City of Peterborough

TO: **Members of the Audit Committee**

FROM: **Sandra Clancy, Director of Corporate Services**

MEETING DATE: **September 17, 2012**

SUBJECT: **Report CPFS12-069**
Report on Results of the 2011 Municipal Performance Measurement Program

PURPOSE

A report to provide information on the City of Peterborough's 2011 results of the Provincially mandated Municipal Performance Measurement Program.

RECOMMENDATION

That Council approve the recommendation outlined in report CPFS12-069 dated September 17, 2012 from the Director of Corporate Services as follows:

That Report CPFS12-069 providing the City of Peterborough's 2011 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 consists of a number of performance measures, which are divided between efficiency and effectiveness measures incorporating thirteen core municipal service areas. In previous years, there were twelve core municipal services areas, but Building Permit and Inspection Services was added as a service area in 2011.

The service areas covered by the program include: General Government, Fire Services, Police Services, Building Permit and Inspection Services, 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).

Due to new measures on the MPMP and how information is collected and recorded on the Financial Information Return prior year's comparatives in some instances needed to be revised.

The Numerator – Operating Costs and Total Costs

Operating costs are used as the numerator for 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, inter-functional 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.

Total costs are also used as the numerator for efficiency measures in the MPMP. Total costs are operating costs, as defined above, plus interest on long-term debt and amortization of tangible capital assets.

The Denominator – Total Units

The denominator consists of total units, such as households, tonnes or kilometres. The resulting efficiency measure represents unit cost.

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, CPFS12-069, on the City's web site at www.peterborough.ca/Business/Finance/Municipal_Performance_Measurement_Program.

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.

SUMMARY

This report provides information on the City of Peterborough's 2011 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,

Sandra Clancy
Director of Corporate Services

Contact Person:

Richard Freymond
Manager of Financial Services
Phone: 705-742-7777 Ext 1862
Toll Free: 1-855-738-3755
Fax: 705-748-8839
E-mail: rfreymond@peterborough.ca

Appendix A – City of Peterborough – 2011 MPMP Report

Appendix A

CITY OF PETERBOROUGH

Municipal Performance Measurement Program
For the year ending December 31, 2011

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 2011 results for the City of Peterborough are provided herein. Where appropriate, the previous year's results have been adjusted for comparison purposes. While it is 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 Services as follows:

Mail:	Richard Freymond Manager of Financial Services City of Peterborough 500 George Street North Peterborough ON K9H 3R9	Phone:	705-742-7777 Extension 1862
E-mail:	rfreymond@peterborough.ca	Fax:	705-748-8839

General Government

1.1a OPERATING COSTS Governance and political support, and corporate management support	1.1b TOTAL COSTS Governance and political support, and corporate management support
Operating costs for Governance and Corporate Management / Total Municipal Operating Costs	Total costs for Governance and Corporate Management / Total Municipal Operating Costs
1.8% of total municipal operating costs	**2.0% of total municipal total costs**
Efficiency Measure *Governance and corporate management operating costs as a percentage of total municipal operating costs.* ***Objective*** *Efficient municipal administration.*	***Efficiency Measure*** *Governance and corporate management total costs as a percentage of total municipal operating costs.* ***Objective*** *Efficient municipal administration.*
Notes The 2010 comparative result for this measure was 2.2%.	**Notes** The 2010 comparative result for this measure was 2.3%.

Fire Services

2.1a OPERATING COSTS FOR FIRE SERVIES	2.1b TOTAL COSTS FOR FIRE SERVICES
Operating Costs for Fire Services (Total Assessment / 1,000)	Total Costs for Fire Services (Total Assessment / 1,000)
$1.85 per $1,000 of property assessment	**$1.89 per $1,000 of property assessment**
Efficiency Measure *Operating costs for fire services per $1,000 of assessment.* ***Objective*** *Efficient municipal management.*	***Efficiency Measure*** *Total costs for fire services per $1,000 of assessment.* ***Objective*** *Efficient municipal management.*
Notes The 2010 restated comparative result for this measure was $1.92 per $1,000 of property assessment. The City's Fire Services provides response personnel that are fully trained, equipped and positioned to provide fire safety education and prompt, professional assistance in the event of a fire, medical emergency or other emergency within the Service's coverage area.	**Notes** The 2010 restated comparative result for this measure was $1.95 per $1,000 of property assessment.

2.2 FIRE RELATED INJURIES	2.3 FIRE RELATED INJURIES OVER 5 YEARS
Total number of residential fire related civilian injuries (Total Population / 1,000)	(Total Number of residential fire related civilian injuries for 2005 + 2006 + 2007+ 2008 +2009) / 5 (Total Population / 1,000)
0.089 per 1,000 persons	**0.089 per 1,000 persons**
Effectiveness Measure *Number of residential fire related injuries per 1,000 persons.* ***Objective*** *Effective municipal management.*	***Effectiveness Measure*** *Number of residential fire related injuries averaged over per 1,000 persons.* ***Objective*** *Effective municipal management.*
Notes The 2010 comparative result for this measure was 0.053 4 people were injured in 2010 compared to 7 people in 2011.	**Notes** The 2010 comparative result for this measure was 0.092.

Fire Services (continued)

2.4 FIRE RELATED FATALITIES

Total number of residential fire related civilian fatalities
(Total Population / 1,000)

0 per 1,000 persons

Effectiveness Measure
Number of residential fire related fatalities per 1,000 persons.

Objective
Effective municipal management.

Notes

The 2010 comparative result for this measure was 0.

2.5 FIRE RELATED FATALITIES OVER 5 YEARS

(Total Number of residential fire related civilian injuries for 2005 + 2006 + 2007+ 2008 +2009) / 5
(Total Population / 1,000)

0 per 1,000 persons

Effectiveness Measure
Number of residential fire related fatalities averaged over 5 years per 1,000 persons.

Objective
Effective municipal management.

Notes

The 2010 comparative result for this measure was 0.

2.6 RESIDENTIAL STRUCTURAL FIRES

Total number of residential structural fires
(Total households / 1,000)

2.752 per 1,000 households

Effectiveness Measure
Number of residential structural fires per 1,000 persons.

Objective
Effective municipal management.

Notes

The 2010 revised comparative result for this measure was 1.524. There were 97 residential fires in 2011 compared to 52 in 2010.

Police Services

3.1a OPERATING COSTS FOR POLICE SERVICES

Operating costs for Police Services
Total population

$255.00 per person

Efficiency Measure
Operating costs for police services per person.

Objective
Efficient municipal police services.

Notes

The 2010 comparative result for this measure was $253.22 per person.

For more information, visit the Peterborough Lakefield Community Police Service's web site at:
www.peterboroughpolice.com

3.1b TOTAL COSTS FOR POLICE SERVICES

Total costs for Police Services
Total population

$262.50 per person

Efficiency Measure
Total costs for police services per person.

Objective
Efficient municipal police services.

Notes

The 2010 comparative result for this measure was $260.42 per person.

3.2 VIOLENT CRIME RATE

Total # of actual incidents of violent crime
Population / 1,000

8.666 violent crimes per 1,000 persons

Efficiency Measure
Violent crime rate per 1,000 persons.

Objective
Safe communities.

Notes

The 2010 comparative result for this measure was 8.513 violent crimes per 1,000 persons.

In 2011 there were a total of 682 incidents of violent crime compared to 647 in 2010.

3.3 PROPERTY CRIME RATE / 1,000

Total # of actual incidents of property crime
Population / 1,000

32.325 property crimes per 1,000 persons

Efficiency Measure
Property crime rate per 1,000 persons.

Objective
Safe communities.

Notes

The 2010 comparative result for this measure was 35.211 property crimes per 1,000 persons.

In 2011 there were a total of 2,544 incidents of property crime compared to 2,676 in 2010.

Police Services (continued)

3.4 CRIME RATE OTHER OFFENCES / 1,000	3.5 TOTAL CRIME RATE / 1,000
Total # of actual incidents of other Criminal Code offences, excluding traffic Population / 1,000	Total # of actual incidents of violent crime, property crime and other Criminal Code offences Population / 1,000
17.522 crimes per 1,000 persons	**58.513 crimes per 1,000 persons**
Efficiency Measure *Other Criminal Code Offences, excluding traffic per 1,000 persons (Criminal Code, excluding traffic.)* *Note that the definition used refers to Criminal Code crimes, excluding traffic.* ***Objective*** *Safe communities*	***Efficiency Measure*** *Total crime rate per 1,000 persons (Criminal Code, excluding traffic.)* *Note that the definition used refers to Criminal Code crimes, excluding traffic.* ***Objective*** *Safe communities*
Notes The 2010 comparative result for this measure was 18.382 crimes per 1,000 persons. In 2011 there were a total of 1,379 actual incidents of other Criminal Code offences, excluding traffic, compared to 1,397 in 2010.	**Notes** The 2010 comparative result for this measure was 62.105 crimes per 1,000 persons. In 2011 there were a total of 4,605 actual incidents of violent crime, property crime, and other Criminal Code offences, excluding traffic, compared to 4,720 in 2010.

Police Services (continued)

3.6 YOUTH CRIME RATE / 1,000

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

60.397 youth crimes per 1,000 youths

Efficiency Measure
Youth crime rate per 1,000 youths.

Objective
Safe communities

Notes

The 2010 comparative result for this measure was 69.888 youth crimes per 1,000 youths.

In 2011, there were a total of 350 youths cleared by charge or cleared otherwise. This number includes 158 cases (2010 – 245 cases) handled by way of Extra Judicial Measures under the *Youth Criminal Justice* Act.

In 2011 there were a total of 350 incidents of youth crime per 1,000 youths compared to 405 in 2010.

Youth population (ages 12 to 17) is estimated at 5,795 (2010 – 5,795) youths and is based on information provided by Statistics Canada.

Building Permits & Inspection Services

4.1a OPERATING COSTS FOR BUILDING PERMITS & INSPECTION SERVICES	4.1b TOTAL COSTS FOR BUILDING PERMITS & INSPECTION SERVICES
Operating costs for Building Permits & Inspection Services Total value of Construction Activity (Based on Permits Issued) /$1,000	Total costs for Building Permits & Inspection Services Total value of Construction Activity (Based on Permits Issued) /$1,000Total
$10.48 per $1,000 of Construction Activity	**$10.48 per $1,000 of Construction Activity**
Efficiency Measure *Operating costs for building permits and inspection services per $1,000 of construction activity (based on permits issued)* ***Objective*** *Complete building permit applications are processed quickly and accurately.*	***Efficiency Measure*** *Total costs for building permits and inspection services per $1,000 of construction activity (based on permits issued)* ***Objective*** *Complete building permit applications are processed quickly and accurately.*
Notes The 2010 comparative result for this measure was $16.06 per $1,000 of construction activity. There is a significant decrease in 2011 as there was only $80,490,000 of construction activity in 2010 compared to $121,854,000 in 2011. The level of construction activity does not significantly influence the amount of operating costs for building permits and inspection services.	**Notes** The 2010 comparative result for this measure was $16.06 per $1,000 of construction activity. There is a significant decrease in 2011 as there was only $80,490,000 of construction activity in 2010 compared to $121,854,000 in 2011. The level of construction activity does not significantly influence the amount of total costs for building permits and inspection services.

4.2a HOUSES (NOT EXCEEDING 3 STOREYS/600 SQUARE METRES)	4.2b SMALL BUILDINGS (COMMERCIAL/INDUSTRIAL NOT EXCEEDING 3 STOREYS/600 SQUARE METRES)
Median number of working days to review a complete building permit application and issue a permit or not issue a permit	Median number of working days to review a complete building permit application and issue a permit or not issue a permit
6 working days	**10 working days**
Efficiency Measure *Provincial standard is 10 working days* ***Objective*** *Complete building permit applications are processed quickly and accurately.*	***Efficiency Measure*** *Provincial standard is 15 working days* ***Objective*** *Complete building permit applications are processed quickly and accurately.*
Notes The 2010 comparative figure for this measure was 5 working days.	**Notes** The 2010 comparative figure for this measure was 12 working days.

Building Permits & Inspection Services

4.2c LARGE BUILDINGS (residential/commercial/ industrial/institutional)	4.2d COMPLEX BUILDINGS (post disaster buildings including hospitals, power/water, fire/police/EMS, communications)
Median number of working days to review a complete building permit application and issue a permit or not issue a permit	Median number of working days to review a complete building permit application and issue a permit or not issue a permit
11 working days	**20 working days**
Efficiency Measure *Provincial standard is 20 working days* ***Objective*** *Complete building permit applications are processed quickly and accurately.*	***Efficiency Measure*** *Provincial standard is 30 working days* ***Objective*** *Complete building permit applications are processed quickly and accurately.*
Notes The 2010 comparative figure for this measure was 12 working days.	**Notes** The 2010 comparative figure for this measure was 21 working days.

Roadways

5.1a OPERATING COSTS FOR PAVED ROADS	5.1b TOTAL COSTS FOR PAVED ROADS
Operating costs for paved roads / Total paved lane kilometres	Total costs for paved roads / Total paved lane kilometres
$3,796.72 per paved lane kilometre	**$8,512.93 per paved lane kilometre**
Efficiency Measure *Operating costs of paved (hard top) roads per lane kilometre.* ***Objective*** *Efficient maintenance of paved roads.*	***Efficiency Measure*** *Total costs of paved (hard top) roads per lane kilometre.* ***Objective*** *Efficient maintenance of paved roads.*
Notes The 2010 restated comparative result for this measure was $3,082.04 per paved lane kilometre. The number of paved road k.m. decreased from the originally stated figure of 939 in 2010 to 922 in 2011 because of lane corrections to make the number of lanes per road standard consistent. In 2010 and prior years, additional lanes such as parking lanes were included. Now only motorized vehicular traffic lanes are included. Although there was an additional arterial road added in 2011 (Medical Dr.), the overall length decreased by 17 k.m. as a result of this restatement. Operating costs for paved roads per lane k.m. is higher in 2011 than in 2010 as a result of more labour hours and materials allocated to the roads system than in 2010.	**Notes** The 2010 restated comparative result for this measure was $7,639.03 per paved lane kilometre. The reason for the increase is the same as stated in 5.1a along with higher amortization costs related to capital investment.

Roadways (continued)

5.2a OPERATING COSTS FOR UNPAVED ROADS	5.2b TOTAL COSTS FOR UNPAVED ROADS
Operating costs for unpaved roads / Total unpaved lane kilometres	Total costs for unpaved roads / Total unpaved lane kilometres
$0.00	**$4,517.50**
Efficiency Measure *Operating costs for unpaved (loose top) roads per lane kilometre.* ***Objective*** *Efficient maintenance of unpaved roads.*	***Efficiency Measure*** *Total costs for unpaved (loose top) roads per lane kilometre.* ***Objective*** *Efficient maintenance of unpaved roads.*
Notes There are two unpaved lane kilometres of roads in the City. In previous years, the City reported zero unpaved lane km's. Through refinements in the data collection process two unpaved lane km's have been identified. There were no operating costs allocated to unpaved roads for 2010 or 2011.	**Notes** There are two unpaved lane kilometres of roads in the City. Total cost for unpaved roads consists of amortization. The 2010 comparative result for this measure was $5,816.

Roadways (continued)

5.3a OPERATING COSTS FOR BRIDGES AND CULVERTS	5.3b TOTAL COSTS FOR BRIDGES AND CULVERTS
Operating costs for Bridges and Culverts Total square metres of surface area on bridges and culverts	Total costs for Bridges and Culverts Total square metres of surface area on bridges and culverts
$0.00 per Square Metre	**$25.42 per Square Metre**
Efficiency Measure *Operating costs for bridges and culverts per square metre of surface area.* ***Objective*** *Efficient maintenance of bridges and culverts.*	***Efficiency Measure*** *Total costs for bridges and culverts per square metre of surface area.* ***Objective*** *Efficient maintenance of bridges and culverts.*
Notes Operating costs in 2010 were $63,435 versus $0 in 2011. This decrease is due to less bridge inspection activity in 2011 and fewer bridge refurbishment costs considered operating in nature.	**Notes** Total costs include amortization of bridges along with interest on long term debt. The 2010 comparative result for this measure was $28.62 per square metres of surface area on bridges and culverts.

5.4a OPERATING COSTS FOR WINTER CONTROL	5.4b TOTAL COSTS FOR WINTER CONTROL
Operating costs for winter control maintenance of roadways Total lane kilometres maintained in winter	Total costs for winter control maintenance of roadways Total lane kilometres maintained in winter
$2,110.78 per lane kilometre	**$2,116.63 per lane kilometre**
Efficiency Measure *Operating costs for winter control maintenance of roadways per lane kilometre maintained in winter.* ***Objective*** *Efficient winter control operation.*	***Efficiency Measure*** *Total costs for winter control maintenance of roadways per lane kilometre maintained in winter.* ***Objective*** *Efficient winter control operation.*
Notes The 2010 comparative result for this measure was $1,732.14 per lane kilometre. Although there were fewer incidents of winter weather in 2011, the cost of those incidents was higher as they were more severe and included more incidents of freezing rain.	**Notes** Total costs include amortization and interest on long term debt. The 2010 comparative result for this measure was $1,737.80 per lane kilometre.

Roadways (continued)

5.5 CONDITION OF ROADS

Number of paved lane kilometres rated as good to very good x 100
Total number of paved lane kilometres

30.00% of lane kilometres

Efficiency Measure
Percentage of paved lane kilometres where condition is rated as good to very good.

Objective
Provide a paved lane system that has a pavement condition that meets municipal standards.

Notes

A detailed analysis of road conditions was initiated in 2011 using Micro Paver, an empirical program recognized across North America. As a result of this process, this conditions measure has decreased significantly.

The 2010 comparative result for this measure was estimated at 70% of paved lane kilometres where condition was rated as good to very good. This was an estimation based on visual inspection of road conditions. This visual inspection process has been refined significantly in 2011 resulting in a decrease in this measure.

5.6 CONDITION OF BRIDGES AND CULVERTS

Number of bridges and culverts rated as good to very good x 100
Total number of paved lane kilometres

26.3% of bridges and culverts

Efficiency Measure
Percentage of bridges and culverts where condition is rated as good to very good.

Objective
Provide a bridge and culvert system that has a pavement condition that meets municipal standards.

Notes

A detailed analysis of the conditions of bridges and culverts was initiated in 2011 using Micro Paver, an empirical program recognized across North America. As a result of this process, this conditions measure has decreased significantly.

The 2010 comparative result for this measure was estimated at 67.3% of bridges and culverts where condition was rated as good to very good. This was an estimation based on visual inspection of road conditions. This visual inspection process has been refined significantly in 2011 resulting in a decrease in this measure.

5.7 WINTER EVENT RESPONSES

Number of winter event responses
that met or exceeded municipal road maintenance standards x 100
Total number of winter events

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 2011, there were 62 winter events, compared to 84 in 2010.

The 2010 comparative result for this measure was also 100%.

Transit Services

6.1a OPERATING COSTS FOR CONVENTIONAL TRANSIT SERVICES

Operating costs for conventional transit
Total number of regular service passenger trips on conventional transit

$2.93 per regular service passenger trip

Efficiency Measure
Operating costs for conventional transit per regular service passenger trip.

Objective
Efficient municipal transit services.

Notes

The 2010 comparative result for this measure was $2.80 per regular service passenger trip.

Conventional transit is defined as all regular public transport services as opposed to specialized services for persons with disabilities.

6.1b TOTAL COSTS FOR CONVENTIONAL TRANSIT SERVICES

Total costs for conventional transit
Total number of regular service passenger trips on conventional transit

$3.30 per regular service passenger trip

Efficiency Measure
Total costs for conventional transit per regular service passenger trip.

Objective
Efficient municipal transit services.

Notes

The 2010 comparative result for this measure was $3.17 per regular service passenger trip.

6.2 PUBLIC TRANSIT USE

Total number of conventional transit passenger
trips in service area in a year
Population of service area

40.42 trips per person

Efficiency Measure
Number of conventional transit passenger trips per person in the service area in a year.

Objective
Maximum utilization of municipal transit services.

Notes

The 2010 comparative result for this measure was 39.92 conventional transit trips per person in the service area in a year.

In 2011, there were 3,181,400 passenger trips compared to 3,033,700 in 2010.

Environmental Protection/Wastewater

7.1a OPERATING COSTS FOR COLLECTION OF WASTEWATER	7.1b TOTAL COSTS FOR COLLECTION OF WASTEWATER
Operating costs for wastewater collection Total kilometres of wastewater mains	Total costs for wastewater collection Total kilometres of wastewater mains
$3,824.90 per kilometre of wastewater main	**$6,815.65 per kilometre of wastewater main**
Efficiency Measure *Operating costs for collection of wastewater per kilometre of wastewater main* ***Objective*** *Efficient wastewater collection.*	***Efficiency Measure*** *Total costs for collection of wastewater per kilometre of wastewater main* ***Objective*** *Efficient wastewater collection.*
Notes The 2010 comparative result for this measure was $4,778.37. The reduction is a result of the amount of costs capitalized in 2011 versus the previous year. There were 361 kilometres of wastewater mains in the City of Peterborough in 2011 and 2010.	**Notes** The 2010 comparative result for this measure was $7,407.03 The reason for the decrease is the same as stated in 7.1a.

7.2a OPERATING COSTS FOR TREATMENT AND DISPOSAL OF WASTEWATER	7.2b TOTAL COSTS FOR TREATMENT AND DISPOSAL OF WASTEWATER
Operating costs for wastewater treatment and disposal Total megalitres of wastewater treated	Total costs for wastewater treatment and disposal Total megalitres of wastewater treated
$275.44 per megalitre*	**$358.94 per megalitre***
Efficiency Measure *Operating costs for treatment and disposal of wastewater per megalitre.* **A megalitre equals 1,000,000 litres or 1,000 cubic metres.* ***Objective*** *Prevention of human and environment health hazards.*	***Efficiency Measure*** *Total costs for treatment and disposal of wastewater per megalitre.* **A megalitre equals 1,000,000 litres or 1,000 cubic metres.* ***Objective*** *Prevention of human and environment health hazards.*
Notes The 2010 comparative result for this measure was $301.02 per megalitre. The decrease is a result of more waste water treated coupled with a smaller percentage increase in costs. In 2011, the City treated 17,276.7 (2010 – 15,245) megalitres of wastewater.	**Notes** The 2010 comparative result for this measure was $396.70 per megalitre. The reason for the decrease is the same as stated 7.2a.

Environmental Protection/Wastewater (continued)

7.3a OPERATING COSTS FOR COLLECTION, TREATMENT AND DISPOSAL	7.3b TOTAL COSTS FOR COLLECTION, TREATMENT AND DISPOSAL
Operating costs for wastewater collection, treatment and disposal Total megalitres of wastewater treated	Total costs for wastewater collection, treatment and disposal Total megalitres of wastewater treated
$355.36 per megalitre *	**$501.35 per megalitre ***
Efficiency Measure *Operating costs for collection, treatment, and disposal of wastewater per megalitre* ** A megalitre equals 1,000,000 litres or 1,000 cubic metres.* ***Objective*** *Efficient wastewater services.*	***Efficiency Measure*** *Total costs for collection, treatment, and disposal of wastewater per megalitre* ** A megalitre equals 1,000,000 litres or 1,000 cubic metres.* ***Objective*** *Efficient wastewater services.*
Notes The 2010 comparative result for this measure was $414.17 per megalitre of wastewater treated. The decrease in this measure is a result of the higher volume of water treated for a very similar cost. Costs are not entirely dependent on megalitres treated. In 2011, there were 17,276.7 megalitres treated compared with 15,245 in 2010.	**Notes** The 2010 comparative result for this measure was $572.10 per megalitre of wastewater treated.

Environmental Protection/Wastewater (continued)

7.4 MAIN BACKUPS	7.5 TREATMENT BYPASS
Total number of backed up wastewater mains / Total kilometres of wastewater mains / 100	Estimated megalitres of untreated wastewater / Total megalitres of wastewater, including treated and untreated x 100
0.5540 per 100 kilometres of main	**0% of wastewater**
Efficiency Measure *Number of wastewater main backups per 100 kilometres of wastewater main in a year.* ***Objective*** *Prevention of human and environment health hazards.*	***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 The 2010 comparative result for this measure was 1.6620 backed up wastewater mains per 100 kilometres of mains. During 2011, there were 2 mains backed up compared with 6 in 2010.	**Notes** The 2010 comparative result for this measure was 0.0%. In 2010 and 2011, 0 megalitres of untreated wastewater was estimated to have by-passed treatment.

Storm Water

8.1a OPERATING COSTS FOR URBAN STORM WATER MANAGEMENT	8.1b TOTAL COSTS FOR URBAN STORM WATER MANAGEMENT
Operating costs for urban storm water management Total kilometres of urban drainage system	Total costs for urban storm water management Total kilometres of urban drainage system
$3,393.09 per kilometre of drainage system	**$5,888.40 per kilometre of drainage system**
Efficiency Measure *Operating costs for urban storm water management (collection, treatment and disposal) per km of drainage system.* ***Objective*** *Efficient urban storm water management.*	***Efficiency Measure*** *Total costs for urban storm water management (collection, treatment and disposal) per km of drainage system.* ***Objective*** *Efficient urban storm water management.*
Notes The 2010 comparable result for this measure was $8051.00 per kilometre of drainage system. The cost per kilometre was significantly higher in 2010 due to a number of Flood Reduction Master Plan Program costs related to projects completed during the year that were not tangible in nature. If not for these one-time charges, this measure is calculated at $2,303.89 for 2010. The 2011 figure is higher than the 2010 restated figure as a result of specific projects undertaken for the Flood reduction master plan. These projects are independent each year and can vary significantly in cost.	**Notes** The 2010 comparable result for this measure was $10,528.47 per kilometre of drainage system. The reason for the higher value in 2010 is the same as stated in 8.1a. If not for the onetime charge, this measure is calculated at $4,779.23 for 2010.

8.2a OPERATING COSTS FOR RURAL STORM WATER MANAGEMENT	8.2b TOTAL COSTS FOR RURAL STORM WATER MANAGEMENT
Operating costs for rural storm water management Total kilometres of rural drainage system	Total costs for rural storm water management Total kilometres of rural drainage system
N/A	**N/A**
Efficiency Measure *Operating costs for rural storm water management (collection, treatment and disposal) per km of drainage system.* ***Objective*** *Efficient rural storm water management.*	***Efficiency Measure*** *Total costs for rural storm water management (collection, treatment and disposal) per km of drainage system.* ***Objective*** *Efficient rural storm water management.*
Notes All storm water management activities within the City are considered urban.	**Notes** All storm water management activities within the City are considered urban.

Water Services

9.1a OPERATING COSTS FOR TREATMENT OF DRINKING WATER	9.1b TOTAL COSTS FOR TREATMENT OF DRINKING WATER
Operating costs for treatment of drinking water / Total megalitres of drinking water treated	Total costs for treatment of drinking water / Total megalitres of drinking water treated
$339.59 per megalitre	**$424.64 per megalitre**
Efficiency Measure *Operating costs for the treatment of drinking water per megalitre.* ***Objective*** *Efficient treatment of drinking water.*	***Efficiency Measure*** *Total costs for the treatment of drinking water per megalitre.* ***Objective*** *Efficient treatment of drinking water.*
Notes There were 13,493 megalitres of water treated compared with 11,875 in 2010. The 2010 comparable result for this measure was $381.51 per megalitre. This measure has decreased since 2010 as a result of a higher number of megalitres of drinking water treated compared to a lower percentage increase in costs of treatment.	Notes The 2010 comparable result for this measure was $481.48 per megalitre. The reason for the lower cost per megalitre in 2011 is the same as stated in 9.1a.

9.2a OPERATING COSTS FOR DISTRIBUTION OF DRINKING WATER	9.2b TOTAL COSTS FOR DISTRIBUTION OF DRINKING WATER
Operating costs for distribution of drinking water / Total kilometres of water main pipe	Total costs for distribution of drinking water / Total kilometres of water main pipe
$6,400.46 per kilometre of water distribution pipe	**$15,602.02 per kilometre of water distribution pipe**
Efficiency Measure *Operating costs for the distribution of drinking water per kilometre of water distribution pipe.* ***Objective*** *Efficient distribution of drinking water.*	***Efficiency Measure*** *Total costs for the distribution of drinking water per kilometre of water distribution pipe.* ***Objective*** *Efficient distribution of drinking water.*
Notes The 2010 comparable result for this measure was $5,899.75 per kilometre of water main pipe. The increase in 2011 is related to higher amortization costs and interest due to capital investments in the system. There were 412 kilometres of water distribution pipe in the City of Peterborough in 2011 and 2010	**Notes** The 2010 comparable result for this measure was $14,988.37 per kilometre of water main pipe. The reason for the higher cost in 2011 is the same as stated in 9.2a.

Water Services (continued)

9.3a TREATMENT AND DISTRIBUTION OF DRINKING WATER (INTREGATED SYSTEM)	9.3b TREATMENT AND DISTRIBUTION OF DRINKING WATER (INTREGATED SYSTEM)
Operating costs for treatment and distribution of drinking water Total megalitres of drinking water treated	Total costs for treatment and distribution of drinking water Total megalitres of drinking water treated
$633.36 per megalitre	**$1,066.65 per megalitre**
Efficiency Measure *Operating costs for the treatment and distribution of drinking water per megalitre.* ***Objective*** *Efficient treatment and distribution of drinking water.*	***Efficiency Measure*** *Total costs for the treatment and distribution of drinking water per megalitre.* ***Objective*** *Efficient treatment and distribution of drinking water.*
Notes The 2010 comparable result for this measure was $586.20 per megalitre. During 2011 there were 11,398 megalitres of water treated compared with 11,875 in 2010.	**Notes** The 2010 comparable result for this measure was $1,001.50 per megalitre.

Water Services (continued)

9.4 BOIL WATER ADVISORIES	9.5 BREAKS IN WATER MAINS
Summation of: number of boil water advisory days times the number of affected connections / Total connections in service area	Number of breaks in water mains / Total kilometres of water main pipe / 100
0 days a year	**8.9806 breaks per 100 kilometres of main**
Effectiveness Measure *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.* ***Objective*** *Water is safe and meets local needs.*	***Effectiveness Measure*** *Number of breaks in water mains per 100 kilometres of water main pipe in a year.* ***Objective*** *Improve system reliability and minimize water loss and operational costs.*
Notes The number of water boil advisories in 2010 was also nil.	**Notes** The 2010 comparative result for this measure was 7.0388 breaks in water mains per 100 kilometres of water main pipe in a year. During 2011, 37 breaks were recorded compared with 29 during 2010.

Solid Waste

10.1a OPERATING COSTS FOR SOLID WASTE COLLECTION	10.1b TOTAL COSTS FOR SOLID WASTE COLLECTION
Operating costs for solid waste collection Total tonnes received from all property classes	Total costs for solid waste collection Total tonnes received from all property classes
$69.70 per tonne	**$87.73 per tonne**
Efficiency Measure *Operating costs for solid waste collection per tonne* ***Objective*** *Efficient solid waste collection programs.*	***Efficiency Measure*** *Total costs for solid waste collection per tonne* ***Objective*** *Efficient solid waste collection programs.*
Notes During 2011, 13,509 (2010 - 13,188) tonnes of residential solid waste was collected. The comparable result for this measure was $70.35 per tonne for solid waste collected in 2010.	**Notes** The comparable result for this measure was $82.55 per tonne for solid waste collected in 2010.

10.2a OPERATING COSTS FOR SOLID WASTE DISPOSAL	10.2b TOTAL COSTS FOR SOLID WASTE DISPOSAL
Operating costs of solid waste disposal Total tonnes disposed of from all property classes	Total costs of solid waste disposal Total tonnes disposed of from all property classes
$80.77 per tonne	**$89.19 per tonne**
Efficiency Measure *Operating costs (revenue) for solid waste disposal per tonne* ***Objective*** *Efficient solid waste disposal programs.*	***Efficiency Measure*** *Total costs (revenue) for solid waste disposal per tonne* ***Objective*** *Efficient solid waste disposal programs.*
Notes During 2011, 49,222 (2010 – 44,042) tonnes of solid waste was disposed of at the landfill facility. The comparable result for this measure was $41.72 per tonne of solid waste disposal in 2010. This measure has increased due to the significant reconstruction costs for the reconstruction of Bensfort road undertaken by the County of Peterborough. There were no comparable reconstruction costs in 2010. Without the reconstruction costs the 2011 measure would be $36.52, which is less than 2010.	**Notes** The comparable result for this measure was $49.64 per tonne of solid waste disposal in 2010. Without the reconstruction costs as explained under measure 10.2a, the 2011 rate per tonne would be $44.94.

Solid Waste (continued)

10.3a OPERATING COSTS FOR SOLID WASTE DIVERSION (RECYCLING)	10.3b TOTAL COSTS FOR SOLID WASTE DIVERSION (RECYCLING)
Operating costs for solid waste diversion (recycling) Total tonnes diverted	Total costs for solid waste diversion (recycling) Total tonnes diverted
$94.58 per tonne	**$98.24 per tonne**
Efficiency Measure *Operating costs for solid waste diversion (recycling) per tonne* ***Objective*** *Effective solid waste diversion.*	***Efficiency Measure*** *Total costs for solid waste diversion (recycling) per tonne* ***Objective*** *Effective solid waste diversion.*
Notes During 2011, 18,537 (2010 – 18,224) tonnes of solid waste was diverted from the City's landfill facility. The 2010 comparative measure was $145.45 per tonne. The reason for the decrease in this measure relates to higher revenues on sale of recyclables in 2011 over the comparable figure in 2010.	**Notes** The 2010 measure was $149.17 per tonne. The decrease in this measure is the same as stated for 10.3a.

10.4a OPERATING COSTS FOR SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT (INTEGRATED SYSTEM)	10.4b TOTAL COST FOR SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT (INTEGRATED SYSTEM)
Operating costs for solid waste management Total tonnes disposed of, and total tonnes diverted	Total costs for solid waste management Total tonnes disposed of, and total tonnes diverted
$98.45 per tonne	**$109.16 per tonne**
Efficiency Measure *Average operating costs for solid waste management (collection, disposal and diversion) per tonne* ***Objective*** *Effective solid waste management.*	***Efficiency Measure*** *Average total costs for solid waste management (collection, disposal and diversion) per tonne* ***Objective*** *Effective solid waste management.*
Notes In 2011, 67,759 (2010 – 62,266) tonnes were disposed of or diverted from all property classes. The 2010 measure was $86.98 per tonne. Total costs are higher in 2011 as a result of increased amortization as a result of capital investment in prior years.	**Notes** The 2010 measure was $96.25 per tonne.

Solid Waste (continued)

10.5 COMPLAINTS FOR SOLID WASTE AND RECYCLING COLLECTION

Number of Complaints
Total Households / 1,000

38.730 complaints per 1,000 households

Efficiency Measure
Number of complaints received in a year concerning the collection of solid waste and recycled materials per 1,000 households.

Objective
Effective waste management services.

Notes

The 2010 comparative result for this measure was 73.139 complaints concerning the collection of garbage and recycled materials per 1,000 households.

10.6 NUMBER OF SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT SITES

Total number of waste management sites

4 sites

Efficiency Measure
Total number of solid waste management facilities owned by Municipal with a Ministry of Environment (MOE) Certificate of Approval

Objective
Efficient MOE compliance.

Notes

The City owns 4 facilities. They are:

- Peterborough County-City Waste Management Facility (ownership is equally shared)
- Peterborough Materials Recycling Facility
- Harper Road Compost Site
- Peterborough Household Hazardous Waste Facility

10.7 COMPLIANCE ORDER FOR REMEDIATION

Days a year an MOE compliance order for remediation was in effect

0 days

Efficiency Measure
Number of days a year an MOE compliance order for remediation was in effect.

Objective
Effective compliance.

Notes

There were no days in either 2011 or 2010 when a compliance order for remediation was in effect.

10.8 DIVERSION OF RESIDENTIAL SOLID WASTE

Total tonnes of residential solid waste diverted
Total tonnes of residential solid waste disposed of and total tonnes diverted

54.0% of residential solid waste diverted for recycling

Efficiency Measure
Percentage of residential solid waste diverted for recycling.

Objective
Efficient waste diversion for recycling.

Notes

During 2011, 18,537 (2010 – 17,364) tonnes of residential sold waste was diverted.

The 2010 comparative result for this measure was 50.1% of residential solid waste diverted for recycling.

Solid Waste (continued)

10.9 DIVERSION OF RESIDENTIAL SOLID WASTE

$$\frac{\text{Total tonnes of solid waste diverted}}{\text{Total tonnes of solid waste disposed of and total tonnes diverted from all property classes}}$$

27.4% of residential solid waste diverted for recycling

Efficiency Measure

Percentage of solid waste diverted for recycling.

Objective

Efficient waste diversion for recycling.

Notes

During 2011, 18,537 (2010 – 18,224) tonnes of solid waste was diverted – all classes.

During 2011, 67,759 (2010 – 62,266) tonnes of solid waste were disposed of and diverted – all classes.

The 2010 comparative result for this measure was 29.3% of residential solid waste diverted for recycling.

Parks and Recreation

11.1a OPERATING COSTS FOR PARKS	11.1b TOTAL COSTS FOR PARKS
Operating costs for parks / Total population	Total costs for parks / Total population
$39.00 per person	**$46.78 per person**
Efficiency Measure *Operating costs for parks per person* ***Objective*** *Efficient operation of parks.*	***Efficiency Measure*** *Total costs for parks per person* ***Objective*** *Efficient operation of parks.*
Notes 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. In 2010, the comparative result was $38.93 per person for the operation of parks.	**Notes** In 2010, the comparative result was $45.34 per person for the operation of parks.

11.2a OPERATING COSTS FOR RECREATION PROGRAMS	11.2b TOTAL COSTS FOR RECREATION PROGRAMS
Operating costs of recreation programs / Total population	Total costs of recreation programs / Total population
$16.44 per person	**$16.44 per person**
Efficiency Measure *Operating costs for recreation programs per person* ***Objective*** *Efficient operation of recreation programs.*	***Efficiency Measure*** *Operating costs for recreation programs per person* ***Objective*** *Efficient operation of recreation programs.*
Notes Recreation programs include a broad range of programs, services and activities. They include both registered and unregistered drop-in programs and clubs. In 2010, the comparative result for this measure was $15.07 per person.	**Notes** In 2010, the comparative result for this measure was $15.07 per person.

Parks and Recreation (continued)

11.3a OPERATING COSTS FOR RECREATION FACILITIES	11.3b TOTAL COSTS FOR RECREATION FACILITIES
Operating costs for recreation facilities Total population	Total costs for recreation facilities Total population
$115.43 per person	**$148.64 per person**
Efficiency Measure *Operating costs for recreation facilities per person* ***Objective*** *Efficient operation of recreation facilities.*	***Efficiency Measure*** *Total costs for recreation facilities per person* ***Objective*** *Efficient operation of recreation facilities.*
Notes 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). In 2010, the comparative result for this measure was $107.32 per person.	**Notes** In 2010, the comparative result for this measure was $143.00 per person.

11.4a OPERATING COSTS FOR RECREATION PROGRAMS AND FACILITIES	11.4b TOTAL COSTS FOR RECREATION PROGRAMS AND FACILITIES
Operating costs for recreation programs and recreation facilities Total population	Total costs for recreation programs and recreation facilities Total population
$131.86 per person	**$165.08 per person**
Efficiency Measure *Operating costs for recreation programs and recreation facilities per person.* ***Objective*** *Efficient operation of recreation programs and recreation facilities.*	***Efficiency Measure*** *Total costs for recreation programs and recreation facilities per person.* ***Objective*** *Efficient operation of recreation programs and recreation facilities.*
Notes This represents a subtotal for measures 11.2a and 11.3a. In 2010, the comparable result for this measure was $122.40 per person.	**Notes** This represents a subtotal for measures 11.2b and 11.3b. In 2010, the comparable result for this measure was $158.08 per person.

Parks and Recreation (continued)

11.5 TOTAL KILOMETRES OF TRAILS

Total kilometres of trails
Total population / 1,000

0.356 kilometres of trails per 1,000 persons

Effectiveness Measure
Kilometres of trails per 1,000 persons.

Objective
Trails provide recreation opportunities.

Notes

The 2010 comparative result for this measure was 0.368 km of trails per 1,000 persons.

The City has 28 kilometres (2010 – 28 km) of trails.

11.6 HECTARES OF OPEN SPACE

Total hectares of open space
Total population / 1,000

4.968 hectares of open space per 1,000 persons

Effectiveness Measure
Hectares of open space per 1,000 persons.

Objective
Open space is adequate for population.

Notes

In 2010, the comparative result was 5.079 hectares of open space per 1,000 persons.

11.7 PARTICIPANT HOURS FOR RECREATION PROGRAMS

Total participant hours for recreation programs:
registered, drop-in and permitted programs
Total population / 1,000

20,252 participant hours of recreation programs per 1,000 persons

Effectiveness Measure
Total participant hours for recreation programs per 1,000 persons.

Objective
Recreation programs serve needs of residents.

Notes

In 2010, the comparative result was 19,056 recreation hours per 1,000 persons.

11.8 INDOOR RECREATION FACILITY SPACE

Square metres of indoor recreation facility space
Total population / 1,000

417.357 square metres of indoor recreation facility space per 1,000 persons

Effectiveness Measure
Square metres of indoor recreation facility space per 1,000 persons.

Objective
Indoor recreation facility space is adequate for population.

Notes

In 2010, the comparative result for this measure was 432.2 square metres of indoor recreation facility space per 1,000 persons.

The population figure as reported by Statistics Canada is 78,700 for 2011. In 2010 it was 76,000. The number of squares metres of recreation space in the City has not changed.

The City has a total of 32,846 square metres of indoor recreation facility space.

Parks and Recreation (continued)

11.9 Outdoor Recreation Facility Space

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

452.5 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 2010, the comparative result for this measure was also 468.61 square metres of outdoor recreation facility space per 1,000 persons.

The population figure as reported by Statistics Canada is 78,700 for 2011. In 2010 it was 76,000. The number of squares metres of recreation space in the City has not changed.

The City has a total of 35,416 square metres of outdoor recreation facility space.

LIBRARY SERVICES

12.1a OPERATING COST PER PERSON

Operating costs for library services
Total population

$25.13 per person

Efficiency Measure
Operating costs for library services per person

Objective
Efficient library services.

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

The comparable result for this measure was $28.20 per person in 2010.

The reason for the decrease in this measure is due to an increase in the population as reported by Statistics Canada. They reported 76,000 in 2010 and 78,700 in 2011.

12.1b TOTAL COST PER PERSON

Total costs for library services
Total population

$30.49 per person

Efficiency Measure
Total costs for library services per person

Objective
Efficient library services.

Notes

The comparable result for this measure was $32.94 per person in 2010.

The decrease in this measure is the same as stated for 12.1a.

12.2a OPERATING COST PER USE

Operating costs for library services
Total uses

$1.12 per use

Efficiency Measure
Operating costs for library services per use

Objective
Efficient library services.

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.

During 2011, there were a total of 1,761,818 (2010 – 1,859,419) uses of library services.

The comparable result for this measure was $1.15 per use in 2010.

12.2b TOTAL COST PER USE

Operating costs for library services
Total uses

$1.36 per use

Efficiency Measure
Operating costs for library services per use

Objective
Efficient library services.

Notes

The comparable result for this measure was $1.35 per use in 2010.

LIBRARY SERVICES (continued)

12.3 LIBRARY USES PER PERSON

Total library uses
Total population

22.387 per person

Effectiveness Measure
Library uses per person

Objective
Increased use of library services.

Notes

The comparable result for this measure was 24.466 library uses per person in 2010.

12.4 ELECTRONIC LIBRARY USES

Electronic library uses
Total library uses

35.0% of total library uses were electronic

Effectiveness Measure
Electronic library uses as a percentage of total library uses.

Objective
Better information on library usage.

Notes

There were 616,636 (2010 – 589,300) electronic uses recorded at the library during the year.

Electronic library uses include the number of people using library workstations, the number of times electronic databases were accessed and the number of electronic reference transactions.

In 2010, the comparable result for this measure was 31.7% of total library uses were electronic.

12.5 NON-ELECTRONIC LIBRARY USES

Non-electronic library uses
Total library uses

65.0% 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 1,145,182 (2010 – 1,270,119) non-electronic uses recorded at the library in 2011.

In 2010, the comparable result for this measure was 68.3% of total library uses were non-electronic.

Land Use Planning

13.1 LOCATION OF NEW DEVELOPMENT

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

100% of new development

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.

Notes

All new development within the City is located within settlement areas for the years 2010 and 2011.

13.2 PRESERVATION OF AGRICULTURAL LAND

Hectares of land designated for agricultural purposes in the Official Plan as of December 31, 2009
Hectares of land designated for agricultural purposes in The Official Plan as of January 1, 2009

100.0% of land designated

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

There was no re-designation of agricultural land in 2011.

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

13.3 PRESERVATION OF AGRICULTURAL LAND RELATIVE TO BASE YEAR

Hectares of land designated for agricultural purpose in the Official Plan as of December 31, 2009
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 2010.

Land Use Planning (continued)

13.4 NUMBER OF HECTARES RE-DESIGNATED DURING REPORTING YEAR	13.5 NUMBER OF HECTARES RE-DESIGNATED SINCE JANUARY 1, 2000
0 hectares of land	**123 hectares of land**
Efficiency Measure *Number of hectares of land originally designated for agricultural purposes that was re-designated for other uses during the reporting year.* ***Objective*** *Preserve agricultural land.*	***Efficiency Measure*** *Number of hectares of land originally designated for agricultural purpose that was re-designated for other uses since January 1, 2000.* ***Objective*** *Preserve agricultural land.*
Notes During 2010, there were 0 hectares of land re-designated from agricultural purposes to other purposes.	**Notes** Summary of hectares of land re-designated: 2000 – 3 2001 – 10 2002 to 2003 – 0 2004 – 110 2005 to 2011 – 0