



City of  
**Peterborough**

---

**TO: Members of the Audit Committee**

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

**MEETING DATE: September 3, 2013**

**SUBJECT: Report CPFS13-036  
Report on Results of the 2012 Municipal Performance  
Measurement Program**

---

## **PURPOSE**

A report to provide information on the City of Peterborough's 2012 results of the provincially mandated Municipal Performance Measurement Program.

## **RECOMMENDATION**

That Council approve the recommendation outlined in report CPFS13-036 dated September 3, 2013 from the Director of Corporate Services as follows:

That Report CPFS13-036 providing the City of Peterborough's 2012 results of the provincially mandated Municipal Performance Measurement Program be received as information.

## **BUDGET AND FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

There is 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.

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).

## **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, CPFS13-036, on the City's web site at [www.peterborough.ca/Business/Finance/Municipal\\_Performance\\_Measurement\\_Program](http://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 2012 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 Ext 1862  
Fax: 705-876-4607  
E-mail: [rfreymond@peterborough.ca](mailto:rfreymond@peterborough.ca)

Attachments: Appendix A – City of Peterborough – 2012 MPMP Report

## APPENDIX A



### CITY OF PETERBOROUGH

#### **Municipal Performance Measurement Program For the year ending December 31, 2012**

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 2012 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:	705-876-4607

<b>General Government</b>	
<b>1.1a OPERATING COSTS</b> Governance and political support, and corporate management support	<b>1.1b TOTAL COSTS</b> 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
<b>0.7% of total municipal operating costs</b>	<b>1.1% of total municipal total costs</b>
<p><b>Efficiency Measure</b> Governance and corporate management operating costs as a percentage of total municipal operating costs.</p> <p><b>Objective</b> Efficient municipal administration.</p>	<p><b>Efficiency Measure</b> Governance and corporate management total costs as a percentage of total municipal operating costs.</p> <p><b>Objective</b> Efficient municipal administration.</p>
<p><b>Notes</b></p> <p>The 2011 comparative result for this measure was 1.8%.</p> <p>The City saw a reduction in General Government expenses as a result of a reconciliation payment from our previous Extended Benefits provider and lower benefits costs. Without these one-time exceptions, the measure would have been 1.5%.</p>	<p><b>Notes</b></p> <p>The 2011 comparative result for this measure was 2.0%.</p> <p>The reason for the decrease in this measure is the same as mentioned for measure 1.1a. Without the one-time exceptions, the measure would have been 1.7%.</p>

<b>Fire Services</b>	
<b>2.1a OPERATING COSTS FOR FIRE SERVICES</b>	<b>2.1b TOTAL COSTS FOR FIRE SERVICES</b>
<u>Operating Costs for Fire Services</u> (Total Assessment / 1,000)	<u>Total Costs for Fire Services</u> (Total Assessment / 1,000)
<b>\$1.80 per \$1,000 of property assessment</b>	<b>\$1.85 per \$1,000 of property assessment</b>
<p><b>Efficiency Measure</b> Operating costs for fire services per \$1,000 of assessment.</p> <p><b>Objective</b> Efficient municipal management.</p>	<p><b>Efficiency Measure</b> Total costs for fire services per \$1,000 of assessment.</p> <p><b>Objective</b> Efficient municipal management.</p>
<p><b>Notes</b></p> <p>The 2011 comparative result for this measure was \$1.85 per \$1,000 of property assessment.</p> <p>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.</p>	<p><b>Notes</b></p> <p>The 2011 comparative result for this measure was \$1.89 per \$1,000 of property assessment.</p>
<b>2.2 FIRE RELATED INJURIES</b>	<b>2.3 FIRE RELATED INJURIES OVER 5 YEARS</b>
<u>Total number of residential fire related civilian injuries</u> (Total Population / 1,000)	(Total Number of residential fire related civilian injuries for <u>2008 + 2009 + 2010 + 2011 + 2012</u> ) / 5 (Total Population / 1,000)
<b>0.089 per 1,000 persons</b>	<b>0.102 per 1,000 persons</b>
<p><b>Effectiveness Measure</b> Number of residential fire related injuries per 1,000 persons.</p> <p><b>Objective</b> Effective municipal management.</p>	<p><b>Effectiveness Measure</b> Number of residential fire related injuries averaged over per 1,000 persons.</p> <p><b>Objective</b> Effective municipal management.</p>
<p><b>Notes</b></p> <p>The 2011 comparative result for this measure was 0.089 7 people were injured in 2011 and also in 2012.</p>	<p><b>Notes</b></p> <p>The 2011 comparative result for this measure was 0.089.</p>

## Fire Services (continued)

2.4 FIRE RELATED FATALITIES	2.5 FIRE RELATED FATALITIES OVER 5 YEARS
<p><u>Total number of residential fire related civilian fatalities</u> (Total Population / 1,000)</p>	<p>(Total Number of residential fire related civilian injuries for <u>2008 + 2009 + 2010+ 2011 +2012</u>) / 5 (Total Population / 1,000)</p>
<b>0 per 1,000 persons</b>	<b>.013 per 1,000 persons</b>
<p><b>Effectiveness Measure</b> Number of residential fire related fatalities per 1,000 persons.</p> <p><b>Objective</b> Effective municipal management.</p>	<p><b>Effectiveness Measure</b> Number of residential fire related fatalities averaged over 5 years per 1,000 persons.</p> <p><b>Objective</b> Effective municipal management.</p>
<p><b>Notes</b></p> <p>The 2011 comparative result for this measure was 0.</p>	<p><b>Notes</b></p> <p>The 2011 comparative result for this measure was .013. There was one fatality in 2008.</p>
2.6 RESIDENTIAL STRUCTURAL FIRES	
<b>1.299 per 1,000 households</b>	
<p><b>Effectiveness Measure</b> Number of residential structural fires per 1,000 persons.</p> <p><b>Objective</b> Effective municipal management.</p>	
<p><b>Notes</b></p> <p>The 2011 comparative result for this measure was 2.752. There were 46 residential fires in 2012 compared to 97 in 2011.</p>	



## Police Services

<b>3.1a OPERATING COSTS FOR POLICE SERVICES</b>	<b>3.1b TOTAL COSTS FOR POLICE SERVICES</b>
<u>Operating costs for Police Services</u> Total population	<u>Total costs for Police Services</u> Total population
<b>\$276.93 per person</b>	<b>\$286.40 per person</b>
<p><b>Efficiency Measure</b> <i>Operating costs for police services per person.</i></p> <p><b>Objective</b> <i>Efficient municipal police services.</i></p>	<p><b>Efficiency Measure</b> <i>Total costs for police services per person.</i></p> <p><b>Objective</b> <i>Efficient municipal police services.</i></p>
<p><b>Notes</b></p> <p>The 2011 restated comparative result for this measure was \$258.62 per person.</p> <p>The main reason for the increase in this measure is higher personnel costs.</p> <p>For more information, visit the Peterborough Lakefield Community Police Service's web site at: <a href="http://www.peterboroughpolice.com">www.peterboroughpolice.com</a></p>	<p><b>Notes</b></p> <p>The 2011 restated comparative result for this measure was \$266.13 per person.</p> <p>The reason for the increase in this measure is the same as mentioned for measure 3.1a.</p>
<b>3.2 VIOLENT CRIME RATE</b>	<b>3.3 PROPERTY CRIME RATE / 1,000</b>
<u>Total # of actual incidents of violent crime</u> Population / 1,000	<u>Total # of actual incidents of property crime</u> Population / 1,000
<b>8.234 violent crimes per 1,000 persons</b>	<b>31.677 property crimes per 1,000 persons</b>
<p><b>Efficiency Measure</b> <i>Violent crime rate per 1,000 persons.</i></p> <p><b>Objective</b> <i>Safe communities.</i></p>	<p><b>Efficiency Measure</b> <i>Property crime rate per 1,000 persons.</i></p> <p><b>Objective</b> <i>Safe communities.</i></p>
<p><b>Notes</b></p> <p>The 2011 comparative result for this measure was 8.666 violent crimes per 1,000 persons.</p> <p>In 2012 there were a total of 648 incidents of violent crime compared to 682 in 2011.</p>	<p><b>Notes</b></p> <p>The 2011 comparative result for this measure was 32.325 property crimes per 1,000 persons.</p> <p>In 2012 there were a total of 2,493 incidents of property crime compared to 2,544 in 2011.</p>

<b>Police Services (continued)</b>	
<b>3.4 CRIME RATE OTHER OFFENCES / 1,000</b>	<b>3.5 TOTAL CRIME RATE / 1,000</b>
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
<b>18.691 crimes per 1,000 persons</b>	<b>58.602 crimes per 1,000 persons</b>
<p><b>Efficiency Measure</b> Other Criminal Code Offences, excluding traffic per 1,000 persons (Criminal Code, excluding traffic.)</p> <p><i>Note that the definition used refers to Criminal Code crimes, excluding traffic.</i></p> <p><b>Objective</b> Safe communities</p>	<p><b>Efficiency Measure</b> Total crime rate per 1,000 persons (Criminal Code, excluding traffic.)</p> <p><i>Note that the definition used refers to Criminal Code crimes, excluding traffic.</i></p> <p><b>Objective</b> Safe communities</p>
<p><b>Notes</b></p> <p>The 2011 comparative result for this measure was 17.522 crimes per 1,000 persons.</p> <p>In 2012 there were a total of 1,471 actual incidents of other Criminal Code offences, excluding traffic, compared to 1,379 in 2011.</p>	<p><b>Notes</b></p> <p>The 2011 comparative result for this measure was 58.513 crimes per 1,000 persons.</p> <p>In 2012 there were a total of 4,612 actual incidents of violent crime, property crime, and other Criminal Code offences, excluding traffic, compared to 4,605 in 2011.</p>

## Police Services (continued)

### 3.6 YOUTH CRIME RATE / 1,000

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

**65.147 youth crimes per 1,000 youths**

**Efficiency Measure**

*Youth crime rate per 1,000 youths.*

**Objective**

*Safe communities*

**Notes**

The 2011 comparative result for this measure was 60.397 youth crimes per 1,000 youths.

In 2012, there were a total of 343 youths cleared by charge or cleared otherwise. This number includes 128 cases (2011 – 158 cases) handled by way of Extra Judicial Measures under the *Youth Criminal Justice Act*.

In 2012 there were a total of 343 incidents of youth crime per 1,000 youths compared to 350 in 2011.

Youth population (ages 12 to 17) is estimated at 5,265 (2011 – 5,795) youths and is based on information provided by Statistics Canada.

## Building Permits & Inspection Services

<b>4.1a OPERATING COSTS FOR BUILDING PERMITS &amp; INSPECTION SERVICES</b>	<b>4.1b TOTAL COSTS FOR BUILDING PERMITS &amp; INSPECTION SERVICES</b>
<u>Operating costs for Building Permits &amp; Inspection Services</u> Total value of Construction Activity (Based on Permits Issued)	<u>Total costs for Building Permits &amp; Inspection Services</u> Total value of Construction Activity (Based on Permits Issued)
<b>\$9.05 per \$1,000 of Construction Activity</b>	<b>\$9.05 per \$1,000 of Construction Activity</b>
<p><b>Efficiency Measure</b> <i>Operating costs for building permits and inspection services per \$1,000 of construction activity ( based on permits issued)</i></p> <p><b>Objective</b> <i>Complete building permit applications are processed quickly and accurately.</i></p>	<p><b>Efficiency Measure</b> <i>Total costs for building permits and inspection services per \$1,000 of construction activity ( based on permits issued)</i></p> <p><b>Objective</b> <i>Complete building permit applications are processed quickly and accurately.</i></p>
<p><b>Notes</b></p> <p>The 2011 comparative result for this measure was \$10.48 per \$1,000 of construction activity. The level of construction activity does not significantly influence operating costs for building permits and inspection services.</p>	<p><b>Notes</b></p> <p>The 2011 comparative result for this measure was \$10.48 per \$1,000 of construction activity. The level of construction activity does not significantly influence total costs for building permits and inspection services.</p>
<b>4.2a HOUSES (NOT EXCEEDING 3 STOREYS/600 SQUARE METRES)</b>	<b>4.2b SMALL BUILDINGS (COMMERCIAL/INDUSTRIAL NOT EXCEEDING 3 STOREYS/600 SQUARE METRES)</b>
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
<b>3 working days</b>	<b>10 working days</b>
<p><b>Efficiency Measure</b> <i>Provincial standard is 10 working days</i></p> <p><b>Objective</b> <i>Complete building permit applications are processed quickly and accurately.</i></p>	<p><b>Efficiency Measure</b> <i>Provincial standard is 15 working days</i></p> <p><b>Objective</b> <i>Complete building permit applications are processed quickly and accurately.</i></p>
<p><b>Notes</b></p> <p>The 2011 comparative figure for this measure was 6 working days.</p>	<p><b>Notes</b></p> <p>The 2011 comparative figure for this measure was 10 working days.</p>

<b>Building Permits &amp; Inspection Services</b>	
<b>4.2c LARGE BUILDINGS (residential/commercial/ industrial/institutional)</b>	<b>4.2d COMPLEX BUILDINGS (post disaster buildings including hospitals, power/water, fire/police/EMS, communications)</b>
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
<b>15 working days</b>	<b>15 working days</b>
<p><b>Efficiency Measure</b> <i>Provincial standard is 20 working days</i></p> <p><b>Objective</b> <i>Complete building permit applications are processed quickly and accurately.</i></p>	<p><b>Efficiency Measure</b> <i>Provincial standard is 30 working days</i></p> <p><b>Objective</b> <i>Complete building permit applications are processed quickly and accurately.</i></p>
<p><b>Notes</b></p> <p>The 2011 comparative figure for this measure was 11 working days.</p>	<p><b>Notes</b></p> <p>The 2011 comparative figure for this measure was 20 working days.</p>

<h2>Roadways</h2>	
<b>5.1a OPERATING COSTS FOR PAVED ROADS</b>	<b>5.1b TOTAL COSTS FOR PAVED ROADS</b>
<u>Operating costs for paved roads</u> Total paved lane kilometres	<u>Total costs for paved roads</u> Total paved lane kilometres
<b>\$2,892.73 per paved lane kilometre</b>	<b>\$7,817.53 per paved lane kilometre</b>
<p><b>Efficiency Measure</b> <i>Operating costs of paved (hard top) roads per lane kilometre.</i></p> <p><b>Objective</b> <i>Efficient maintenance of paved roads.</i></p>	<p><b>Efficiency Measure</b> <i>Total costs of paved (hard top) roads per lane kilometre.</i></p> <p><b>Objective</b> <i>Efficient maintenance of paved roads.</i></p>
<p><b>Notes</b></p> <p>The 2011 restated comparative result for this measure was \$3,195.73 per paved lane kilometre.</p>	<p><b>Notes</b></p> <p>The 2011 restated comparative result for this measure was \$7,911.94 per paved lane kilometre.</p>

<h2>Roadways (continued)</h2>	
<b>5.2a OPERATING COSTS FOR UNPAVED ROADS</b>	<b>5.2b TOTAL COSTS FOR UNPAVED ROADS</b>
<u>Operating costs for unpaved roads</u> Total unpaved lane kilometres	<u>Total costs for unpaved roads</u> Total unpaved lane kilometres
<b>\$0.00</b>	<b>\$4,517.50</b>
<p><b>Efficiency Measure</b> <i>Operating costs for unpaved (loose top) roads per lane kilometre.</i></p> <p><b>Objective</b> <i>Efficient maintenance of unpaved roads.</i></p>	<p><b>Efficiency Measure</b> <i>Total costs for unpaved (loose top) roads per lane kilometre.</i></p> <p><b>Objective</b> <i>Efficient maintenance of unpaved roads.</i></p>
<p><b>Notes</b></p> <p>There are two unpaved lane kilometres of roads in the City.</p> <p>There were no operating costs allocated to unpaved roads for 2011 or 2012.</p>	<p><b>Notes</b></p> <p>There are two unpaved lane kilometres of roads in the City. Total cost for unpaved roads consists of amortization.</p> <p>The 2011 comparative result for this measure was \$4,517.50.</p>

<b>Roadways (continued)</b>	
<b>5.3a OPERATING COSTS FOR BRIDGES AND CULVERTS</b>	<b>5.3b TOTAL COSTS FOR BRIDGES AND CULVERTS</b>
<u>Operating costs for Bridges and Culverts</u> Total square metres of surface area on bridges and culverts	<u>Total costs for Bridges and Culverts</u> Total square metres of surface area on bridges and culverts
<b>\$0.00 per Square Metre</b>	<b>\$40.39 per Square Metre</b>
<p><b>Efficiency Measure</b> <i>Operating costs for bridges and culverts per square metre of surface area.</i></p> <p><b>Objective</b> <i>Efficient maintenance of bridges and culverts.</i></p>	<p><b>Efficiency Measure</b> <i>Total costs for bridges and culverts per square metre of surface area.</i></p> <p><b>Objective</b> <i>Efficient maintenance of bridges and culverts.</i></p>
<p><b>Notes</b></p> <p>Operating costs in 2011 were \$0.00.</p> <p>There were no operating costs for bridges and culverts for either 2011 or 2012.</p>	<p><b>Notes</b></p> <p>Total costs include amortization of bridges along with interest on long term debt.</p> <p>The 2011 comparative result for this measure was \$25.62 per square metres of surface area on bridges and culverts.</p>
<b>5.4a OPERATING COSTS FOR WINTER CONTROL</b>	<b>5.4b TOTAL COSTS FOR WINTER CONTROL</b>
<u>Operating costs for winter control maintenance of roadways</u> Total lane kilometres maintained in winter	<u>Total costs for winter control maintenance of roadways</u> Total lane kilometres maintained in winter
<b>\$1,835.52 per lane kilometre</b>	<b>\$1,841.24 per lane kilometre</b>
<p><b>Efficiency Measure</b> <i>Operating costs for winter control maintenance of roadways per lane kilometre maintained in winter.</i></p> <p><b>Objective</b> <i>Efficient winter control operation.</i></p>	<p><b>Efficiency Measure</b> <i>Total costs for winter control maintenance of roadways per lane kilometre maintained in winter.</i></p> <p><b>Objective</b> <i>Efficient winter control operation.</i></p>
<p><b>Notes</b></p> <p>The 2011 comparative result for this measure was \$2,110.78 per lane kilometre. There were 62 incidents of winter weather in 2011 and 57 in 2012.</p> <p>There were fewer Freezing Rain events in 2012 than in 2011, resulting in less sand/salt materials being bought, thereby lowering the costs.</p>	<p><b>Notes</b></p> <p>Total costs include amortization and interest on long term debt. The 2011 comparative result for this measure was \$2,116.63 per lane kilometre.</p>

## Roadways (continued)

5.5 CONDITION OF ROADS	5.6 CONDITION OF BRIDGES AND CULVERTS
$\frac{\text{Number of paved lane kilometres rated as good to very good}}{\text{Total number of paved lane kilometres}} \times 100$	$\frac{\text{Number of bridges and culverts rated as good to very good}}{\text{Total number of paved lane kilometres}} \times 100$
<b>31.7% of lane kilometres</b>	<b>26.3% of bridges and culverts</b>
<p><b>Efficiency Measure</b>  <i>Percentage of paved lane kilometres where condition is rated as good to very good.</i></p> <p><b>Objective</b>  <i>Provide a paved lane system that has a pavement condition that meets municipal standards.</i></p>	<p><b>Efficiency Measure</b>  <i>Percentage of bridges and culverts where condition is rated as good to very good.</i></p> <p><b>Objective</b>  <i>Provide a bridge and culvert system that has a pavement condition that meets municipal standards.</i></p>
<p><b>Notes</b></p> <p>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.</p> <p>The 2011 comparative result for this measure was estimated at 30% of paved lane kilometres where condition was rated as good to very good. This was an estimation based on visual inspection of road conditions.</p>	<p><b>Notes</b></p> <p>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.</p> <p>The 2011 comparative result for this measure was estimated at 26.3% of bridges and culverts where condition was rated as good to very good. This was an estimation based on visual inspection of road conditions.</p>
5.7 WINTER EVENT RESPONSES	
$\frac{\text{Number of winter event responses that met or exceeded municipal road maintenance standards}}{\text{Total number of winter events}} \times 100$	
<b>100.00% of winter event responses met or exceeded municipal standards</b>	
<p><b>Efficiency Measure</b>  <i>Percentage of winter event responses that met or exceeded municipal road maintenance standards.</i></p> <p><b>Objective</b>  <i>Provide appropriate winter response.</i></p>	
<p><b>Notes</b></p> <p>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 2012, there were 57 winter events, compared to 62 in 2011 and to 84 in 2010.</p> <p>The 2011 comparative result for this measure was also 100%.</p>	



## Transit Services

6.1a OPERATING COSTS FOR CONVENTIONAL TRANSIT SERVICES	6.1b TOTAL COSTS FOR CONVENTIONAL TRANSIT SERVICES
<p><small>Operating costs for conventional transit</small> Total number of regular service passenger trips on conventional transit</p>	<p><small>Total costs for conventional transit</small> Total number of regular service passenger trips on conventional transit</p>
<b>\$2.96 per regular service passenger trip</b>	<b>\$3.33 per regular service passenger trip</b>
<p><b>Efficiency Measure</b> <i>Operating costs for conventional transit per regular service passenger trip.</i></p> <p><b>Objective</b> <i>Efficient municipal transit services.</i></p>	<p><b>Efficiency Measure</b> <i>Total costs for conventional transit per regular service passenger trip.</i></p> <p><b>Objective</b> <i>Efficient municipal transit services.</i></p>
<p><b>Notes</b></p> <p>The 2011 comparative result for this measure was \$2.93 per regular service passenger trip.</p> <p>Conventional transit is defined as all regular public transport services as opposed to specialized services for persons with disabilities.</p>	<p><b>Notes</b></p> <p>The 2011 comparative result for this measure was \$3.30 per regular service passenger trip.</p>
6.2 PUBLIC TRANSIT USE	
<p>Total number of conventional transit passenger <math>\frac{\text{trips in service area in a year}}{\text{Population of service area}}</math></p>	
<b>43.02 trips per person</b>	
<p><b>Efficiency Measure</b> <i>Number of conventional transit passenger trips per person in the service area in a year.</i></p> <p><b>Objective</b> <i>Maximum utilization of municipal transit services.</i></p>	
<p><b>Notes</b></p> <p>The 2011 comparative result for this measure was 40.42 conventional transit trips per person in the service area in a year.</p> <p>In 2012, there were 3,385,300 passenger trips compared to 3,181,400 in 2011.</p>	

## Environmental Protection/Wastewater

<b>7.1a OPERATING COSTS FOR COLLECTION OF WASTEWATER</b>	<b>7.1b TOTAL COSTS FOR COLLECTION OF WASTEWATER</b>
$\frac{\text{Operating costs for wastewater collection}}{\text{Total kilometres of wastewater mains}}$	$\frac{\text{Total costs for wastewater collection}}{\text{Total kilometres of wastewater mains}}$
<b>\$5,023.11 per kilometre of wastewater main</b>	<b>\$8,048.84 per kilometre of wastewater main</b>
<p><b>Efficiency Measure</b>  <i>Operating costs for collection of wastewater per kilometre of wastewater main</i></p> <p><b>Objective</b>  <i>Efficient wastewater collection.</i></p>	<p><b>Efficiency Measure</b>  <i>Total costs for collection of wastewater per kilometre of wastewater main</i></p> <p><b>Objective</b>  <i>Efficient wastewater collection.</i></p>
<p><b>Notes</b></p> <p>The 2011 comparative result for this measure was \$3,824.90.</p> <p>There are 361 kilometres of wastewater mains in the City.</p> <p>Costs are higher due to the level of work done on Sanitary Sewer maintenance and minor equipment purchases for the Waste Water Treatment Plant.</p>	<p><b>Notes</b></p> <p>The 2011 comparative result for this measure was \$6,815.65.</p>

7.2a OPERATING COSTS FOR TREATMENT AND DISPOSAL OF WASTEWATER	7.2b TOTAL COSTS FOR TREATMENT AND DISPOSAL OF WASTEWATER
<p style="text-align: center;"><u>Operating costs for wastewater treatment and disposal</u> Total megalitres of wastewater treated</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><u>Total costs for wastewater treatment and disposal</u> Total megalitres of wastewater treated</p>
<p><b>\$291.29 per megalitre*</b></p>	<p><b>\$380.17 per megalitre*</b></p>
<p><b>Efficiency Measure</b> <i>Operating costs for treatment and disposal of wastewater per megalitre.</i></p> <p><i>*A megalitre equals 1,000,000 litres or 1,000 cubic metres.</i></p> <p><b>Objective</b> <i>Prevention of human and environment health hazards.</i></p>	<p><b>Efficiency Measure</b> <i>Total costs for treatment and disposal of wastewater per megalitre.</i></p> <p><i>*A megalitre equals 1,000,000 litres or 1,000 cubic metres.</i></p> <p><b>Objective</b> <i>Prevention of human and environment health hazards.</i></p>
<p><b>Notes</b></p> <p>The 2011 comparative result for this measure was \$275.44 per megalitre.</p> <p>In 2012, the City treated 15,791 (2011 – 17,276.7) megalitres of wastewater.</p> <p>Less water was treated at a reduced cost, but the decrease in cost was not proportionate to the decrease in water treated, resulting in a higher cost per megalitre.</p>	<p><b>Notes</b></p> <p>The 2011 comparative result for this measure was \$358.94 per megalitre</p>

## Environmental Protection/Wastewater (continued)

<b>7.3a OPERATING COSTS FOR COLLECTION, TREATMENT AND DISPOSAL</b>	<b>7.3b TOTAL COSTS FOR COLLECTION, TREATMENT AND DISPOSAL</b>
<u>Operating costs for wastewater collection, treatment and disposal</u> Total megalitres of wastewater treated	<u>Total costs for wastewater collection, treatment and disposal</u> Total megalitres of wastewater treated
<b>\$406.12 per megalitre *</b>	<b>\$564.17 per megalitre *</b>
<p><b>Efficiency Measure</b> <i>Operating costs for collection, treatment, and disposal of wastewater per megalitre</i></p> <p>* A megalitre equals 1,000,000 litres or 1,000 cubic metres.</p> <p><b>Objective</b> <i>Efficient wastewater services.</i></p>	<p><b>Efficiency Measure</b> <i>Total costs for collection, treatment, and disposal of wastewater per megalitre</i></p> <p>* A megalitre equals 1,000,000 litres or 1,000 cubic metres.</p> <p><b>Objective</b> <i>Efficient wastewater services.</i></p>
<p><b>Notes</b></p> <p>The 2011 comparative result for this measure was \$355.36 per megalitre of wastewater treated.</p> <p>In 2012, there were 15,791 megalitres treated compared with 17,276.7 in 2011.</p>	<p><b>Notes</b></p> <p>The 2011 comparative result for this measure was \$501.35 per megalitre of wastewater treated.</p>

## Environmental Protection/Wastewater (continued)

<b>7.4 MAIN BACKUPS</b>	<b>7.5 TREATMENT BYPASS</b>
$\frac{\text{Total number of backed up wastewater mains}}{\text{Total kilometres of wastewater mains}} / 100$	$\frac{\text{Estimated megalitres of untreated wastewater}}{\text{Total megalitres of wastewater, including treated and untreated}} \times 100$
<b>0.5540 per 100 kilometres of main</b>	<b>0.598% of wastewater</b>
<p><b>Efficiency Measure</b> Number of wastewater main backups per 100 kilometres of wastewater main in a year.</p> <p><b>Objective</b> Prevention of human and environment health hazards.</p>	<p><b>Efficiency Measure</b> Percentage of wastewater estimated to have by-passed treatment.</p> <p><i>A megalitre equals 1,000,000 litres or 1,000 cubic metres.</i></p> <p><b>Objective</b> Effective wastewater and treatment and disposal services</p>
<p><b>Notes</b></p> <p>The 2011 comparative result for this measure was 0.5540 backed up wastewater mains per 100 kilometres of mains.</p> <p>During 2011 and 2012 there were 2 mains backed up.</p>	<p><b>Notes</b></p> <p>The 2011 comparative result for this measure was 0.0%.</p> <p>In 2010 and 2011, 0 megalitres of untreated wastewater was estimated to have by-passed treatment. In 2012 it is estimated 94.98 megalitres by-passed treatment.</p>

## Storm Water

8.1a OPERATING COSTS FOR URBAN STORM WATER MANAGEMENT		8.1b TOTAL COSTS FOR URBAN STORM WATER MANAGEMENT	
<u>Operating costs for urban storm water management</u> Total kilometres of urban drainage system		<u>Total costs for urban storm water management</u> Total kilometres of urban drainage system	
<b>\$3,376.78 per kilometre of drainage system</b>		<b>\$5,980.55 per kilometre of drainage system</b>	
<p><b>Efficiency Measure</b>                      Operating costs for urban storm water management (collection, treatment and disposal) per km of drainage system.</p> <p><b>Objective</b>                      Efficient urban storm water management.</p>		<p><b>Efficiency Measure</b>                      Total costs for urban storm water management (collection, treatment and disposal) per km of drainage system.</p> <p><b>Objective</b>                      Efficient urban storm water management.</p>	
<p><b>Notes</b></p> <p>The 2011 comparable result for this measure was \$3,393.09 per kilometre of drainage system.</p>		<p><b>Notes</b></p> <p>The 2011 comparable result for this measure was \$5,888.40 per kilometre of drainage system.</p>	
8.2a OPERATING COSTS FOR RURAL STORM WATER MANAGEMENT		8.2b TOTAL COSTS FOR RURAL STORM WATER MANAGEMENT	
<u>Operating costs for rural storm water management</u> Total kilometres of rural drainage system		<u>Total costs for rural storm water management</u> Total kilometres of rural drainage system	
N/A		N/A	
<p><b>Efficiency Measure</b>                      Operating costs for rural storm water management (collection, treatment and disposal) per km of drainage system.</p> <p><b>Objective</b>                      Efficient rural storm water management.</p>		<p><b>Efficiency Measure</b>                      Total costs for rural storm water management (collection, treatment and disposal) per km of drainage system.</p> <p><b>Objective</b>                      Efficient rural storm water management.</p>	
<p><b>Notes</b></p> <p>All storm water management activities within the City are considered urban.</p>		<p><b>Notes</b></p> <p>All storm water management activities within the City are considered urban.</p>	

## Water Services

<b>9.1a OPERATING COSTS FOR TREATMENT OF DRINKING WATER</b>		<b>9.1b TOTAL COSTS FOR TREATMENT OF DRINKING WATER</b>	
<u>Operating costs for treatment of drinking water</u> Total megalitres of drinking water treated		<u>Total costs for treatment of drinking water</u> Total megalitres of drinking water treated	
<b>\$339.73 per megalitre</b>		<b>\$418.64 per megalitre</b>	
<p><b>Efficiency Measure</b> <i>Operating costs for the treatment of drinking water per megalitre.</i></p> <p><b>Objective</b> <i>Efficient treatment of drinking water.</i></p>		<p><b>Efficiency Measure</b> <i>Total costs for the treatment of drinking water per megalitre.</i></p> <p><b>Objective</b> <i>Efficient treatment of drinking water.</i></p>	
<p><b>Notes</b></p> <p>There were 13,345 megalitres of water treated in 2012 compared with 13,493 in 2011.</p> <p>The 2011 comparable result for this measure was \$339.59 per megalitre.</p>		<p><b>Notes</b></p> <p>The 2011 comparable result for this measure was \$424.64 per megalitre.</p>	
<b>9.2a OPERATING COSTS FOR DISTRIBUTION OF DRINKING WATER</b>		<b>9.2b TOTAL COSTS FOR DISTRIBUTION OF DRINKING WATER</b>	
<u>Operating costs for distribution of drinking water</u> Total kilometres of water main pipe		<u>Total costs for distribution of drinking water</u> Total kilometres of water main pipe	
<b>\$6,363.95 per kilometre of water distribution pipe</b>		<b>\$17,530.87 per kilometre of water distribution pipe</b>	
<p><b>Efficiency Measure</b> <i>Operating costs for the distribution of drinking water per kilometre of water distribution pipe.</i></p> <p><b>Objective</b> <i>Efficient distribution of drinking water.</i></p>		<p><b>Efficiency Measure</b> <i>Total costs for the distribution of drinking water per kilometre of water distribution pipe.</i></p> <p><b>Objective</b> <i>Efficient distribution of drinking water.</i></p>	
<p><b>Notes</b></p> <p>The 2011 comparable result for this measure was \$6,400.46 per kilometre of water main pipe.</p> <p>There were 408 kilometres of water distribution pipe in the City of Peterborough in 2012.</p>		<p><b>Notes</b></p> <p>The 2011 comparable result for this measure was \$15,602.02 per kilometre of water main pipe.</p>	

## Water Services (continued)

<b>9.3a TREATMENT AND DISTRIBUTION OF DRINKING WATER (INTREGATED SYSTEM)</b>	<b>9.3b TREATMENT AND DISTRIBUTION OF DRINKING WATER (INTREGATED SYSTEM)</b>
<u>Operating costs for treatment and distribution of drinking water</u> Total megalitres of drinking water treated	<u>Total costs for treatment and distribution of drinking water</u> Total megalitres of drinking water treated
<b>\$534.30 per megalitre</b>	<b>\$954.61 per megalitre</b>
<p><b><i>Efficiency Measure</i></b> <i>Operating costs for the treatment and distribution of drinking water per megalitre.</i></p> <p><b><i>Objective</i></b> <i>Efficient treatment and distribution of drinking water.</i></p>	<p><b><i>Efficiency Measure</i></b> <i>Total costs for the treatment and distribution of drinking water per megalitre.</i></p> <p><b><i>Objective</i></b> <i>Efficient treatment and distribution of drinking water.</i></p>
<p><b>Notes</b></p> <p>The 2011 revised comparable result for this measure was \$535.02 per megalitre.</p> <p>During 2012 there were 13,345 megalitres of water treated compared with 13,493 in 2011.</p>	<p><b>Notes</b></p> <p>The 2011 revised comparable result for this measure was \$901.04 per megalitre.</p>



<b>Water Services (continued)</b>	
<b>9.4 BOIL WATER ADVISORIES</b>	<b>9.5 BREAKS IN WATER MAINS</b>
Summation of: number of boil water advisory days $\frac{\text{times the number of affected connections}}{\text{Total connections in service area}}$	$\frac{\text{Number of breaks in water mains}}{\text{Total kilometres of water main pipe} / 100}$
<b>0 days a year</b>	<b>5.3922 breaks per 100 kilometres of main</b>
<p><b>Effectiveness Measure</b>  <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><b>Objective</b>  <i>Water is safe and meets local needs.</i></p>	<p><b>Effectiveness Measure</b>  <i>Number of breaks in water mains per 100 kilometres of water main pipe in a year.</i></p> <p><b>Objective</b>  <i>Improve system reliability and minimize water loss and operational costs.</i></p>
<p><b>Notes</b></p> <p>The number of water boil advisories in 2011 was also nil.</p>	<p><b>Notes</b></p> <p>The 2011 comparative result for this measure was 8.9806 breaks in water mains per 100 kilometres of water main pipe in a year.</p> <p>During 2012, 22 breaks were recorded compared with 37 during 2011.</p>

<b>Solid Waste</b>	
<b>10.1a OPERATING COSTS FOR SOLID WASTE COLLECTION</b>	<b>10.1b TOTAL COSTS FOR SOLID WASTE COLLECTION</b>
<u>Operating costs for solid waste collection</u> Total tonnes received from all property classes	<u>Total costs for solid waste collection</u> Total tonnes received from all property classes
<b>\$68.54 per tonne</b>	<b>\$81.78 per tonne</b>
<p><b>Efficiency Measure</b> <i>Operating costs for solid waste collection per tonne</i></p> <p><b>Objective</b> <i>Efficient solid waste collection programs.</i></p>	<p><b>Efficiency Measure</b> <i>Total costs for solid waste collection per tonne</i></p> <p><b>Objective</b> <i>Efficient solid waste collection programs.</i></p>
<p><b>Notes</b></p> <p>During 2012, 14,582 (2011 - 13,509) tonnes of residential solid waste was collected.</p> <p>The comparable result for this measure was \$69.70 per tonne for solid waste collected in 2011.</p>	<p><b>Notes</b></p> <p>The comparable result for this measure was \$87.73 per tonne for solid waste collected in 2011.</p>
<b>10.2a OPERATING COSTS FOR SOLID WASTE DISPOSAL</b>	<b>10.2b TOTAL COSTS FOR SOLID WASTE DISPOSAL</b>
<u>Operating costs of solid waste disposal</u> Total tonnes disposed of from all property classes	<u>Total costs of solid waste disposal</u> Total tonnes disposed of from all property classes
<b>\$58.59 per tonne</b>	<b>\$67.51 per tonne</b>
<p><b>Efficiency Measure</b> <i>Operating costs (revenue) for solid waste disposal per tonne</i></p> <p><b>Objective</b> <i>Efficient solid waste disposal programs.</i></p>	<p><b>Efficiency Measure</b> <i>Total costs (revenue) for solid waste disposal per tonne</i></p> <p><b>Objective</b> <i>Efficient solid waste disposal programs.</i></p>
<p><b>Notes</b></p> <p>During 2012, 47,465 (2011 – 49,222) tonnes of solid waste was disposed of at the landfill facility.</p> <p>The comparable result for this measure was \$80.77 per tonne of solid waste disposal in 2011.</p> <p>This measure has decreased due to the significant reconstruction costs for the Bensfort road undertaken by the County of Peterborough in 2011.</p>	<p><b>Notes</b></p> <p>The comparable result for this measure was \$89.19 per tonne of solid waste disposal in in 2011.</p> <p>Without the reconstruction costs as explained under measure 10.2a, the 2011 rate per tonne would be \$44.94.</p>

## Solid Waste (continued)

10.3a OPERATING COSTS FOR SOLID WASTE DIVERSION (RECYCLING)	10.3b TOTAL COSTS FOR SOLID WASTE DIVERSION (RECYCLING)
<u>Operating costs for solid waste diversion (recycling)</u> Total tonnes diverted	<u>Total costs for solid waste diversion (recycling)</u> Total tonnes diverted
<b>\$124.12 per tonne</b>	<b>\$127.40 per tonne</b>
<p><b>Efficiency Measure</b>                      Operating costs for solid waste diversion (recycling) per tonne</p> <p><b>Objective</b>                      Effective solid waste diversion.</p>	<p><b>Efficiency Measure</b>                      Total costs for solid waste diversion (recycling) per tonne</p> <p><b>Objective</b>                      Effective solid waste diversion.</p>
<p><b>Notes</b></p> <p>During 2012, 20,675 (2011 – 18,538) tonnes of solid waste was diverted from the City’s landfill facility.</p> <p>The 2011 comparative measure was \$94.58 per tonne.                      The 2010 comparative measure was \$145.45 per tonne.</p> <p>The variations from year to year highlight the volatility in the revenues per tonne in the sale of recyclables.</p>	<p><b>Notes</b></p> <p>The 2011 measure was \$98.24 per tonne.</p> <p>The 2010 measure was \$149.17 per tonne.</p> <p>The fluctuations in this measure are the same as stated for 10.3a.</p>
10.4a OPERATING COSTS FOR SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT (INTEGRATED SYSTEM)	10.4b TOTAL COST FOR SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT (INTEGRATED SYSTEM)
<u>Operating costs for solid waste management</u> Total tonnes disposed of, and total tonnes diverted	<u>Total costs for solid waste management</u> Total tonnes disposed of, and total tonnes diverted
<b>\$96.15 per tonne</b>	<b>\$106.20 per tonne</b>
<p><b>Efficiency Measure</b>                      Average operating costs for solid waste management (collection, disposal and diversion) per tonne</p> <p><b>Objective</b>                      Effective solid waste management.</p>	<p><b>Efficiency Measure</b>                      Average total costs for solid waste management (collection, disposal and diversion) per tonne</p> <p><b>Objective</b>                      Effective solid waste management.</p>
<p><b>Notes</b></p> <p>In 2012, 68,140 (2011 – 67,759) tonnes were disposed of or diverted from all property classes.</p> <p>The 2011 comparable measure was \$98.45 per tonne.</p> <p>Total costs were higher in 2011 as a result of increased amortization as a result of capital investment in prior years.</p>	<p><b>Notes</b></p> <p>The 2011 measure was \$109.16 per tonne.</p>

<b>Solid Waste (continued)</b>	
<b>10.5 COMPLAINTS FOR SOLID WASTE AND RECYCLING COLLECTION</b>	<b>10.6 NUMBER OF SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT SITES</b>
<u>Number of Complaints</u> Total Households / 1,000	Total number of waste management sites
<b>21.996 complaints per 1,000 households</b>	<b>4 sites</b>
<p><b>Efficiency Measure</b> <i>Number of complaints received in a year concerning the collection of solid waste and recycled materials per 1,000 households.</i></p> <p><b>Objective</b> <i>Effective waste management services.</i></p>	<p><b>Efficiency Measure</b> <i>Total number of solid waste management facilities owned by Municipal with a Ministry of Environment (MOE) Certificate of Approval</i></p> <p><b>Objective</b> <i>Efficient MOE compliance.</i></p>
<p><b>Notes</b></p> <p>The 2011 comparative result for this measure was 38.73 complaints concerning the collection of garbage and recycled materials per 1,000 households.</p>	<p><b>Notes</b></p> <p>The City owns 4 facilities. They are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Peterborough County-City Waste Management Facility (ownership is equally shared)</li> <li>- Peterborough Materials Recycling Facility</li> <li>- Harper Road Compost Site</li> <li>- Peterborough Household Hazardous Waste Facility</li> </ul>
<b>10.7 COMPLIANCE ORDER FOR REMEDIATION</b>	<b>10.8 DIVERSION OF RESIDENTIAL SOLID WASTE</b>
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 and total tonnes diverted
<b>0 days</b>	<b>56.1% of residential solid waste diverted for recycling</b>
<p><b>Efficiency Measure</b> <i>Number of days a year an MOE compliance order for remediation was in effect.</i></p> <p><b>Objective</b> <i>Effective compliance.</i></p>	<p><b>Efficiency Measure</b> <i>Percentage of residential solid waste diverted for recycling.</i></p> <p><b>Objective</b> <i>Efficient waste diversion for recycling.</i></p>
<p><b>Notes</b></p> <p>There were no days in either 2011 or 2010 when a compliance order for remediation was in effect.</p>	<p><b>Notes</b></p> <p>During 2012, 18,625 (2011 – 18,537) tonnes of residential solid waste was diverted.</p> <p>The 2011 comparative result for this measure was 54.0% of residential solid waste diverted for recycling.</p>

## Parks and Recreation

11.1a OPERATING COSTS FOR PARKS		11.1b TOTAL COSTS FOR PARKS	
<u>Operating costs for parks</u> Total population		<u>Total costs for parks</u> Total population	
<b>\$40.09 per person</b>		<b>\$48.51 per person</b>	
<p><b>Efficiency Measure</b> <i>Operating costs for parks per person</i></p> <p><b>Objective</b> <i>Efficient operation of parks.</i></p>		<p><b>Efficiency Measure</b> <i>Total costs for parks per person</i></p> <p><b>Objective</b> <i>Efficient operation of parks.</i></p>	
<p><b>Notes</b></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 2011, the comparative result was \$39.00 per person for the operation of parks.</p>		<p><b>Notes</b></p> <p>In 2011, the comparative result was \$46.78 per person for the operation of parks.</p>	
11.2a OPERATING COSTS FOR RECREATION PROGRAMS		11.2b TOTAL COSTS FOR RECREATION PROGRAMS	
<u>Operating costs of recreation programs</u> Total population		<u>Total costs of recreation programs</u> Total population	
<b>\$17.64 per person</b>		<b>\$17.64 per person</b>	
<p><b>Efficiency Measure</b> <i>Operating costs for recreation programs per person</i></p> <p><b>Objective</b> <i>Efficient operation of recreation programs.</i></p>		<p><b>Efficiency Measure</b> <i>Operating costs for recreation programs per person</i></p> <p><b>Objective</b> <i>Efficient operation of recreation programs.</i></p>	
<p><b>Notes</b></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 2011, the comparative result for this measure was \$16.44 per person.</p>		<p><b>Notes</b></p> <p>In 2011, the comparative result for this measure was \$16.44 per person.</p>	

## Parks and Recreation (continued)

<b>11.3a OPERATING COSTS FOR RECREATION FACILITIES</b>	<b>11.3b TOTAL COSTS FOR RECREATION FACILITIES</b>
<u>Operating costs for recreation facilities</u> Total population	<u>Total costs for recreation facilities</u> Total population
<b>\$109.18 per person</b>	<b>\$142.34 per person</b>
<p><b>Efficiency Measure</b> <i>Operating costs for recreation facilities per person</i></p> <p><b>Objective</b> <i>Efficient operation of recreation facilities.</i></p>	<p><b>Efficiency Measure</b> <i>Total costs for recreation facilities per person</i></p> <p><b>Objective</b> <i>Efficient operation of recreation facilities.</i></p>
<p><b>Notes</b></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 2011, the comparative result for this measure was \$115.43 per person.</p>	<p><b>Notes</b></p> <p>In 2011, the comparative result for this measure was \$148.64 per person.</p>
<b>11.4a OPERATING COSTS FOR RECREATION PROGRAMS AND FACILITIES</b>	<b>11.4b TOTAL COSTS FOR RECREATION PROGRAMS AND FACILITIES</b>
<u>Operating costs for recreation programs and recreation facilities</u> Total population	<u>Total costs for recreation programs and recreation facilities</u> Total population
<b>\$126.82 per person</b>	<b>\$159.98 per person</b>
<p><b>Efficiency Measure</b> <i>Operating costs for recreation programs and recreation facilities per person.</i></p> <p><b>Objective</b> <i>Efficient operation of recreation programs and recreation facilities.</i></p>	<p><b>Efficiency Measure</b> <i>Total costs for recreation programs and recreation facilities per person.</i></p> <p><b>Objective</b> <i>Efficient operation of recreation programs and recreation facilities.</i></p>
<p><b>Notes</b></p> <p>This represents a subtotal for measures 11.2a and 11.3a.</p> <p>In 2011, the comparable result for this measure was \$131.86 per person.</p>	<p><b>Notes</b></p> <p>This represents a subtotal for measures 11.2b and 11.3b.</p> <p>In 2011, the comparable result for this measure was \$165.08 per person.</p>

## Parks and Recreation (continued)

11.5 TOTAL KILOMETRES OF TRAILS		11.6 HECTARES OF OPEN SPACE	
$\frac{\text{Total kilometres of trails}}{\text{Total population} / 1,000}$		$\frac{\text{Total hectares of open space}}{\text{Total population} / 1,000}$	
<b>0.356 kilometres of trails per 1,000 persons</b>		<b>5.197 hectares of open space per 1,000 persons</b>	
<p><b>Effectiveness Measure</b> Kilometres of trails per 1,000 persons.</p> <p><b>Objective</b> Trails provide recreation opportunities.</p>		<p><b>Effectiveness Measure</b> Hectares of open space per 1,000 persons.</p> <p><b>Objective</b> Open space is adequate for population.</p>	
<p><b>Notes</b></p> <p>The 2011 comparative result for this measure was 0.356 km of trails per 1,000 persons.</p> <p>The City has 28 kilometres (2011 – 28 km) of trails.</p>		<p><b>Notes</b></p> <p>In 2011, the restated comparative result was 5.197 hectares of open space per 1,000 persons.</p>	
11.7 PARTICIPANT HOURS FOR RECREATION PROGRAMS		11.8 INDOOR RECREATION FACILITY SPACE	
$\frac{\text{Total participant hours for recreation programs: registered, drop-in and permitted programs}}{\text{Total population} / 1,000}$		$\frac{\text{Square metres of indoor recreation facility space}}{\text{Total population} / 1,000}$	
<b>20,326 participant hours of recreation programs per 1,000 persons</b>		<b>710.178 square metres of indoor recreation facility space per 1,000 persons</b>	
<p><b>Effectiveness Measure</b> Total participant hours for recreation programs per 1,000 persons.</p> <p><b>Objective</b> Recreation programs serve needs of residents.</p>		<p><b>Effectiveness Measure</b> Square metres of indoor recreation facility space per 1,000 persons.</p> <p><b>Objective</b> Indoor recreation facility space is adequate for population.</p>	
<p><b>Notes</b></p> <p>In 2011, the comparative result was 20,252 recreation hours per 1,000 persons.</p>		<p><b>Notes</b></p> <p>In 2011, the comparative result for this measure was 710.178 square metres of indoor recreation facility space per 1,000 persons.</p> <p>The City has a total of 55,891 square metres of indoor recreation facility space.</p>	

## 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

**452.872 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 2011, the comparative result for this measure was 452.5 square metres of outdoor recreation facility space per 1,000 persons.

The City has a total of 35,641 square metres of outdoor recreation facility space (2011 - 35,416 sq metres)



# LIBRARY SERVICES

12.1a OPERATING COST PER PERSON		12.1b TOTAL COST PER PERSON	
<u>Operating costs for library services</u> Total population		<u>Total costs for library services</u> Total population	
<b>\$27.58 per person</b>		<b>\$33.03 per person</b>	
<p><b>Efficiency Measure</b> <i>Operating costs for library services per person</i></p> <p><b>Objective</b> <i>Efficient library services.</i></p>		<p><b>Efficiency Measure</b> <i>Total costs for library services per person</i></p> <p><b>Objective</b> <i>Efficient library services.</i></p>	
<p><b>Notes</b></p> <p>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 <a href="http://www.peterborough.library.on.ca">http://www.peterborough.library.on.ca</a></p> <p>The comparable result for this measure was \$25.13 per person in 2011.</p>		<p><b>Notes</b></p> <p>The comparable result for this measure was \$30.49 per person in 2011.</p>	
12.2a OPERATING COST PER USE		12.2b TOTAL COST PER USE	
<u>Operating costs for library services</u> Total uses		<u>Operating costs for library services</u> Total uses	
<b>\$1.10 per use</b>		<b>\$1.32 per use</b>	
<p><b>Efficiency Measure</b> <i>Operating costs for library services per use</i></p> <p><b>Objective</b> <i>Efficient library services.</i></p>		<p><b>Efficiency Measure</b> <i>Operating costs for library services per use</i></p> <p><b>Objective</b> <i>Efficient library services.</i></p>	
<p><b>Notes</b></p> <p>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 2012, there were a total of 1,974,283 (2011 – 1,761,818) uses of library services.</p> <p>The comparable result for this measure was \$1.12 per use in 2011.</p>		<p><b>Notes</b></p> <p>The comparable result for this measure was \$1.36 per use in 2011.</p>	

## LIBRARY SERVICES (continued)

12.3 LIBRARY USES PER PERSON	12.4 ELECTRONIC LIBRARY USES
$\frac{\text{Total library uses}}{\text{Total population}}$	$\frac{\text{Electronic library uses}}{\text{Total library uses}}$
<b>25.086 per person</b>	<b>34.3% of total library uses were electronic</b>
<p><b>Effectiveness Measure</b> <i>Library uses per person</i></p> <p><b>Objective</b> <i>Increased use of library services.</i></p>	<p><b>Effectiveness Measure</b> <i>Electronic library uses as a percentage of total library uses.</i></p> <p><b>Objective</b> <i>Better information on library usage.</i></p>
<p><b>Notes</b></p> <p>The comparable result for this measure was 22.387 library uses per person in 2011.</p>	<p><b>Notes</b></p> <p>There were 677,179 (2011 – 616,636) electronic uses recorded at the library during the year.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>In 2011, the comparable result for this measure was 35.0% of total library uses were electronic.</p>
12.5 NON-ELECTRONIC LIBRARY USES	
$\frac{\text{Non-electronic library uses}}{\text{Total library uses}}$	
<b>65.7% of total library uses were non-electronic</b>	
<p><b>Effectiveness Measure</b> <i>Non-electronic library uses as a percentage of total library uses.</i></p> <p><b>Objective</b> <i>Better information on library usage.</i></p>	
<p><b>Notes</b></p> <p>There were 1,297,104 (2011 – 1,145,182) non-electronic uses recorded at the library in 2012.</p> <p>In 2011, the comparable result for this measure was 65.0% of total library uses were non-electronic.</p>	

<b>Land Use Planning</b>	
<b>13.1 LOCATION OF NEW DEVELOPMENT</b>	<b>13.2 PRESERVATION OF AGRICULTURAL LAND</b>
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, 2009 Hectares of land designated for agricultural purposes in The Official Plan as of January 1, 2009
<b>100% of new development</b>	<b>100.0% of land designated</b>
<p><b>Efficiency Measure</b>                      Percentage of new-detached houses, semi-detached houses, row houses and new/condo apartments with final approval that are located within settlement areas.</p> <p><b>Objective</b>                      That new lot creation is occurring within settlement areas.</p>	<p><b>Efficiency Measure</b>                      Percentage of land designated for agricultural purposes that was not re-designated for other uses during the reporting year.</p> <p><b>Objective</b>                      Preserve agricultural land.</p>
<p><b>Notes</b></p> <p>All new development within the City is located within settlement areas for the years 2011 and 2012.</p>	<p><b>Notes</b></p> <p>There was no re-designation of agricultural land in 2012.</p> <p>As of December 31<sup>st</sup>, the City had 120 hectares of land designated for agricultural purposes in the Official Plan.</p>
<b>13.3 PRESERVATION OF AGRICULTURAL LAND RELATIVE TO BASE YEAR</b>	
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	
<b>49.4% of land designated</b>	
<p><b>Efficiency Measure</b>                      Percentage of land designated for agricultural purposes that was not re-designated for other uses relative to the base year of 2000.</p> <p><b>Objective</b>                      Preservation of agricultural land.</p>	
<p><b>Notes</b></p> <p>There was no change from 2011.</p>	

## Land Use Planning (continued)

<b>13.4 NUMBER OF HECTARES RE-DESIGNATED DURING REPORTING YEAR</b>	<b>13.5 NUMBER OF HECTARES RE-DESIGNATED SINCE JANUARY 1, 2000</b>
<b>0 hectares of land</b>	<b>123 hectares of land</b>
<p><b>Efficiency Measure</b>  <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><b>Objective</b>  <i>Preserve agricultural land.</i></p>	<p><b>Efficiency Measure</b>  <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><b>Objective</b>  <i>Preserve agricultural land.</i></p>
<p><b>Notes</b></p> <p>During 2011, there were 0 hectares of land re-designated from agricultural purposes to other purposes.</p>	<p><b>Notes</b></p> <p>Summary of hectares of land re-designated:                      2000 – 3                      2001 – 10                      2002 to 2003 – 0                      2004 – 110                      2005 to 2012 – 0</p>