.00% of lane kilometres	
<p>Efficiency Measure <i>Operating costs for winter control maintenance of roadways per lane kilometre maintained in winter.</i></p> <p>Objective <i>Efficient winter control operation.</i></p>		<p>Efficiency Measure <i>Percentage of paved lane kilometres where condition is rated as good to very good.</i></p> <p>Objective <i>Provide a paved lane system that has a pavement condition that meets municipal standards.</i></p>	
<p>Notes The 2007 comparative result for this measure was \$2,089.67 per lane kilometre.</p> <p>The primary reason for the increase is a result of more intense snow events requiring a greater winter control response when compared to the prior year.</p>		<p>Notes The above percentage is an estimation based on visual inspection of road conditions. The last detailed analysis of road conditions within the City was completed in 1996.</p> <p>The 2007 comparative result for this measure was estimated at 70% of paved lane kilometres where condition was rated as good to very good.</p>	

Road Services (continued)

4.5 WINTER EVENT RESPONSES

$$\frac{\text{Number of winter event responses that met or exceeded municipal road maintenance standards}}{\text{Total number of winter events}} \times 100$$

100.00% of winter event responses met or exceeded municipal standards

Efficiency Measure

Percentage of winter event responses that met or exceeded municipal road maintenance standards.

Objective

Provide appropriate winter response.

Notes

A winter event is a weather condition affecting roads such as snow fall, wind blown snow, sleet, freezing rain, frost, black ice, etc. A response to a winter event is a series of winter control activities related to one winter event. In 2008, there were 70 winter events, compared to 85 in 2007.

The 2007 comparative result for this measure was also 100%.

Transit Services

5.1 OPERATING COSTS

5.2 PUBLIC TRANSIT USE

<p><u>Operating costs for conventional transit</u> Total number of regular service passenger trips on conventional transit</p>	<p>Total number of conventional transit passenger <u>trips in service area in a year</u> Population of service area</p>
\$3.73 per regular service passenger trip	36.61 trips per person
<p>Efficiency Measure <i>Operating costs for conventional transit per regular service passenger trip.</i></p> <p>Objective <i>Efficient municipal transit services.</i></p>	<p>Efficiency Measure <i>Number of conventional transit passenger trips per person in the service area in a year.</i></p> <p>Objective <i>Maximum utilization of municipal transit services.</i></p>
<p>Notes</p> <p>The 2007 comparative result for this measure was \$3.00 per regular service passenger trip. The dramatic rise in fuel prices during the year was a significant factor in the increase of operating costs.</p> <p>Conventional transit is defined as all regular public transport services as opposed to specialized services for persons with disabilities.</p>	<p>Notes</p> <p>The 2007 comparative result for this measure was 35.3707 conventional transit trips per person in the service area in a year.</p> <p>In 2008, there were 2,782,400 passenger trips compared to 2,688,300 in 2007.</p>

Environmental Protection/Wastewater

6.1 OPERATING COSTS FOR COLLECTION OF WASTEWATER	6.2 OPERATING COSTS FOR TREATMENT AND DISPOSAL OF WASTEWATER
<u>Operating costs for wastewater collection</u> Total kilometres of wastewater mains	<u>Operating costs for wastewater treatment and disposal</u> Total megalitres of wastewater treated
\$2,832.65 per kilometre of wastewater main	\$200.54 per megalitre*
<p>Efficiency Measure Operating costs for collection of wastewater per kilometre of wastewater main</p> <p>Objective Efficient wastewater collection.</p>	<p>Efficiency Measure Operating costs for treatment and disposal of wastewater per megalitre.</p> <p>*A megalitre equals 1,000,000 litres or 1,000 cubic metres.</p> <p>Objective Prevention of human and environment health hazards.</p>
<p>Notes</p> <p>The 2007 comparative result for this measure was \$2,507.56.</p> <p>In 2008, there were 357 km of wastewater main compared to 345 in 2007. In 2008 a more dedicated, and proactive, maintenance regime was initiated for wastewater mains.</p>	<p>Notes</p> <p>In 2008, the City treated 19,845 (2007 – 16,198) megalitres of wastewater.</p> <p>The 2007 comparative result for this measure was \$239.88 per megalitre.</p>
6.3 OPERATING COSTS FOR COLLECTION, TREATMENT AND DISPOSAL	6.4 MAIN BACKUPS
<u>Operating costs for wastewater collection, treatment and disposal</u> Total megalitres of wastewater treated	<u>Total number of backed up wastewater mains</u> Total kilometres of wastewater mains / 100
\$251.50 per megalitre *	3.6415 per 100 kilometres of main
<p>Efficiency Measure Operating costs for collection, treatment, and disposal of wastewater per megalitre</p> <p>* A megalitre equals 1,000,000 litres or 1,000 cubic metres.</p> <p>Objective Efficient wastewater services.</p>	<p>Efficiency Measure Number of wastewater main backups per 100 kilometres of wastewater main in a year.</p> <p>Objective Prevention of human and environment health hazards.</p>
<p>Notes</p> <p>The 2007 comparative result for this measure was \$293.29 per megalitre of wastewater treated.</p> <p>In 2008, there were 19,845 megalitres treated compared with 16,198 in 2007.</p>	<p>Notes</p> <p>The 2007 comparative result for this measure was 1.3699 backed up wastewater mains per 100 kilometres of mains.</p> <p>During 2008, there were 13 mains backed up compared with 5 in 2007.</p>

Environmental Protection/Wastewater (continued)

6.5 TREATMENT BYPASS

$\frac{\text{Estimated megalitres of untreated wastewater}}{\text{Total megalitres of wastewater, including treated and untreated}} \times 100$

0.259% of wastewater

Efficiency Measure

Percentage of wastewater estimated to have by-passed treatment.

A megalitre equals 1,000,000 litres or 1,000 cubic metres.

Objective

Effective wastewater and treatment and disposal services

Notes

In 2008, 51.53 megalitres of untreated wastewater was estimated to have by-passed treatment. During 2007, there were 0.000 megalitres of wastewater estimated to have by-passed treatment.

In 2008 there was significant rain and snow volumes. The bypassed volume was from three different events (two in April and one in December). The spring events were due to Inflow & Infiltration from the melting of heavy snow pack and the December event was due to Inflow & Infiltration from a combination of heavy rain and snow melt.

Storm Water

7.1 OPERATING COSTS FOR URBAN STORM WATER MANAGEMENT

7.2 OPERATING COSTS FOR RURAL STORM WATER MANAGEMENT

Operating costs for urban storm water management
Total kilometres of urban drainage system

Operating costs for rural storm water management
Total kilometres of rural drainage system

\$1,248.19 per kilometre of drainage system

N/A

Efficiency Measure

Operating costs for urban storm water management (collection, treatment, disposal) per km of drainage system.

Efficiency Measure

Operating costs for rural storm water management (collection, treatment, disposal) per km of drainage system.

Objective

Efficient urban storm water management.

Objective

Efficient rural storm water management.

Notes

The 2007 comparable result for this measure was \$1,459.19 per kilometre of drainage system.

Notes

All storm water management activities within the City are considered to be urban.

Water Services

8.1 OPERATING COSTS FOR TREATMENT OF DRINKING WATER	8.2 OPERATING COSTS FOR DISTRIBUTION OF DRINKING WATER
<u>Operating costs for treatment of drinking water</u> Total megalitres of drinking water treated	<u>Operating costs for distribution of drinking water</u> Total kilometres of water main pipe
\$301.08 per megalitre	\$6,242.07 per kilometre of water distribution pipe
<p>Efficiency Measure <i>Operating costs for the treatment of drinking water per megalitre.</i></p> <p>Objective <i>Efficient treatment of drinking water.</i></p>	<p>Efficiency Measure <i>Operating costs for the distribution of drinking water per kilometre of water distribution pipe.</i></p> <p>Objective <i>Efficient distribution of drinking water.</i></p>
<p>Notes</p> <p>As a result of additional precipitation during the year, there were only 12,557 megalitres of water treated compared with 14,250 in 2007.</p> <p>The 2007 comparable result for this measure is \$256.38 per megalitre.</p>	<p>Notes</p> <p>The 2007 comparative result for this measure was \$6,116.00.</p> <p>There were 409 kilometres of water distribution pipe in the City of Peterborough in 2008, the same number of kilometres as in 2007.</p>
8.3 TREATMENT AND DISTRIBUTION OF DRINKING WATER (INTREGATED SYSTEM)	
<u>Operating costs for treatment and distribution of drinking water</u> Total megalitres of drinking water treated	
\$504.40 per megalitre	
<p>Efficiency Measure <i>Operating costs for the treatment and distribution of drinking water per megalitre.</i></p> <p>Objective <i>Efficient treatment and distribution of drinking water.</i></p>	
<p>Notes</p> <p>The 2007 comparative result for this measure was \$431.92 per megalitre of drinking water treated and distributed.</p> <p>During 2008 there were 12,557 megalitres of water treated compared with 14,250 in 2007.</p>	

Water Services

8.4 BOIL WATER ADVISORIES

8.5 BREAKS IN WATER MAINS

Summation of: number of boil water advisory days $\frac{\text{times the number of affected connections}}{\text{Total connections in service area}}$	<u>Number of breaks in water mains</u> Total kilometres of water main pipe / 100
0 days a year	5.87 breaks per 100 kilometres of main
<p>Effectiveness Measure <i>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.</i></p> <p>Objective <i>Water is safe and meets local needs.</i></p>	<p>Effectiveness Measure <i>Number of breaks in water mains per 100 kilometres of water main pipe in a year.</i></p> <p>Objective <i>Improve system reliability and minimize water loss and operational costs.</i></p>
<p>Notes</p> <p>The number of water boil advisories in 2007 was also nil.</p>	<p>Notes</p> <p>The 2007 comparative result for this measure was 9.54 breaks in water mains per 100 kilometres of water main pipe in a year.</p> <p>During 2008, 24 breaks were recorded compared with 39 during 2007.</p>

Solid Waste

9.1 SOLID WASTE COLLECTION		9.2 SOLID WASTE DISPOSAL	
<u>Operating costs for solid waste collection</u> Total tonnes received from all property classes		<u>Operating costs of solid waste disposal</u> Total tonnes disposed of from all property classes	
\$76.58 per tonne		\$23.87 per tonne	
<p>Efficiency Measure <i>Operating costs for solid waste collection per tonne</i></p> <p>Objective <i>Efficient solid waste collection programs.</i></p>		<p>Efficiency Measure <i>Operating costs (revenue) for solid waste disposal per tonne</i></p> <p>Objective <i>Efficient solid waste disposal programs..</i></p>	
<p>Notes</p> <p>During 2008, 13,006 (2007 - 13,034) tonnes of residential solid waste was collected.</p> <p>The comparable result for this measure was \$74.53 per tonne for solid waste collected in 2007.</p>		<p>Notes</p> <p>During 2008, 63,499 (2007 – 61,641) tonnes of solid waste was disposed of at the City’s landfill facility.</p> <p>The comparable result for this measure was \$22.61 per tonne of solid waste disposal in 2007.</p>	
9.3 SOLID WASTE DIVERSION (RECYCLING)		9.4 SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT (INTEGRATED SYSTEM)	
<u>Operating costs for solid waste diversion (recycling)</u> Total tonnes diverted		<u>Operating costs for solid waste management</u> Total tonnes disposed of, and total tonnes diverted	
\$78.60 per tonne		\$48.68 per tonne	
<p>Efficiency Measure <i>Operating costs for solid waste diversion (recycling) per tonne</i></p> <p>Objective <i>Effective solid waste diversion.</i></p>		<p>Efficiency Measure <i>Average operating costs for solid waste management (collection, disposal and diversion) per tonne</i></p> <p>Objective <i>Effective solid waste management.</i></p>	
<p>Notes</p> <p>During 2008, 19,368 (2007 – 14,798) tonnes of solid waste was diverted from the City’s landfill facility. The increased tonnage was a result of several new products being added to the program, a heightened focus on education with the move to a 4 day collection schedule and a 2 box system (paper & all other product types).</p> <p>The 2007 comparative result for this measure was \$123.94 per tonne.</p> <p>The primary reason for the decrease in this measure was the increase in the numbers of tonnes diverted from the City’s landfill site.</p>		<p>Notes</p> <p>In 2008, 82,867 (2007 – 76,439) tonnes were disposed of or diverted from all property classes.</p> <p>The 2007 comparative result for this measure was \$54.93 per tonne.</p>	

Solid Waste (continued)

9.5 COMPLAINTS FOR SOLID WASTE AND RECYCLING COLLECTION		9.6 NUMBER OF SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT SITES	
<u>Number of Complaints</u> Total Households / 1,000		Total number of waste management sites	
30.872 complaints per 1,000 households		4 sites	
<p>Efficiency Measure <i>Number of complaints received in a year concerning the collection of solid waste and recycled materials per 1,000 households.</i></p> <p>Objective <i>Effective waste management services.</i></p>		<p>Efficiency Measure <i>Total number of solid waste management facilities owned by Municipal with a Ministry of Environment (MOE) Certificate of Approval</i></p> <p>Objective <i>Efficient MOE compliance.</i></p>	
<p>Notes</p> <p>The 2007 comparative result for this measure was 35.37 complaints concerning the collection of garbage and recycled materials per 1,000 households.</p>		<p>Notes</p> <p>The City owns 4 facilities. They are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Peterborough County-City Waste Management Facility (ownership is equally shared) - Peterborough Materials Recycling Facility - Harper Road Compost Site - Peterborough Household Hazardous Waste Facility 	
9.7 COMPLIANCE ORDER FOR REMEDIATION		9.8 DIVERSION OF RESIDENTIAL SOLID WASTE	
Days a year an MOE compliance order for remediation was in effect		<u>Total tonnes of residential solid waste diverted</u> Total tonnes of residential solid waste disposed of an total tonnes diverted	
0 days		50.9% of residential solid waste diverted for recycling	
<p>Efficiency Measure <i>Number of days a year an MOE compliance order for remediation was in effect.</i></p> <p>Objective <i>Effective compliance.</i></p>		<p>Efficiency Measure <i>Percentage of residential solid waste diverted for recycling.</i></p> <p>Objective <i>Efficient waste diversion for recycling.</i></p>	
<p>Notes</p> <p>There were no days in either 2008 or 2007 when a compliance order for remediation was in effect.</p>		<p>Notes</p> <p>During 2008, 19,367 (2007 – 14,798) tonnes of residential sold waste was diverted.</p> <p>The 2007 comparative result for this measure was 44.40% of residential solid waste diverted for recycling.</p>	

Parks and Recreation	
10.1 PARKS	10.2 RECREATION PROGRAMS
<u>Operating costs for parks</u> Total population	<u>Operating costs of recreation programs</u> Total population
\$33.41 per person	\$14.79 per person
<p>Efficiency Measure <i>Operating costs for parks per person</i></p> <p>Objective <i>Efficient operation of parks.</i></p>	<p>Efficiency Measure <i>Operating costs for recreation programs per person</i></p> <p>Objective <i>Efficient operation of recreation programs.</i></p>
<p>Notes</p> <p>The City's parks provide opportunities and benefits for active, passive and programmed community recreation and leisure; contribute to the preservation and protection of open space and the environment and are generally accessible to the public all of the time, or when programs are not taking place.</p> <p>In 2007, the comparative result was \$30.74 per person for the operation of parks.</p>	<p>Notes</p> <p>Recreation programs include a broad range of programs, services and activities. They include both registered and unregistered drop-in programs and clubs.</p> <p>In 2007, the comparative result for this measure was \$14.41 per person.</p>
10.3 RECREATION FACILITIES	10.4 RECREATION PROGRAMS AND FACILITIES
<u>Operating costs for recreation facilities</u> Total population	<u>Operating costs for recreation programs and recreation facilities</u> Total population
\$90.64 per person	\$105.43 per person
<p>Efficiency Measure <i>Operating costs for recreation facilities per person</i></p> <p>Objective <i>Efficient operation of recreation facilities.</i></p>	<p>Efficiency Measure <i>Operating costs for recreation programs and recreation facilities per person.</i></p> <p>Objective <i>Efficient operation of recreation programs and recreation facilities.</i></p>
<p>Notes</p> <p>Recreation facilities include built or enclosed structures used for the purposes of community recreation and leisure and include each of the City's arenas as well as the Memorial Centre and the Peterborough Sport and Wellness Centre (PSWC).</p> <p>In 2007, the comparative result for this measure was \$82.66 per person.</p>	<p>Notes</p> <p>This represents a subtotal for measures 10.1 and 10.2.</p> <p>In 2007, the comparable result for this measure was \$97.08 per person.</p>

Parks and Recreation (continued)

10.5 PARKS, RECREATION PROGRAMS AND RECREATION FACILITIES

Operating costs for parks, recreation programs and recreation facilities
Total population

\$138.85 per person

Efficiency Measure

Operating costs for parks, recreation programs and recreation facilities per person.

Objective

Efficient operation of parks, recreation programs and recreation facilities.

Notes

This measure represents a subtotal for measures 10.1 to 10.3.

In 2007, the comparable result for this measure was \$127.81 per person

Parks and Recreation (continued)

10.5 PARTICIPANT HOURS FOR RECREATION PROGRAMS	10.6 HECTARES OF OPEN SPACE
Total participant hours for recreation programs: <u>registered, drop-in and permitted programs</u> Total population / 1,000	<u>Total hectares of open space</u> Total population / 1,000
40,318 participant hours of recreation programs per 1,000 persons	5.145 hectares of open space per 1,000 persons
<p>Effectiveness Measure Total participant hours for recreation programs per 1,000 persons.</p> <p>Objective Recreation programs serve needs of residents.</p>	<p>Effectiveness Measure Hectares of open space per 1,000 persons.</p> <p>Objective Open space is adequate for population.</p>
<p>Notes In 2007, the comparative result was 40,274 recreation hours per 1,000 persons.</p>	<p>Notes In 2007, the comparative result was 4.368 hectares of open space per 1,000 persons.</p>
10.7 TOTAL KILOMETRES OF TRAILS	10.8 INDOOR RECREATION FACILITY SPACE
<u>Total kilometres of trails</u> Total population / 1,000	<u>Square metres of indoor recreation facility space</u> Total population / 1,000
0.553 kilometres of trails per 1,000 persons	378.80 square metres of indoor recreation facility space per 1,000 persons
<p>Effectiveness Measure Kilometres of trails per 1,000 persons.</p> <p>Objective Trails provide recreation opportunities.</p>	<p>Effectiveness Measure Square metres of indoor recreation facility space per 1,000 persons.</p> <p>Objective Indoor recreation facility space is adequate for population.</p>
<p>Notes The 2007 comparative result for this measure was 0.474 km of trails per 1,000 persons.</p> <p>The City has 42 kilometres (2007 – 36 km) of trails.</p>	<p>Notes In 2007, the comparative result for this measure was also 378.8 square metres of indoor recreation facility space per 1,000 persons.</p> <p>The City has a total of 28,786 square metres of indoor recreation facility space.</p>

Parks and Recreation (continued)

10.9 Outdoor Recreation Facility Space

Square metres of outdoor recreation facility space with controlled access and electrical or mechanical functions
Total population / 1,000

468.61 square metres of outdoor recreation facility space per 1,000 persons

Efficiency Measure

Square metres of outdoor recreation facility space per 1,000 persons..

Objective

Outdoor recreation space is adequate for the population

Notes

In 2007, the comparative result for this measure was also 468.61 square metres of outdoor recreation facility space per 1,000 persons.

LIBRARY SERVICES

11.1 COST PER PERSON

11.2 COST PER USE

$\frac{\text{Operating costs for library services}}{\text{Total population}}$	$\frac{\text{Operating costs for library services}}{\text{Total uses}}$
\$21.33 per person	\$1.20 per use
<p>Efficiency Measure <i>Operating costs for library services per person</i></p> <p>Objective <i>Efficient library services.</i></p>	<p>Efficiency Measure <i>Operating costs for library services per use</i></p> <p>Objective <i>Efficient library services.</i></p>
<p>Notes The Library has four departments: Children’s Services, Collections Maintenance, Information Services, and Technical Services. For more information about the Library and the services provided, visit their web site at http://www.peterborough.library.on.ca</p> <p>The comparable result for this measure was \$26.22 per person in 2007.</p>	<p>Notes Library uses include: visits to the library, circulation of materials, program attendance, reference questions, use of electronic workstations and databases as well as accessing the library’s website.</p> <p>During 2008, there were a total of 1,356,236 (2007 – 1,250,026) uses of library services.</p> <p>The comparable result for this measure was \$1.59 per use in 2007.</p>

11.3 LIBRARY USES PER PERSON

11.4 ELECTRONIC LIBRARY USES

$\frac{\text{Total library uses}}{\text{Total population}}$	$\frac{\text{Electronic library uses}}{\text{Total library uses}}$
17.845 per person	25.5% of total library uses were electronic
<p>Effectiveness Measure <i>Library uses per person</i></p> <p>Objective <i>Increased use of library services.</i></p>	<p>Effectiveness Measure <i>Electronic library uses as a percentage of total library uses.</i></p> <p>Objective <i>Better information on library usage.</i></p>
<p>Notes The comparable result for this measure was 16.448 library uses per person in 2007.</p>	<p>Notes There were 346,150 (2007 – 317,200) electronic uses recorded at the library during the year.</p> <p>Electronic library uses include the number of people using library work-stations, the number of times electronic databases were accessed and the number of electronic reference transactions.</p> <p>In 2007, the comparable result for this measure was 25.4% of total library uses were electronic.</p>

LIBRARY SERVICES (continued)

11.5 NON-ELECTRONIC LIBRARY USES

$$\frac{\text{Non-electronic library uses}}{\text{Total library uses}}$$

74.5% of total library uses were non-electronic

Effectiveness Measure

Non-electronic library uses as a percentage of total library uses.

Objective

Better information on library usage.

Notes

There were 1,010,086 (2007 - 932,826) non-electronic uses recorded at the library in 2008.

In 2007, the comparable result for this measure was 74.6% of total library uses were non-electronic.

Land Use Planning

12.1 LOCATION OF NEW DEVELOPMENT

12.2 PRESERVATION OF AGRICULTURAL LAND

Number of residential units in new detached houses, semi-detached houses, row houses and new/condo apartments located within settlement areas
 Total number of new residential units within the entire municipality

Hectares of land designated for agricultural purposes in the Official Plan as of December 31, 2007
 Hectares of land designated for agricultural purposes in the Official Plan as of January 1, 2007

100% of new development

100.0% of land designated

Efficiency Measure
Percentage of new detached houses, semi-detached houses, row houses and new/condo apartments with final approval that are located within settlement areas.

Objective
That new lot creation is occurring within settlement areas.

Efficiency Measure
Percentage of land designated for agricultural purposes that was not re-designated for other uses during the reporting year.

Objective
Preserve agricultural land.

Notes

In previous years, the percentage was based on new lots, blocks and units. This year it is based on residential units in detached, semi-detached and row houses and new apartments or condos.

All new development within the City is located within settlement areas for the years 2007 and 2008.

Notes

There was no re-designation of agricultural land in 2008.

As of December 31st, the City had 120 hectares of land designated for agricultural purposes in the Official Plan.

12.3 PRESERVATION OF AGRICULTURAL LAND RELATIVE TO BASE YEAR

Hectares of land designated for agricultural purpose in the Official Plan as of December 31, 2008
 Hectares of land designated for agricultural purposes in the Official Plan as of January 1, 2000

49.4% of land designated

Efficiency Measure
Percentage of land designated for agricultural purposes that was not re-designated for other uses relative to the base year of 2000.

Objective
Preservation of agricultural land.

Notes

There was no change from 2007.

Land Use Planning (continued)	
12.4 NUMBER OF HECTARES RE-DESIGNATED DURING REPORTING YEAR	12.5 NUMBER OF HECTARES RE-DESIGNATED SINCE JANUARY 1, 2000
0 hectares of land	123 hectares of land
<p>Efficiency Measure <i>Number of hectares of land originally designated for agricultural purposes that was re-designated for other uses during the reporting year.</i></p> <p>Objective <i>Preserve agricultural land.</i></p>	<p>Efficiency Measure <i>Number of hectares of land originally designated for agricultural purpose that was re-designated for other uses since January 1, 2000.</i></p> <p>Objective <i>Preserve agricultural land.</i></p>
<p>Notes</p> <p>During 2008, there were 0 hectares of land re-designated from agricultural purposes to other purposes.</p>	<p>Notes</p> <p>Summary of hectares of land re-designated: 2000 – 3 2001 – 10 2002 – 2003 – 0 2004 – 110 2005 - 2008 – 0</p>