



City of
Peterborough

To: Members of the Audit Committee

From: Sandra Clancy, Director of Corporate Services

Meeting Date: September 22, 2014

Subject: Report CPFS14-022
Report on Results of the 2013 Municipal Performance
Measurement Program

Purpose

A report to provide information on the City of Peterborough's 2013 results of the provincially mandated Municipal Performance Measurement Program.

Recommendation

That Council approve the recommendation outlined in Report CPFS14-022 dated September 22, 2014 from the Director of Corporate Services as follows:

That Report CPFS14-022 providing the City of Peterborough's 2013 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, CPFS14-022, 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 2013 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

Attachments: Appendix A – City of Peterborough – 2013 MPMP Report

APPENDIX A



CITY OF PETERBOROUGH

Municipal Performance Measurement Program For the year ending December 31, 2013

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 2013 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

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
1.6% of total municipal operating costs	1.9% of total municipal total costs
<p>Efficiency Measure Governance and corporate management operating costs as a percentage of total municipal operating costs.</p> <p>Objective Efficient municipal administration.</p>	<p>Efficiency Measure Governance and corporate management total costs as a percentage of total municipal operating costs.</p> <p>Objective Efficient municipal administration.</p>
<p>Notes</p> <p>The 2012 comparative result for this measure was 0.7%.</p> <p>The City saw a reduction in 2012 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 previous year measure would have been 1.5%.</p>	<p>Notes</p> <p>The 2012 comparative result for this measure was 1.1%.</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 previous year measure would have been 1.7%.</p>

Fire Services	
2.1a OPERATING COSTS FOR FIRE SERVICES	2.1b TOTAL COSTS FOR FIRE SERVICES
<u>Operating Costs for Fire Services</u> (Total Assessment / 1,000)	<u>Total Costs for Fire Services</u> (Total Assessment / 1,000)
\$1.81 per \$1,000 of property assessment	\$1.86 per \$1,000 of property assessment
<p>Efficiency Measure Operating costs for fire services per \$1,000 of assessment.</p> <p>Objective Efficient municipal management.</p>	<p>Efficiency Measure Total costs for fire services per \$1,000 of assessment.</p> <p>Objective Efficient municipal management.</p>
<p>Notes</p> <p>The 2012 comparative result for this measure was \$1.80 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>Notes</p> <p>The 2012 comparative result for this measure was \$1.85 per \$1,000 of property assessment.</p>
2.2 FIRE RELATED INJURIES	2.3 FIRE RELATED INJURIES OVER 5 YEARS
<u>Total number of residential fire related civilian injuries</u> (Total Population / 1,000)	(Total Number of residential fire related civilian injuries for <u>2009 + 2010 + 2011 + 2012 + 2013</u>) / 5 (Total Population / 1,000)
0.064 per 1,000 persons	0.089 per 1,000 persons
<p>Effectiveness Measure Number of residential fire related injuries per 1,000 persons.</p> <p>Objective Effective municipal management.</p>	<p>Effectiveness Measure Number of residential fire related injuries averaged over per 1,000 persons.</p> <p>Objective Effective municipal management.</p>
<p>Notes</p> <p>The 2012 comparative result for this measure was 0.089. Five people were injured in 2013 and seven in 2012.</p>	<p>Notes</p> <p>The 2012 comparative result for this measure was 0.102</p>

Fire Services (continued)

2.4 FIRE RELATED FATALITIES	2.5 FIRE RELATED FATALITIES OVER 5 YEARS
<u>Total number of residential fire related civilian fatalities</u> (Total Population / 1,000)	(Total Number of residential fire related civilian injuries for <u>2009 + 2010 + 2011 + 2012 + 2013</u> / 5 (Total Population / 1,000)
0 per 1,000 persons	0 per 1,000 persons
<p>Effectiveness Measure Number of residential fire related fatalities per 1,000 persons.</p> <p>Objective Effective municipal management.</p>	<p>Effectiveness Measure Number of residential fire related fatalities averaged over 5 years per 1,000 persons.</p> <p>Objective Effective municipal management.</p>
<p>Notes</p> <p>The 2012 comparative result for this measure was 0.</p>	<p>Notes</p> <p>The 2012 comparative result for this measure was .013 as there was one fire related fatality in 2008.</p>
2.6 RESIDENTIAL STRUCTURAL FIRES	
<p>1.129 per 1,000 households</p>	
<p>Effectiveness Measure Number of residential structural fires per 1,000 persons.</p> <p>Objective Effective municipal management.</p>	
<p>Notes</p> <p>The 2012 comparative result for this measure was 1.299. There were 40 residential fires in 2013 compared to 46 in 2012.</p>	

Police Services

3.1a OPERATING COSTS FOR POLICE SERVICES

3.1b TOTAL COSTS FOR POLICE SERVICES

<u>Operating costs for Police Services</u> Total population	<u>Total costs for Police Services</u> Total population
\$282.13 per person	\$296.03 per person
<p>Efficiency Measure Operating costs for police services per person.</p> <p>Objective Efficient municipal police services.</p>	<p>Efficiency Measure Total costs for police services per person.</p> <p>Objective Efficient municipal police services.</p>
<p>Notes</p> <p>The 2012 comparative result for this measure was \$276.93 per person.</p> <p>For more information, visit the Peterborough Lakefield Community Police Service's web site at: www.peterboroughpolice.com</p>	<p>Notes</p> <p>The 2012 comparative result for this measure was \$286.40 per person.</p>
3.2 VIOLENT CRIME RATE	3.3 PROPERTY CRIME RATE / 1,000
<u>Total # of actual incidents of violent crime</u> Population / 1,000	<u>Total # of actual incidents of property crime</u> Population / 1,000
10.61 violent crimes per 1,000 persons	39.06 property crimes per 1,000 persons
<p>Efficiency Measure Violent crime rate per 1,000 persons.</p> <p>Objective Safe communities.</p>	<p>Efficiency Measure Property crime rate per 1,000 persons.</p> <p>Objective Safe communities.</p>
<p>Notes</p> <p>The 2012 comparative result for this measure was 9.11 violent crimes per 1,000 persons.</p> <p>In 2013 there were a total of 835 incidents of violent crime compared to 780 in 2012.</p>	<p>Notes</p> <p>The 2012 comparative result for this measure was 39.72 property crimes per 1,000 persons.</p> <p>In 2013 there were a total of 3,074 incidents of property crime compared to 3,126 in 2012.</p>

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

10.584 crimes per 1,000 persons

60.254 crimes per 1,000 persons

Efficiency Measure

Other Criminal Code Offences, excluding traffic per 1,000 persons (Criminal Code, excluding traffic.)

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.

Note that the definition used refers to Criminal Code crimes, excluding traffic.

Objective

Safe communities

Objective

Safe communities

Notes

The 2012 comparative result for this measure was 9.428 crimes per 1,000 persons.

Notes

The 2012 comparative result for this measure was 59.060 crimes per 1,000 persons.

In 2013 there were a total of 833 actual incidents of other Criminal Code offences, excluding traffic, compared to 742 in 2012.

In 2013 there were a total of 4,742 actual incidents of violent crime, property crime, and other Criminal Code offences, excluding traffic, compared to 4,648 in 2012.

3.6 YOUTH CRIME RATE / 1,000

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

64.387 youth crimes per 1,000 youths

Efficiency Measure

Youth crime rate per 1,000 youths.

Objective

Safe communities

Notes

The 2012 comparative result for this measure was 65.147 youth crimes per 1,000 youths.

In 2013, there were a total of 339 youths cleared by charge or cleared otherwise. This number includes 111 cases (2011 – 158 cases) handled by way of Extra Judicial Measures under the Youth Criminal Justice Act.

In 2013 there were a total of 339 incidents of youth crime per 1,000 youths compared to 343 in 2012.

Youth population (ages 12 to 17) is estimated at 5,265 (2012 – 5,265) 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
<p><u>Operating costs for Building Permits & Inspection Services</u> Total value of Construction Activity – 3 year average (Based on Permits Issued)</p>	<p><u>Total costs for Building Permits & Inspection Services</u> Total value of Construction Activity – 3 year average (Based on Permits Issued)</p>
\$ 11.18 per \$1,000 of Construction Activity	\$11.18 per \$1,000 of Construction Activity
<p>Efficiency Measure Operating costs for building permits and inspection services per \$1,000 of construction activity – 3 year average (based on permits issued)</p> <p>Objective Complete building permit applications are processed quickly and accurately.</p>	<p>Efficiency Measure Total costs for building permits and inspection services per \$1,000 of construction activity – 3 year average (based on permits issued)</p> <p>Objective Complete building permit applications are processed quickly and accurately.</p>
<p>Notes</p> <p>The 2012 restated comparative result for this measure was \$11.48 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>Notes</p> <p>The 2012 restated comparative result for this measure was \$11.48 per \$1,000 of construction activity. The level of construction activity does not significantly influence total costs for building permits and inspection services.</p>
4.2a HOUSES (NOT EXCEEDING 3 STOREYS/600 SQUARE METRES)	4.2b SMALL BUILDINGS (COMMERCIAL/INDUSTRIAL NOT EXCEEDING 3 STOREYS/600 SQUARE METRES)
<p>Median number of working days to review a complete building permit application and issue a permit or not issue a permit</p>	<p>Median number of working days to review a complete building permit application and issue a permit or not issue a permit</p>
8 working days	14 working days
<p>Efficiency Measure Provincial standard is 10 working days</p> <p>Objective Complete building permit applications are processed quickly and accurately.</p>	<p>Efficiency Measure Provincial standard is 15 working days</p> <p>Objective Complete building permit applications are processed quickly and accurately.</p>
<p>Notes</p> <p>The 2012 comparative figure for this measure was 3 working days.</p>	<p>Notes</p> <p>The 2012 comparative figure for this measure was 10 working days.</p>

Building Permits & Inspection Services (continued)

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
22 working days	N/A working days
<p>Efficiency Measure Provincial standard is 20 working days</p> <p>Objective Complete building permit applications are processed quickly and accurately.</p>	<p>Efficiency Measure Provincial standard is 30 working days</p> <p>Objective Complete building permit applications are processed quickly and accurately.</p>
<p>Notes</p> <p>The 2012 comparative figure for this measure was 15 working days.</p>	<p>Notes</p> <p>There were no building permits issued in 2013 for this category. The 2012 comparative figure for this measure was 15 working days.</p>

<h1>Roadways</h1>	
5.1a OPERATING COSTS FOR PAVED ROADS	5.1b TOTAL COSTS FOR PAVED ROADS
<u>Operating costs for paved roads</u> Total paved lane kilometres	<u>Total costs for paved roads</u> Total paved lane kilometres
\$1,788.27 per paved lane kilometre	\$7,059.64 per paved lane kilometre
<p>Efficiency Measure Operating costs of paved (hard top) roads per lane kilometre.</p> <p>Objective Efficient maintenance of paved roads.</p>	<p>Efficiency Measure Total costs of paved (hard top) roads per lane kilometre.</p> <p>Objective Efficient maintenance of paved roads.</p>
<p>Notes</p> <p>The 2012 comparative result for this measure was \$2,892.73 per paved lane kilometre.</p> <p>Costs for paved roads were lower in 2013 due to personnel and equipment costs applicable to winter control and other roadways related activities.</p>	<p>Notes</p> <p>The 2012 comparative result for this measure was \$7,817.53 per paved lane kilometre.</p> <p>The explanation for the decrease in this measure is the same as measure 5.1a.</p>

Roadways (continued)

5.2a OPERATING COSTS FOR UNPAVED ROADS	5.2b TOTAL COSTS FOR UNPAVED ROADS
<u>Operating costs for unpaved roads</u> Total unpaved lane kilometres	<u>Total costs for unpaved roads</u> Total unpaved lane kilometres
\$0.00	\$4,517.50
<p>Efficiency Measure Operating costs for unpaved (loose top) roads per lane kilometre.</p> <p>Objective Efficient maintenance of unpaved roads.</p>	<p>Efficiency Measure Total costs for unpaved (loose top) roads per lane kilometre.</p> <p>Objective Efficient maintenance of unpaved roads.</p>
<p>Notes</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 2012 or 2013.</p>	<p>Notes</p> <p>There are two unpaved lane kilometres of roads in the City. Total cost for unpaved roads consists of amortization.</p> <p>The 2012 comparative result for this measure was \$4,517.50.</p>

Roadways (continued)

5.3a OPERATING COSTS FOR BRIDGES AND CULVERTS		5.3b TOTAL COSTS FOR BRIDGES AND CULVERTS	
<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	
\$0.00 per Square Metre		\$28.28 per Square Metre	
<p>Efficiency Measure Operating costs for bridges and culverts per square metre of surface area.</p> <p>Objective Efficient maintenance of bridges and culverts.</p>		<p>Efficiency Measure Total costs for bridges and culverts per square metre of surface area.</p> <p>Objective Efficient maintenance of bridges and culverts.</p>	
<p>Notes</p> <p>Operating costs in 2012 were \$0.00.</p> <p>There were no operating costs for bridges and culverts for either 2012 or 2013.</p>		<p>Notes</p> <p>Total costs include amortization of bridges along with interest on long term debt.</p> <p>The 2012 comparative result for this measure was \$40.39 per square metres of surface area on bridges and culverts. Amortization costs have decreased in 2013 bringing down the cost.</p>	
5.4a OPERATING COSTS FOR WINTER CONTROL		5.4b TOTAL COSTS FOR WINTER CONTROL	
<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	
\$2,539.01 per lane kilometre		\$2,544.72 per lane kilometre	
<p>Efficiency Measure Operating costs for winter control maintenance of roadways per lane kilometre maintained in winter.</p> <p>Objective Efficient winter control operation.</p>		<p>Efficiency Measure Total costs for winter control maintenance of roadways per lane kilometre maintained in winter.</p> <p>Objective Efficient winter control operation.</p>	
<p>Notes</p> <p>The 2012 comparative result for this measure was \$1,835.52 per lane kilometre. There were 78 incidents of winter weather in 2013 and 57 in 2012.</p> <p>Personnel and equipment costs for winter control activities were higher in 2013 than in 2012 due to the increase number of winter control incidents and freeze-thaw cycles.</p>		<p>Notes</p> <p>Total costs include amortization and interest on long term debt. The 2012 comparative result for this measure was \$1,841.24 per lane kilometre.</p> <p>The explanation for the increase in this measure is the same as 5.4a.</p>	

Roadways (continued)

5.5 CONDITION OF ROADS	5.6 CONDITION OF BRIDGES AND CULVERTS
$\frac{\text{Number of paved lane kilometres rated as good to very good}}{\text{Total number of paved lane kilometres}} \times 100$	$\frac{\text{Number of bridges and culverts rated as good to very good}}{\text{Total number of paved lane kilometres}} \times 100$
63.5% of lane kilometres	59.6 % of bridges and culverts
<p>Efficiency Measure Percentage of paved lane kilometres where condition is rated as good to very good.</p> <p>Objective Provide a paved lane system that has a pavement condition that meets municipal standards.</p>	<p>Efficiency Measure Percentage of bridges and culverts where condition is rated as good to very good.</p> <p>Objective Provide a bridge and culvert system that has a pavement condition that meets municipal standards.</p>
<p>Notes</p> <p>A complete review of the Road System has been completed using Micro Paver, an empirical program recognized across North America. This has increased the percentage of roads that are rated as good to very good.</p> <p>The 2012 comparative result for this measure was estimated at 31.7% 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>Notes</p> <p>In 2013 the Inspection Reports were updated, resulting in more accurate counts. The last update was 2008.</p> <p>The 2012 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	
$\frac{\text{Number of winter event responses that met or exceeded municipal road maintenance standards}}{\text{Total number of winter events}} \times 100$	
100.00% of winter event responses met or exceeded municipal standards	
<p>Efficiency Measure Percentage of winter event responses that met or exceeded municipal road maintenance standards.</p> <p>Objective Provide appropriate winter response.</p>	
<p>Notes</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 2013, there were 78 winter events, compared to 57 in 2012.</p> <p>The 2012 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><u>Operating costs for conventional transit</u> Total number of regular service passenger trips on conventional transit</p>	<p><u>Total costs for conventional transit</u> Total number of regular service passenger trips on conventional transit</p>
\$3.24 per regular service passenger trip	\$3.61 per regular service passenger trip
<p>Efficiency Measure Operating costs for conventional transit per regular service passenger trip.</p> <p>Objective Efficient municipal transit services.</p>	<p>Efficiency Measure Total costs for conventional transit per regular service passenger trip.</p> <p>Objective Efficient municipal transit services.</p>
<p>Notes</p> <p>The 2012 comparative result for this measure was \$2.96 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>Notes</p> <p>The 2012 comparative result for this measure was \$3.33 per regular service passenger trip.</p>
6.2 PUBLIC TRANSIT USE	
<p>Total number of conventional transit passenger <u>trips in service area in a year</u> Population of service area</p>	
43.43 trips per person	
<p>Efficiency Measure Number of conventional transit passenger trips per person in the service area in a year.</p> <p>Objective Maximum utilization of municipal transit services.</p>	
<p>Notes</p> <p>The 2012 comparative result for this measure was 43.02 conventional transit trips per person in the service area in a year.</p> <p>In 2013 there were 3,418,077 passenger trips compared to 3,385,300 in 2012.</p>	

Environmental Protection/Wastewater

7.1a OPERATING COSTS FOR COLLECTION OF WASTEWATER	7.1b TOTAL COSTS FOR COLLECTION OF WASTEWATER
<u>Operating costs for wastewater collection</u> Total kilometres of wastewater mains	<u>Total costs for wastewater collection</u> Total kilometres of wastewater mains
\$5,739.07 per kilometre of wastewater main	\$9,154.84 per kilometre of wastewater main
<p>Efficiency Measure Operating costs for collection of wastewater per kilometre of wastewater main</p> <p>Objective Efficient wastewater collection.</p>	<p>Efficiency Measure Total costs for collection of wastewater per kilometre of wastewater main</p> <p>Objective Efficient wastewater collection.</p>
<p>Notes</p> <p>The 2012 comparative result for this measure was \$5,023.11.</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.</p>	<p>Notes</p> <p>The 2012 comparative result for this measure was \$8,048.84.</p>

Environmental Protection/Wastewater (continued)

7.2a OPERATING COSTS FOR TREATMENT AND DISPOSAL OF WASTEWATER	7.2b TOTAL COSTS FOR TREATMENT AND DISPOSAL OF WASTEWATER
<u>Operating costs for wastewater treatment and disposal</u> Total megalitres of wastewater treated	<u>Total costs for wastewater treatment and disposal</u> Total megalitres of wastewater treated
\$306.07 per megalitre*	\$383.27 per megalitre*
<p>Efficiency Measure Operating costs for treatment and disposal of wastewater per megalitre.</p> <p>*A megalitre equals 1,000,000 litres or 1,000 cubic metres.</p> <p>Objective Prevention of human and environment health hazards.</p>	<p>Efficiency Measure Total costs for treatment and disposal of wastewater per megalitre.</p> <p>*A megalitre equals 1,000,000 litres or 1,000 cubic metres.</p> <p>Objective Prevention of human and environment health hazards.</p>
<p>Notes</p> <p>The 2012 comparative result for this measure was \$291.29 per megalitre.</p> <p>In 2013, the City treated 16,079 (2012 – 15,791) megalitres of wastewater.</p>	<p>Notes</p> <p>The 2012 comparative result for this measure was \$380.17 per megalitre</p>

Environmental Protection/Wastewater (continued)

7.3a OPERATING COSTS FOR COLLECTION, TREATMENT AND DISPOSAL	7.3b TOTAL COSTS FOR COLLECTION, TREATMENT AND DISPOSAL
<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
\$434.92 per megalitre *	\$588.81 per megalitre *
<p>Efficiency Measure Operating costs for collection, treatment, and disposal of wastewater per megalitre</p> <p>* A megalitre equals 1,000,000 litres or 1,000 cubic metres.</p> <p>Objective Efficient wastewater services.</p>	<p>Efficiency Measure Total costs for collection, treatment, and disposal of wastewater per megalitre</p> <p>* A megalitre equals 1,000,000 litres or 1,000 cubic metres.</p> <p>Objective Efficient wastewater services.</p>
<p>Notes</p> <p>The 2012 comparative result for this measure was \$406.12 per megalitre of wastewater treated.</p> <p>In 2013, the City treated 16,079 (2012 – 15,791) megalitres of wastewater.</p>	<p>Notes</p> <p>The 2012 comparative result for this measure was \$564.17 per megalitre of wastewater treated.</p>

Environmental Protection/Wastewater (continued)

7.4 MAIN BACKUPS	7.5 TREATMENT BYPASS
$\frac{\text{Total number of backed up wastewater mains}}{\text{Total kilometres of wastewater mains}} / 100$	$\frac{\text{Estimated megalitres of untreated wastewater}}{\text{Total megalitres of wastewater, including treated and untreated}} \times 100$
2.4931 per 100 kilometres of main	0.0% of wastewater
<p>Efficiency Measure Number of wastewater main backups per 100 kilometres of wastewater main in a year.</p> <p>Objective Prevention of human and environment health hazards.</p>	<p>Efficiency Measure Percentage of wastewater estimated to have by-passed treatment.</p> <p>A megalitre equals 1,000,000 litres or 1,000 cubic metres.</p> <p>Objective Effective wastewater and treatment and disposal services</p>
<p>Notes</p> <p>The 2012 comparative result for this measure was 0.5540 backed up wastewater mains per 100 kilometres of mains.</p> <p>During 2013 there were 9 mains backed up and 2 in 2012.</p>	<p>Notes</p> <p>The 2012 comparative result for this measure was 0.598%.</p> <p>In 2013, 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	
\$3,004.31 per kilometre of drainage system		\$5,444.24 per kilometre of drainage system	
<p>Efficiency Measure Operating costs for urban storm water management (collection, treatment and disposal) per km of drainage system.</p> <p>Objective Efficient urban storm water management.</p>		<p>Efficiency Measure Total costs for urban storm water management (collection, treatment and disposal) per km of drainage system.</p> <p>Objective Efficient urban storm water management.</p>	
<p>Notes</p> <p>The 2012 comparable result for this measure was \$3,376.78 per kilometre of drainage system.</p>		<p>Notes</p> <p>The 2012 comparable result for this measure was \$5,980.55 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>Efficiency Measure Operating costs for rural storm water management (collection, treatment and disposal) per km of drainage system.</p> <p>Objective Efficient rural storm water management.</p>		<p>Efficiency Measure Total costs for rural storm water management (collection, treatment and disposal) per km of drainage system.</p> <p>Objective Efficient rural storm water management.</p>	
<p>Notes</p> <p>All storm water management activities within the City are considered urban.</p>		<p>Notes</p> <p>All storm water management activities within the City are considered urban.</p>	

Water Services

9.1a OPERATING COSTS FOR TREATMENT OF DRINKING WATER		9.1b TOTAL COSTS FOR TREATMENT OF DRINKING WATER	
<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	
\$449.48 per megalitre		\$539.53 per megalitre	
<p>Efficiency Measure Operating costs for the treatment of drinking water per megalitre.</p> <p>Objective Efficient treatment of drinking water.</p>		<p>Efficiency Measure Total costs for the treatment of drinking water per megalitre.</p> <p>Objective Efficient treatment of drinking water.</p>	
<p>Notes</p> <p>There were 11,499 megalitres of water treated in 2013 compared to 11,200 in 2012.</p> <p>The 2012 restated comparable result for this measure was \$404.79 per megalitre.</p>		<p>Notes</p> <p>The 2012 comparable result for this measure was \$498.82 per megalitre.</p>	
9.2a OPERATING COSTS FOR DISTRIBUTION OF DRINKING WATER		9.2b TOTAL COSTS FOR DISTRIBUTION OF DRINKING WATER	
<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	
\$5,804.43 per kilometre of water distribution pipe		\$16,739.17 per kilometre of water distribution pipe	
<p>Efficiency Measure Operating costs for the distribution of drinking water per kilometre of water distribution pipe.</p> <p>Objective Efficient distribution of drinking water.</p>		<p>Efficiency Measure Total costs for the distribution of drinking water per kilometre of water distribution pipe.</p> <p>Objective Efficient distribution of drinking water.</p>	
<p>Notes</p> <p>The 2012 comparable result for this measure was \$6,363.95 per kilometre of water main pipe.</p> <p>There were 419 kilometres of water distribution pipe in the City of Peterborough in 2013 and 408 in 2012.</p>		<p>Notes</p> <p>The 2012 comparable result for this measure was \$17,530.87 per kilometre of water main pipe.</p>	

Water Services (continued)

9.3a TREATMENT AND DISTRIBUTION OF DRINKING WATER (INTREGATED SYSTEM)	9.3b TREATMENT AND DISTRIBUTION OF DRINKING WATER (INTREGATED SYSTEM)
<u>Operating costs for treatment and distribution of drinking water</u> Total megalitres of drinking water treated	<u>Total costs for treatment and distribution of drinking water</u> Total megalitres of drinking water treated
\$660.99 per megalitre	\$1,149.47 per megalitre
<p>Efficiency Measure Operating costs for the treatment and distribution of drinking water per megalitre.</p> <p>Objective Efficient treatment and distribution of drinking water.</p>	<p>Efficiency Measure Total costs for the treatment and distribution of drinking water per megalitre.</p> <p>Objective Efficient treatment and distribution of drinking water.</p>
<p>Notes</p> <p>The 2012 restated result for this measure was \$636.62 per megalitre.</p> <p>During 2013 there were 11,499 megalitres of water treated compared with 11,200 in 2012</p>	<p>Notes</p> <p>The 2012 result for this measure was \$1,137.44 per megalitre.</p>

Water Services (continued)

9.4 BOIL WATER ADVISORIES	9.5 BREAKS IN WATER MAINS
Summation of: number of boil water advisory days $\frac{\text{times the number of affected connections}}{\text{Total connections in service area}}$	$\frac{\text{Number of breaks in water mains}}{\text{Total kilometres of water main pipe} / 100}$
0 days a year	5.2506 breaks per 100 kilometres of main
<p>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.</p> <p>Objective Water is safe and meets local needs.</p>	<p>Effectiveness Measure Number of breaks in water mains per 100 kilometres of water main pipe in a year.</p> <p>Objective Improve system reliability and minimize water loss and operational costs.</p>
<p>Notes</p> <p>The number of water boil advisories in 2012 was also nil.</p>	<p>Notes</p> <p>The 2012 comparative result for this measure was 5.3922 breaks in water mains per 100 kilometres of water main pipe in a year.</p> <p>22 breaks were recorded in 2013 and 2012.</p>

Solid Waste

10.1a OPERATING COSTS FOR SOLID WASTE COLLECTION		10.1b TOTAL COSTS FOR SOLID WASTE COLLECTION	
<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	
\$85.94 per tonne		\$101.47 per tonne	
<p>Efficiency Measure Operating costs for solid waste collection per tonne</p> <p>Objective Efficient solid waste collection programs.</p>		<p>Efficiency Measure Total costs for solid waste collection per tonne</p> <p>Objective Efficient solid waste collection programs.</p>	
<p>Notes</p> <p>Although costs have remained consistent, the tonnage collected has decreased. During 2013, 13,780 (2012 – 15,914) tonnes of solid waste was collected.</p> <p>The decrease in tonnage collected in 2013 results in a higher cost per tonne than 2012. Costs for solid waste collection are relatively fixed and do not fluctuate significantly based on tonnage collected which can lead to large fluctuations in this measure.</p> <p>The comparable result for this measure was \$68.54 per tonne for solid waste collected in 2012.</p>		<p>Notes</p> <p>The comparable result for this measure was \$81.78 per tonne for solid waste collected in 2012.</p>	
10.2a OPERATING COSTS FOR SOLID WASTE DISPOSAL		10.2b TOTAL COSTS FOR SOLID WASTE DISPOSAL	
<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	
\$88.71 per tonne		\$99.10 per tonne	
<p>Efficiency Measure Operating costs (revenue) for solid waste disposal per tonne</p> <p>Objective Efficient solid waste disposal programs.</p>		<p>Efficiency Measure Total costs (revenue) for solid waste disposal per tonne</p> <p>Objective Efficient solid waste disposal programs.</p>	
<p>Notes</p> <p>During 2013, 39,048 (2012 – 47,465) tonnes of solid waste was disposed of at the landfill facility.</p> <p>The comparable result for this measure was \$58.95 in 2012.</p>		<p>Notes</p> <p>The comparable result for this measure was \$67.51 in 2012.</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
\$125.93 per tonne	\$129.14 per tonne
<p>Efficiency Measure Operating costs for solid waste diversion (recycling) per tonne</p> <p>Objective Effective solid waste diversion.</p>	<p>Efficiency Measure Total costs for solid waste diversion (recycling) per tonne</p> <p>Objective Effective solid waste diversion.</p>
<p>Notes</p> <p>During 2013, 21,141 (2012 – 20,675) tonnes of solid waste was diverted from the City's landfill facility.</p> <p>The 2012 comparative measure was \$124.12 per tonne. 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>Notes</p> <p>The 2012 measure was \$127.40 per tonne. The 2011 measure was \$98.24 per tonne. The 2010 measure was \$149.17 per tonne.</p> <p>The fluctuations in this measure are the same as stated for 10.3a.</p>

Solid Waste (continued)	
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
\$121.46 per tonne	\$132.88 per tonne
<p>Efficiency Measure Average operating costs for solid waste management (collection, disposal and diversion) per tonne</p> <p>Objective Effective solid waste management.</p>	<p>Efficiency Measure Average total costs for solid waste management (collection, disposal and diversion) per tonne</p> <p>Objective Effective solid waste management.</p>
<p>Notes</p> <p>In 2013, 60,189 (2012 – 68,140) tonnes were disposed of or diverted from all property classes.</p> <p>This measure is higher in 2013 than in 2012 as a result of fewer tonnes disposed of and higher costs related to future landfill site closure, the reconstruction of Bensfort Rd. and site operator costs.</p> <p>The 2012 comparable measure was \$96.15 per tonne.</p>	<p>Notes</p> <p>The 2012 measure was \$106.20 per tonne.</p>

Solid Waste (continued)	
10.5 COMPLAINTS FOR SOLID WASTE AND RECYCLING COLLECTION	10.6 NUMBER OF SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT SITES
<u>Number of Complaints</u> Total Households / 1,000	Total number of waste management sites
35.16 complaints per 1,000 households	4 sites
<p>Efficiency Measure Number of complaints received in a year concerning the collection of solid waste and recycled materials per 1,000 households.</p> <p>Objective Effective waste management services.</p>	<p>Efficiency Measure Total number of solid waste management facilities owned by Municipal with a Ministry of Environment (MOE) Certificate of Approval</p> <p>Objective Efficient MOE compliance.</p>
<p>Notes</p> <p>The 2012 comparative result for this measure was 21.996 complaints concerning the collection of garbage and recycled materials per 1,000 households.</p>	<p>Notes</p> <p>The City owns 4 facilities. They are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Peterborough County-City Waste Management Facility (ownership is equally shared) - Peterborough Materials Recycling Facility - Harper Road Compost Site - Peterborough Household Hazardous Waste Facility
10.7 COMPLIANCE ORDER FOR REMEDIATION	10.8 DIVERSION OF RESIDENTIAL SOLID WASTE
Days a year an MOE compliance order for remediation was in effect	<u>Total tonnes of residential solid waste diverted</u> Total tonnes of residential solid waste disposed of and total tonnes diverted
0 days	57.3% of residential solid waste diverted for recycling
<p>Efficiency Measure Number of days a year an MOE compliance order for remediation was in effect.</p> <p>Objective Effective compliance.</p>	<p>Efficiency Measure Percentage of residential solid waste diverted for recycling.</p> <p>Objective Efficient waste diversion for recycling.</p>
<p>Notes</p> <p>There were no days in either 2011 or 2010 when a compliance order for remediation was in effect.</p>	<p>Notes</p> <p>During 2013, 18,990 (2012 – 18,625) tonnes of residential solid waste was diverted.</p> <p>The 2012 comparative result for this measure was 56.1% 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	
\$39.72 per person		\$48.42 per person	
<p>Efficiency Measure Operating costs for parks per person</p> <p>Objective Efficient operation of parks.</p>		<p>Efficiency Measure Total costs for parks per person</p> <p>Objective Efficient operation of parks.</p>	
<p>Notes</p> <p>The City's parks provide opportunities and benefits for active, passive and programmed community recreation and leisure; contribute to the preservation and protection of open space and the environment and are generally accessible to the public all of the time, or when programs are not taking place.</p> <p>In 2012, the comparative result was \$40.09 per person for the operation of parks.</p>		<p>Notes</p> <p>In 2012, the comparative result was \$48.51 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	
\$18.72 per person		\$18.72 per person	
<p>Efficiency Measure Operating costs for recreation programs per person</p> <p>Objective Efficient operation of recreation programs.</p>		<p>Efficiency Measure Operating costs for recreation programs per person</p> <p>Objective Efficient operation of recreation programs.</p>	
<p>Notes</p> <p>Recreation programs include a broad range of programs, services and activities. They include both registered and unregistered drop-in programs and clubs.</p> <p>In 2012, the comparative result for this measure was \$17.64 per person.</p>		<p>Notes</p> <p>In 2012, the comparative result for this measure was \$17.64 per person.</p>	

Parks and Recreation (continued)

11.3a OPERATING COSTS FOR RECREATION FACILITIES	11.3b TOTAL COSTS FOR RECREATION FACILITIES
<u>Operating costs for recreation facilities</u> Total population	<u>Total costs for recreation facilities</u> Total population
\$119.13 per person	\$150.38 per person
<p>Efficiency Measure Operating costs for recreation facilities per person</p> <p>Objective Efficient operation of recreation facilities.</p>	<p>Efficiency Measure Total costs for recreation facilities per person</p> <p>Objective Efficient operation of recreation facilities.</p>
<p>Notes</p> <p>Recreation facilities include built or enclosed structures used for the purposes of community recreation and leisure and include each of the City's arenas as well as the Memorial Centre and the Peterborough Sport and Wellness Centre (PSWC).</p> <p>In 2012, the comparative result for this measure was \$109.18 per person.</p>	<p>Notes</p> <p>In 2012, the comparative result for this measure was \$142.34 per person.</p>
11.4a OPERATING COSTS FOR RECREATION PROGRAMS AND FACILITIES	11.4b TOTAL COSTS FOR RECREATION PROGRAMS AND FACILITIES
<u>Operating costs for recreation programs and recreation facilities</u> Total population	<u>Total costs for recreation programs and recreation facilities</u> Total population
\$137.85 per person	\$169.10 per person
<p>Efficiency Measure Operating costs for recreation programs and recreation facilities per person.</p> <p>Objective Efficient operation of recreation programs and recreation facilities.</p>	<p>Efficiency Measure Total costs for recreation programs and recreation facilities per person.</p> <p>Objective Efficient operation of recreation programs and recreation facilities.</p>
<p>Notes</p> <p>This represents a subtotal for measures 11.2a and 11.3a.</p> <p>In 2012, the comparable result for this measure was \$126.82 per person.</p>	<p>Notes</p> <p>This represents a subtotal for measures 11.2b and 11.3b.</p> <p>In 2012, the comparable result for this measure was \$159.98 per person.</p>

Parks and Recreation (continued)

11.5 TOTAL KILOMETRES OF TRAILS	11.6 HECTARES OF OPEN SPACE
$\frac{\text{Total kilometres of trails}}{\text{Total population} / 1,000}$	$\frac{\text{Total hectares of open space}}{\text{Total population} / 1,000}$
0.356 kilometres of trails per 1,000 persons	7.611 hectares of open space per 1,000 persons
<p>Effectiveness Measure Kilometres of trails per 1,000 persons.</p> <p>Objective Trails provide recreation opportunities.</p>	<p>Effectiveness Measure Hectares of open space per 1,000 persons.</p> <p>Objective Open space is adequate for population.</p>
<p>Notes</p> <p>The 2012 comparative result for this measure was 0.356 km of trails per 1,000 persons.</p> <p>The City has 28 kilometres (2012 – 28 km) of trails.</p>	<p>Notes</p> <p>In 2012, the restated comparative result was 7.611 hectares of open space per 1,000 persons.</p>

Parks and Recreation (continued)

11.7 PARTICIPANT HOURS FOR RECREATION PROGRAMS	11.8 INDOOR RECREATION FACILITY SPACE
Total participant hours for recreation programs: <u>registered, drop-in and permitted programs</u> Total population / 1,000	<u>Square metres of indoor recreation facility space</u> Total population / 1,000
21,443 participant hours of recreation programs per 1,000 persons	710.178 square metres of indoor recreation facility space per 1,000 persons
Effectiveness Measure Total participant hours for recreation programs per 1,000 persons.	Effectiveness Measure Square metres of indoor recreation facility space per 1,000 persons.
Objective Recreation programs serve needs of residents.	Objective Indoor recreation facility space is adequate for population.
Notes In 2012, the comparative result was 20,326 recreation hours per 1,000 persons.	Notes In 2012, the comparative result for this measure was 710.178 square metres of indoor recreation facility space per 1,000 persons. The City has a total of 55,891 square metres of indoor recreation facility space.
11.9 Outdoor Recreation Facility Space	
<u>Square metres of outdoor recreation facility space with controlled access and electrical or mechanical functions</u> Total population / 1,000	
630.76 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 2012, the comparative result for this measure was 452.872 square metres of outdoor recreation facility space per 1,000 persons. The City has a total of 49,641 square metres of outdoor recreation facility space, with the addition of two Fleming Sport fields this year (2012 - 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
\$28.56 per person	\$34.07 per person
<p>Efficiency Measure Operating costs for library services per person</p> <p>Objective Efficient library services.</p>	<p>Efficiency Measure Total costs for library services per person</p> <p>Objective Efficient library services.</p>
<p>Notes</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 http://www.peterborough.library.on.ca</p> <p>The comparable result for this measure was \$27.58 per person in 2012.</p>	<p>Notes</p> <p>The comparable result for this measure was \$33.03 per person in 2012.</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
\$1.29 per use	\$1.55 per use
<p>Efficiency Measure Operating costs for library services per use</p> <p>Objective Efficient library services.</p>	<p>Efficiency Measure Operating costs for library services per use</p> <p>Objective Efficient library services.</p>
<p>Notes</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 2013 there were a total of 1,748,699 (2012 – 1,974,283) uses of library services.</p> <p>The comparable result for this measure was \$1.10 per use in 2012.</p>	<p>Notes</p> <p>The comparable result for this measure was \$1.32 per use in 2012.</p>

LIBRARY SERVICES (continued)

12.3 LIBRARY USES PER PERSON	12.4 ELECTRONIC LIBRARY USES
$\frac{\text{Total library uses}}{\text{Total population}}$	$\frac{\text{Electronic library uses}}{\text{Total library uses}}$
22.22 per person	26% of total library uses were electronic
<p>Effectiveness Measure Library uses per person</p> <p>Objective Increased use of library services.</p>	<p>Effectiveness Measure Electronic library uses as a percentage of total library uses.</p> <p>Objective Better information on library usage.</p>
<p>Notes</p> <p>The comparable result for this measure was 25.086 library uses per person in 2011.</p>	<p>Notes</p> <p>There were 455,500 (2012 – 677,179) 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 2012, the comparable result for this measure was 34.3% of total library uses were electronic.</p>
12.5 NON-ELECTRONIC LIBRARY USES	
$\frac{\text{Non-electronic library uses}}{\text{Total library uses}}$	
74% of total library uses were non-electronic	
<p>Effectiveness Measure Non-electronic library uses as a percentage of total library uses.</p> <p>Objective Better information on library usage.</p>	
<p>Notes</p> <p>There were 1,293,199 (2011 – 1,297,104) non-electronic uses recorded at the library in 2013.</p> <p>In 2012, the comparable result for this measure was 65.7% of total library uses were non-electronic.</p>	

Land Use Planning	
13.1 LOCATION OF NEW DEVELOPMENT	13.2 PRESERVATION OF AGRICULTURAL LAND
<p>Number of residential units in new detached houses, semi-detached houses, row houses and new/condo apartments located within settlement areas</p> <p>Total number of new residential units within the entire municipality</p>	<p>Hectares of land designated for agricultural purposes in the Official Plan as of December 31, 2009</p> <p>Hectares of land designated for agricultural purposes in The Official Plan as of January 1, 2009</p>
100% of new development	100.0% of land designated
<p>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.</p> <p>Objective That new lot creation is occurring within settlement areas.</p>	<p>Efficiency Measure Percentage of land designated for agricultural purposes that was not re-designated for other uses during the reporting year.</p> <p>Objective Preserve agricultural land.</p>
<p>Notes</p> <p>All new development within the City is located within settlement areas for the years 2012 and 2013.</p>	<p>Notes</p> <p>There was no re-designation of agricultural land in 2013.</p> <p>As of December 31st, the City had 120 hectares of land designated for agricultural purposes in the Official Plan.</p>
13.3 PRESERVATION OF AGRICULTURAL LAND RELATIVE TO BASE YEAR	
<p><u>Hectares of land designated for agricultural purpose in the Official Plan as of December 31, 2009</u> Hectares of land designated for agricultural purposes in the Official Plan as of January 1, 2000</p>	
49.4% of land designated	
<p>Efficiency Measure Percentage of land designated for agricultural purposes that was not re-designated for other uses relative to the base year of 2000.</p> <p>Objective Preservation of agricultural land.</p>	
<p>Notes</p> <p>There was no change from 2012.</p>	

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
<p>Efficiency Measure Number of hectares of land originally designated for agricultural purposes that was re-designated for other uses during the reporting year.</p> <p>Objective Preserve agricultural land.</p>	<p>Efficiency Measure Number of hectares of land originally designated for agricultural purpose that was re-designated for other uses since January 1, 2000.</p> <p>Objective Preserve agricultural land.</p>
<p>Notes</p> <p>During 2012, there were 0 hectares of land re-designated from agricultural purposes to other purposes.</p>	<p>Notes</p> <p>Summary of hectares of land re-designated: 2000 – 3 2001 – 10 2002 to 2003 – 0 2004 – 110 2005 to 2013 – 0</p>