



City of Kingston

**Municipal Performance Measurement Program (MPMP) Report
for the 2010 Reporting Year**

Volume 11

Background

The Municipal Performance Measurement Program (MPMP) is a Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing-led initiative that requires municipalities to publicly report service delivery achievement over time.

It encourages accountability and transparency because the annual results must be published for all to see. It also helps municipal Councils establish priorities and allocate budget dollars to achieve desired results and improvements.

Most importantly, MPMP can lead to improved service delivery because it focuses on actual results and how effectively and efficiently resources are being used.

MPMP was initiated by the provincial Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing in 2000 as a means of demonstrating how efficiently and effectively their municipality is operating, thereby helping to hold municipalities to account, and eventually improving service delivery to Ontario residents. The program requires Ontario municipalities to track and report performance measures on the services that are most visible and represent the highest percentage of the municipal budget.

Purpose of this Report

This report card provides a summary of the Kingston MPMP results for the year 2010 and previous years. It is important that municipal leaders compare their reports, explore the reasons for differences and understand the actions taken that led to the results.

The reported results need to be reviewed and assessed to understand if the differences are due to factors such as population size, location, climate or economic conditions versus better management strategies and practices. Once the unique circumstances are understood, comparison data can be used to make service level or budget decisions that will lead to service improvements.

Readers are encouraged to review the Handbook prepared by the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing, which provides detailed information regarding the purposes of, and background to, the program. The Handbook is available on the Ministry's web site at <http://www.mah.gov.on.ca/Page314.aspx>

Additional Information

We encourage you to review the results and share your comments. Reports from previous years are available on the City of Kingston's web site at: www.cityofkingston.ca/cityhall/reportcard

Your feedback is important to us. Contact details for those with responsibility for each service delivery area are included within the report. You can also raise issues with your district councillor or by contacting the Organization Development team at contactus@cityofkingston.ca or by phone at 613-546-0000.

Frequently Asked Questions

What is being measured?

To get an accurate picture of municipal service delivery, indicators for both efficiency and effectiveness measures have been developed. It is important to measure both efficiency and effectiveness to achieve optimum service delivery results. A higher service level can always be purchased for more money. Similarly, cutting spending can lead to a decline in service effectiveness. The goal is to deliver the level of service and quality the citizens of Kingston desire, for the best possible price.

Efficiency indicators measure the amount of staff time and other income/expenditure used to deliver a service – the cost of service delivery, expressed as a dollar value per person or service level provided.

Effectiveness indicators measure the extent to which a service is achieving its intended results – service quality and outputs, benefits to citizens measured in non-financial terms.

Are Performance Measures for all municipal services being reported?

Municipalities deliver a wide range of services and programs. To date, only the service areas that have the greatest impact on citizens are being measured. The criteria used to determine the service areas include major cost, high interest and value to the public and data that is relatively easy to collect. Performance results published in this report are for the calendar year ending December 31, 2010.

Can Kingston's results be compared to previous years?

Formulas for all **efficiency** measures were changed in 2005 to improve the definition of operating costs by including external transfers. Therefore, comparisons are generally limited to 2005 to 2009. Large scale accounting changes imposed on all municipalities in 2009 has meant that 2009 and 2010 costs are not, in many instances, comparable to previous years. The changes relate to how capital (e.g. costs of building assets) and operating (e.g. salaries, general supplies) costs are classified. Where there have been changes to how costs are disclosed in this way, the report has tried to demonstrate this.

Effectiveness measures however do continue to allow for meaningful comparison for the full period covered by the report card process as these relate to outputs, and not costs.

KINGSTON

Municipal Performance Measurement Program • 2010 RESULTS

Can Kingston's results be compared to other municipalities?

All municipalities have a responsibility to make their MPMP results public. There is a web-based application available to municipalities called MIDAS (Municipal Information & Data Analysis System), which provides Ontario's 444 municipalities with the ability to compare performance statistics against each other with the end result that they are able to identify differences in performance and consider the reasons why. It is hoped that the use of MIDAS will enhance overall transparency through the normal systems of governance and accountability already in existence at the City, challenge existing assumptions, and encourage even more effective strategic management of performance.

What factors need to be considered when comparing results to other municipalities?

There are many factors that need to be considered when making comparisons. Demographics, decisions of local Councils, local wage rates, the age of infrastructure, and reporting methods are some of the factors that impact local results.

How can performance data help improve service delivery?

Performance data focuses on results. The data can be used by municipal Councils to evaluate the impact of budget and service level decisions against the achievement of municipal goals. Comparison data can help municipal staff to determine how well they are delivering services in comparison to other municipalities. Best practice reviews can reveal what others are doing to achieve optimum results.

Questions about MPMP results should be addressed to:

Name: Customer Service Department	Phone: 613-546-0000
Title:	
Municipality: City of Kingston	
E-mail:	

Related documents and links:

Local Government

S. Dickey, Manager of Finance, Financial Services, 613-546-4291 ext.2370 sdickey@cityofkingston.ca

1.1 GENERAL GOVERNMENT - EFFICIENCY

	2010	2009		
1.1 a) Operating costs for governance and corporate management as a percentage of total municipal operating costs.	3.6%	4.0%		
1.1 b) Total costs for governance and corporate management as a percentage of total municipal costs.	3.7%	4.0%		

OBJECTIVE:
Efficient local government.

NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:
Total operating costs for governance and corporate management for 2010 are reported at \$11,357,034. The total municipal operating costs are \$314,842,428. The 2009 operating costs contained some specific one-time projects, accounting for most of the reason for the improved efficiency figures for 2010.

REFERENCE:

- The total costs efficiency measure was new for 2009. Total costs are operating costs as defined in MPMP plus amortization and interest on long-term debt.
- The 2009-2010 formulas for operating costs and total costs were changed to net out payments to the Municipal Property Assessment Corporation (MPAC) and tax write-offs & allowances reported in Schedule 40, Consolidated Statement of Operations: Expenses.
- Financial Information Return: 91 0206 35 (Operating costs measure) and 91 0206 45 (Total costs measure).

Fire Services

H. Tulk, Fire Chief, 613-548-4001 ext.5204 htulk@cityofkingston.ca

2.1 FIRE SERVICES

	2010	2009	2008	2007	2006	2005
2.1 a) Operating costs for fire services per \$1,000 of assessment.	\$ 1.87	\$ 1.95	\$ 2.04	\$ 2.01	\$ 1.86	\$ 1.94
2.1 b) Total costs for fire services per \$1,000 of assessment.	\$ 1.93	\$ 2.02				

OBJECTIVE:

Efficient fire services.

NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:

The City's fire service had been determined to be significantly understaffed and under resourced post-amalgamation and in 2005 we initiated a concerted, systematic strategy to properly staff and resource the service to meet the needs and circumstances of the community and the response standards established by Council. The return on the investment in staffing and improved operations is evidenced by an improvement in insurance gradings throughout the municipality.

REFERENCE:

- The efficiency measure based on total costs was new for 2009. Total costs are operating costs as defined in MPMP plus amortization and interest on long-term debt.
- Financial Information Return: 91 1103 35 (Operating costs measure) and 91 1103 45 (Total costs measure).

Line number for 2010 and prior years:

If amounts for unfunded liabilities are not material for fire services and there are no changes in what are deemed to be capital expenses, then,

- The efficiency measure based on operating costs for fire services in 91 1103 35 for 2009 and 2010 is comparable to the efficiency measure in 91 1102 13 for the years 2005 to 2008.

2.2 & 2.3 CIVILIAN FIRE RELATED INJURIES

		2010	2009
2.2	Number of residential fire related injuries per 1,000 persons.	0.042	0.042
2.3	Number of residential fire related injuries averaged over 5 years per 1,000 persons.	0.050	0.034
OBJECTIVE: Minimize the number of civilian injuries in residential fires.			
NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS: Special emphasis is placed on public education in our fire prevention programs at the elementary school level through to senior citizens. The programs include desired behaviour when confronted with fire emergencies in their residence.			
REFERENCE: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The effectiveness measures for fire services were new for 2009. • Measures 2.2 and 2.3 refer to the number of civilian injuries. • Financial Information Return: 92 1151 07 (2.2) and 92 1152 07 (2.3). 			

2.4 & 2.5 CIVILIAN FIRE RELATED FATALITIES - EFFECTIVENESS

		2010	2009
2.4	Number of residential fire related fatalities per 1,000 persons.	0.008	0.000
2.5	Number of residential fire related fatalities averaged over 5 years per 1,000 persons.	0.000	0.008
OBJECTIVE: Minimize the number of civilian fatalities in residential fires.			
NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS: Special emphasis is placed on public education programs in fire service operations. This includes appropriate measures to be taken by citizens under fire conditions. We are confident this will minimize loss of life due to fire in the community.			
REFERENCE: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The effectiveness measures for fire services were new for 2009. • Measures 2.4 and 2.5 refer to the number of civilian fatalities. • Financial Information Return: 92 1155 07 (2.4) and 92 1156 07 (2.5). 			

2.6 NUMBER OF RESIDENTIAL STRUCTURAL FIRES

		2010	2009
2.6	Number of residential structural fires per 1,000 households.	1.398	1.630
OBJECTIVE: Minimize the number of residential structural fires.			
NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS: Special emphasis is placed on public education in our fire prevention programs at the elementary school level through to senior citizens.			
REFERENCE:			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The effectiveness measures for fire services were new for 2009. • Financial Information Return: 92 1160 07. 			

Police Services

Chief of Police, Kingston Police, 613-549-4660 ext. 2213, chief@kpf.ca

3.1 POLICE SERVICES

	2010	2009
3.1 a) Operating costs for police services per person. ¹	\$ 255.35	\$ 240.61
3.1 b) Total costs for police services per person.	\$ 281.48	\$ 262.47

OBJECTIVE:

Efficient police services.

NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:

The increase to \$255.35 compares to \$240.61 last year and represents an increase of 6.1%. This is primarily related to contractual wage increases plus the move to fill staff vacancies in order to achieve all program initiatives aimed at increased police enforcement related to traffic violations and drug enforcement. Although the costs incurred for policing have increased, much of the increase was offset by cost reimbursement and additional provincial grants from proceeds of crime that totaled \$17.90 per person. The operating expense budget increase for 2010 was 3.4%.

REFERENCE:

- Financial Information Return: 91 1204 35 (Operating costs measure) and 91 1204 45 (Total costs measure).

Line numbers for 2010 and prior years:

Report results for 2009 and 2010 only, unless results for prior years are restated. In determining whether to restate the efficiency measure based on operating costs for police services, consider whether amounts for unfunded liabilities are material and whether there are changes in what are deemed to be capital expenses.

- The efficiency measure based on operating costs for police services in 91 1204 35 for 2009 and 2010 may be compared to the measure in 91 1203 13 for 2005 to 2008, provided costs for prisoner transportation and court security are included.

3.2 VIOLENT CRIME RATE

		2010	2009
3.2	Violent crime rate per 1,000 persons. ¹	11.31	12.37
OBJECTIVE: Safe communities.			
NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS: Violent crime rates were down slightly from 2009, but are still consistent with the long term trend.			
REFERENCE:			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ¹ Statistics Canada has expanded the definition of violent crime. Therefore, prior years are not comparable unless restated. 			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Financial Information Return: 92 1258 07. 			

3.3 PROPERTY CRIME RATE

		2010	2009
3.3	Property crime rate per 1,000 persons. ¹	42.5	40.4
OBJECTIVE: Safe communities.			
NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS: Property crime rates have decreased fairly consistently for the last seven years from a high of 59 (2004) to 42.5 (2010), a decrease of 28%.			
REFERENCE:			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ¹ Statistics Canada has expanded the definition of property crime. Therefore, prior years are not comparable unless restated. 			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Financial Information Return: 92 1259 07. 			

3.4 TOTAL CRIME RATE

	2010	2009	2008	2007	2006	2005
3.4 Total crime rate per 1,000 persons (<i>Criminal Code</i> offences, excluding traffic).	61.4	59.6	66.0	68.0	76.0	70.0

OBJECTIVE:

Safe communities.

NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:

Total crime rates have continued to trend slightly downward over the last five years. A decrease from 70 (2005) to 61.4 (2010) is a decrease of 12%.

REFERENCE:

- Financial Information Return: 92 1263 07.

3.5 YOUTH CRIME RATE

	2010	2009	2008	2007	2006	2005
3.5 Youth crime rate per 1,000 youths.	36.2	44.5	37.0	38.0	43.0	34.0

OBJECTIVE:

Safe communities.

NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:

Youth crime rates have remained relatively stable over the past five years.

REFERENCE:

- Financial Information Return: 92 1265 07.

Roads

D Wells, Director, Public Works, 613-546-4291 ext. 2313 dwells@cityofkingston.ca

4.1 PAVED ROADS

	2010	2009	2008	2007	2006	2005
4.1 a) Operating costs for paved (hard top) roads per lane kilometre.	\$ 3,073.03	\$ 2,751.75	\$ 1,153.00	\$ 965.00	\$ 1,082.00	\$ 958.00
4.1 b) Total costs for paved (hard top) roads per lane kilometre.	\$ 8,510.01	\$ 8,406.49				

OBJECTIVE:

Efficient maintenance of paved roads.

NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:

Total operating costs for paved (hard top) roads for 2010 were \$5,325,560. This compares to \$4,812,816 for 2009. Due to changes in the accounting treatment of previously capitalized costs as operating expenses, the efficiency measures are not easily comparable to 2008 and prior years. Additional capital costs within the 2010 figure equate to around \$886K (made up of \$650K in contracted services and \$236K in salaries and benefits). In 2009, a total of \$884K had been added to operating costs from non-asset related capital projects (\$672K in contracted services and \$212K in salaries and benefits). If we compare 2010 to 2009, operating costs for paved roads per lane kilometre have increased. The increase is largely due to allocation of program support expenses which have increased to \$944,942 in 2010 as compared to \$298,878 in 2009. Overall, program support expenses increased in 2010 as a result of more corporate wide initiatives. 2009 operating/total costs were adjusted to realign costs from paved roads (roadside maintenance - ditches & culverts) to rural storm water management to reflect correct reporting treatment and to allow for better comparability between years.

REFERENCE:

- The efficiency measure based on total costs was new for 2009. Total costs are operating costs as defined in MPMP plus amortization and interest on long-term debt.
- Financial Information Return: 91 2109 35 (Operating costs measure) and 91 2109 45 (Total costs measure).

Line numbers for 2010 and prior years:

If amounts for unfunded liabilities are not material for paved roads and there are no changes in what are deemed to be capital expenses, then,

- The efficiency measure based on operating costs for paved roads in 91 2109 35 for 2009 and 2010 is comparable to the measure in 91 2107 13 for 2005 to 2008.

4.2 UNPAVED ROADS

	2010	2009	2008	2007	2006	2005
4.2 a) Operating costs for unpaved (loose top) roads per lane kilometre.	\$ 2,018.81	\$ 1,698.86	\$ 1,597.00	\$ 1,991.00	\$ 1,703.00	\$ 1,559.00
4.2 b) Total costs for unpaved (loose top) roads per lane kilometre.	\$ 2,608.77	\$ 2,328.67				

OBJECTIVE:

Efficient maintenance of unpaved roads.

NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:

2010 operating costs for unpaved roads were \$106,997. This compares to \$86,642 in 2009. The total unpaved lane KM's increased to 53 from 51. The increased costs are a result of additional effort being put towards unpaved road maintenance plus some minimal additional cost for the increase in lane kilometres.

REFERENCE:

- The efficiency measure based on total costs was new for 2009. Total costs are operating costs as defined in MPMP plus amortization and interest on long-term debt.
- Financial Information Return: 91 2110 35 (Operating costs measure) and 91 2110 45 (Total costs measure).

Line numbers for 2010 and prior years:

If amounts for unfunded liabilities are not material for unpaved roads and there are no changes in what are deemed to be capital expenses, then,

- The efficiency measure based on operating costs for unpaved roads in 91 2110 35 for 2009 and 2010 is comparable to the measure in 91 2108 13 for 2005 to 2008.

4.3 BRIDGES AND CULVERTS

	2010	2009
4.3 a) Operating costs for bridges and culverts per square metre of surface area.	\$ 6.36	\$ 2.48
4.3 b) Total costs for bridges and culverts per square metre of surface area.	\$ 29.42	\$ 24.28
OBJECTIVE: Efficient maintenance of bridges and culverts.		
NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS: Total operating costs for Bridges and Culverts for 2010 were \$122,924, to service 19,317 square metres of bridges/culverts. This compares to \$47,984 to service 19,317 square metres of bridges/culverts in 2009. Due to changes in the accounting treatment which expenses all non-asset related expenditures in the current year; there is an additional \$19K included in salaries and benefits from a one time operational study. If we compare 2010 to 2009, operating costs for bridges and culverts have increased. This increase is largely due to contracted services which have increased to \$59K in 2010 as compared to \$38K in 2009 and allocation of program support expenses which have increased to \$35,878 in 2010 as compared to \$2K in 2009. The contracted services expenses represent the work associated with bridge washing and graffiti removal.		
REFERENCE: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The efficiency measures for bridges and culverts were new for 2009. Total costs are operating costs as defined in MPMP plus amortization and interest on long-term debt. • Financial Information Return: 91 2130 35 (Operating costs measure) and 91 2130 45 (Total costs measure). 		

4.4 WINTER MAINTENANCE OF ROADS

	2010	2009	2008	2007	2006	2005
4.4 a) Operating costs for winter maintenance of roadways per lane kilometre maintained in winter.	\$ 2,299.94	\$ 2,654.56	\$ 4,125.00	\$ 3,785.00	\$ 1,902.00	\$ 2,495.00
4.4 b) Total costs for winter maintenance of roadways per lane kilometre maintained in winter.	\$ 2,299.94	\$ 2,654.56				

OBJECTIVE:

Efficient winter maintenance of roads.

NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:

Operating costs for winter maintenance of roadways (excluding sidewalks and parking lots) for 2010 were \$4,109,997 to service 1,787 KM's of roadway. This compares to costs of \$4,778,212 to service 1,800 KM's of roadway for 2009. If we compare 2010 to 2009, operating costs for winter maintenance have decreased. This decrease is largely due to materials expenses which have decreased to \$696K in 2010 as compared to \$1.077M in 2009 and contracted services expenses which have decreased to \$974K in 2010 as compared to \$1.163M in 2009. Decreases are due to differences in winter weather experienced, year to year. As reported in the 2008 MPMP report, 2008 costs were unusually high due to a long winter season necessitated by winter control shifts being initiated earlier.

REFERENCE:

- The total costs efficiency measure was new for 2009. Total costs are operating costs as defined in MPMP plus amortization and interest on long-term debt.
- Financial Information Return: 91 2205 35 (Operating costs measure) and 91 2205 45 (Total costs measure).

Line numbers for 2010 and prior years:

If amounts for unfunded liabilities are not material for winter maintenance of roadways and there are no changes in what are deemed to be capital expenses, then,

- The efficiency measure based on operating costs for winter maintenance of roads in 91 2205 35 for 2009 and 2010 is comparable to the efficiency measure in 91 2204 13 for the years 2005 to 2008.

4.5 ADEQUACY OF PAVED ROADS

	2010	2009	2008	2007	2006	2005
4.5 Percentage of paved lane kilometres where the condition is rated as good to very good. ¹	69.4%	68.2%	70.5%	70.4%	71.7%	69.0%

OBJECTIVE:

Pavement condition meets municipal objectives.

NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:

The values recorded in 2005, 2009 and 2010 reflect actual inspections conducted of the entire road network. Changes from year over year reflect the continued aging of roads which are derived through computer modeling as well as the improvement of roads where work has been completed under the capital program.

REFERENCE:

- ¹Pavement condition is rated using a Pavement Condition Index (PCI) such as the Index used by the Ontario Good Roads Association (OGRA) or the Ministry of Transportation's Roads Inventory Management System (RIMS).

- Financial Information Return: 92 2152 07.

4.6 ADEQUACY OF BRIDGES AND CULVERTS

	2010	2009	
4.6 Percentage of bridges and culverts where the condition is rated as good to very good. ¹	88.8%	88.8%	

OBJECTIVE:

Safe bridges and culverts.

NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:

As with all Ontario municipalities a regulated process (OSIM) is utilized to evaluate all of the City's bridges and culverts. All of the bridges have been ranked as good or very good. Forty-five of the fifty-five culverts in the City have been rated as good or very good. Of the ten culverts that were rated lower than good, nine of them are located under pedestrian pathways and only one is subjected to vehicular traffic loads. This culvert is structurally sound and will be monitored regularly.

REFERENCE:

- The effectiveness measure for bridges and culverts was new for 2009.
- ¹A bridge or culvert is rated in good to very good condition if distress to the primary components is minimal, requiring only maintenance. Primary components are the main load carrying components of the structure, including the deck, beams, girders, abutments, foundations, etc.

- Financial Information Return: 92 2165 07.

4.7 WINTER EVENT RESPONSES

	2010	2009	2008	2007	2006	2005
4.7 Percentage of winter events where the response met or exceeded locally determined municipal service levels for road maintenance.	95%	96%	94%	95%	95%	96%
OBJECTIVE: Response to winter storm events meets locally determined service levels for winter road maintenance.						
NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS: Consistent with prior years.						
REFERENCE: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Financial Information Return: 92 2251 07. 						

Conventional Transit

S. Kidd, Director, Transportation Services, 613-546-4291 ext.2221 skidd@cityofkingston.ca

5.1 CONVENTIONAL TRANSIT

	2010	2009	2008	2007	2006	2005
5.1 a) Operating costs for conventional transit per regular service passenger trip.	\$ 3.71	\$ 3.68	\$ 4.11	\$ 4.03	\$ 3.90	\$ 3.63
5.1 b) Total costs for conventional transit per regular service passenger trip.	\$ 4.02	\$ 4.04				

OBJECTIVE:

Efficient conventional transit services.

NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:

Results for 2010 are consistent with those reported in 2009. The marginal increase in operating costs is offset by continued growth in ridership and revenue. Increase in operating costs includes the implementation of two new routes (Route 7, Route 18) effective September 2010.

REFERENCE:

- The efficiency measure based on total costs was new for 2009. Total costs are operating costs as defined in MPMP plus amortization and interest on long-term debt.
- Financial Information Return: 91 2203 35 (Operating costs measure) and 91 2203 45 (Total costs measure).

Line numbers for 2010 and prior years:

If amounts for unfunded liabilities are not material for conventional transit and there are no changes in what are deemed to be capital expenses, then,

- The efficiency measure based on operating costs for transit in 91 2303 35 for 2009 and 2010 is comparable to the efficiency measure in 91 2302 13 for the years 2005 to 2008.

5.2 CONVENTIONAL TRANSIT RIDERSHIP

	2010	2009	2008	2007	2006	2005
5.2 Number of conventional transit passenger trips per person in the service area in a year.	31.0	30.0	30.0	29.0	27.0	26.0

OBJECTIVE:

Maximum utilization of municipal transit services.

NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:

The continued positive trend in ridership reflects the investments made to improve Kingston Transit from 2005-2008. A portion of ridership increase can also be attributed to the implementation of two new routes (Route 7, Route 18) in September 2010.

REFERENCE:

- Financial Information Return: 92 2351 07.

Wastewater (Sewage)

K Riley, Manager, Waste and Wastewater Operations, 613-546-1181 ext. 2224

6.1 WASTEWATER COLLECTION/CONVEYANCE

	2010	2009	2008	2007	2006
6.1 a) Operating costs for the collection/conveyance of wastewater per kilometre of wastewater main.	\$ 11,533.17	\$ 11,877.21	\$ 4,795.00	\$ 5,392.00	\$ 5,065.00
6.1 b) Total costs for the collection/conveyance of wastewater per kilometre of wastewater main.	\$ 14,211.98	\$ 14,446.49			

OBJECTIVE:

Efficient municipal wastewater collection/conveyance.

NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:

Total operating costs for the collection/conveyance of wastewater for 2010 were \$6,043,381 to service 524 KM of wastewater mains. This compares to costs of \$6,140,515 to service 517 KM of wastewater mains in 2009. Due to changes in the accounting treatment, the efficiency measures are not easily comparable to 2008 and prior years. An additional \$1.028M of costs were included in 2010 and \$727K in 2009 due to accounting changes. A large variation between 2009 and 2010 as compared to 2008 and prior years is related to the classification of costs between wastewater collection/conveyance, and wastewater treatment and disposal. This is almost entirely related to contracted services cost classifications. For 2010 and 2009, contracted services for wastewater collection were \$5,369,685 (including \$1.028M of additional costs relating to capital) and \$5,226,583 (including \$727K of additional costs relating to capital), respectively. For 2008, this figure was \$2,330,474. It is also the case that as priorities change between collection and treatment over time, variances in the cost to manage and maintain these two separately disclosed, but jointly depend

REFERENCE:

- The efficiency measure based on total costs were new for 2009. Total costs are operating costs as defined in MPMP plus amortization and interest on long-term debt.
- Financial Information Return: 91 3111 35 (Operating costs measure) and 91 3111 45 (Total costs measure).

Line numbers for 2010 and prior years:

If amounts for unfunded liabilities are not material for wastewater collection/conveyance and there are no changes in what are deemed to be capital expenses, then,

- The efficiency measure based on operating costs for wastewater collection/conveyance in 91 3111 35 for 2009 and 2010 is comparable to the measure in 91 3110 13 for 2006 to 2008.

6.2 WASTEWATER TREATMENT AND DISPOSAL

	2010	2009	2008	2007	2006	2005
6.2 a) Operating costs for the treatment and disposal of wastewater per megalitre.	\$ 154.80	\$ 117.81	\$ 188.00	\$ 200.00	\$ 160.00	\$ 170.00
6.2 b) Total costs for the treatment and disposal of wastewater per megalitre.	\$ 448.60	\$ 326.77				

OBJECTIVE:

Efficient municipal wastewater treatment and disposal.

NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:

Total operating costs for the treatment and disposal of wastewater for 2010 were \$4,624,864 to service 29,875.91 megalitres of wastewater. This compares to costs of \$4,065,065 to service 34,506.51 megalitres of wastewater for 2009. If we compare 2010 to 2009, operating costs for the treatment and disposal of wastewater per megalitre have increased. This increase is largely due to contracted services expenses which have increased to \$4,546,474 in 2010 as compared to \$4,065,065 in 2009, while total megalitres of wastewater treated have decreased. Operating expenses have also increased as a result of additional maintenance costs at some of the treatment facilities due to age of equipment. Increased chemical costs have also contributed to additional expenses. Total costs for the treatment and disposal of wastewater for 2010 were \$13,402,374 as compared to \$11,275,602 in 2009. The increase of total costs is due to interest on long term debt which has increased to \$2,437,735 in 2010 as compared to \$1,566,640 in 2009 and amortization which has increased to \$6,339,775 in 2010 as compared to \$5,643,897 in 2009. 2009 total costs were restated to realign interest on long term debt from wastewater collection/conveyance to wastewater treatment and disposal.

REFERENCE:

- The efficiency measure based on total costs were new for 2009. Total costs are operating costs as defined in MPMP plus amortization and interest on long-term debt.
- Financial Information Return: 91 3112 35 (Operating costs measure) and 91 3112 45 (Total costs measure).

Line numbers for 2010 and prior years:

If amounts for unfunded liabilities are not material for wastewater treatment and disposal and there are no changes in what are deemed to be capital expenses, then,

- The efficiency measure based on operating costs for the treatment and disposal of wastewater in 91 3112 35 for 2009 and 2010 is comparable to the measure in 91 3108 13 for 2005 to 2008.

6.3 WASTEWATER INTEGRATED SYSTEM

	2010	2009	2008	2007	2006	2005
6.3 a) Operating costs for the collection/conveyance, treatment, and disposal of wastewater per megalitre (integrated system).	\$ 357.09	\$ 295.76	\$ 253.00	\$ 279.00	\$ 222.00	\$ 239.00
6.3 b) Total costs for the collection/conveyance, treatment, and disposal of wastewater per megalitre (integrated system).	\$ 697.87	\$ 543.21				

OBJECTIVE:

Efficient municipal wastewater system (integrated system).

NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:

See items 6.1 and 6.2 above. Total costs for this service in 2010 were \$10,668,245, to service 29,875.91 megalitres of wastewater. Total costs for 2009 were \$10,205,580 to service 34,506.51 megalitres of wastewater.

REFERENCE:

- The efficiency measure based on total costs were new for 2009. Total costs are operating costs as defined in MPMP plus amortization and interest on long-term debt.
- Financial Information Return: 91 3113 35 (Operating costs measure) and 91 3113 45 (Total costs measure).

Line numbers for 2010 and prior years:

If amounts for unfunded liabilities are not material for an integrated wastewater system and there are no changes in what are deemed to be capital expenses, then,

- The efficiency measure based on operating costs for the integrated wastewater system in 91 3113 35 for 2009 and 2010 will be comparable to the measure in 91 3109 13 for 2005 to 2008.

6.4 WASTEWATER MAIN BACKUPS

	2010	2009	2008	2007	2006	2005
6.4 Number of wastewater main backups per 100 kilometres of wastewater main in a year.	0.00	1.16	14.80	13.50	10.70	1.40

OBJECTIVE:

Municipal sewage management practices prevent environmental and human health hazards.

NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:

Reduction/elimination in main backups is a reflection of the upgrades to infrastructure that is happening in the collection systems. Main flushing programs have also helped with this issue.

REFERENCE:

- Financial Information Return: 92 3154 07.

6.5 WASTEWATER BYPASSES TREATMENT

	2010	2009	2008	2007	2006	2005
6.5 Percentage of wastewater estimated to have by-passed treatment.	0.829%	0.943%	1.726%	2.641%	7.028%	0.568%

OBJECTIVE:

Municipal sewage management practices prevent environmental and human health hazards.

NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:

This reduction is due to the effectiveness of the infrastructure upgrades, pumping station improvements and system operational improvements. The weather also has played a role in the reduction.

REFERENCE:

- Financial Information Return: 92 3155 07.

Storm Water

M Campbell, Construction Manager, Engineering, 613-546-4921 ext.. 3139 mcampbell@cityofkingston.ca

7.1 URBAN STORM WATER MANAGEMENT

	2010	2009	2008	2007	2006
7.1 a) Operating costs for urban storm water management (collection, treatment, disposal) per kilometre of drainage system.	\$ 1,809.00	\$ 1,782.71	\$ 1,971.00	\$ 1,977.00	\$ 1,723.00
7.1 b) Total costs for urban storm water management (collection, treatment, disposal) per kilometre of drainage system.	\$ 7,550.00	\$ 7,164.17			
OBJECTIVE: Efficient urban storm water management.					
NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS: Total costs for urban storm water management (collection, treatment, disposal) for 2010 were \$617,665. For 2009, this compares to \$622,164. Total KM's of urban drainage system serviced was 341 KM in 2010, compared to 349 KM in 2009. 2009 operating/total costs were adjusted to reclassify costs between urban storm water management and rural storm water management to reflect correct reporting treatment and to allow for better comparability between years.					
REFERENCE: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The efficiency measure based on total costs were new for 2009. Total costs are operating costs as defined in MPMP plus amortization and interest on long-term debt. Financial Information Return: 91 3209 35 (Operating costs measure) and 91 3209 45 (Total costs measure). 					
Line numbers for 2010 and prior years: If amounts for unfunded liabilities are not material for the urban storm water system and there are no changes in what are deemed to be capital expenses, then, <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The efficiency measure based on operating costs for urban storm water management in 91 3209 35 for 2009 and 2010 is comparable to the measure in 91 3207 13 for 2006 to 2008. 					

7.2 RURAL STORM WATER MANAGEMENT

	2010	2009
7.2 a) Operating costs for rural storm water management (collection, treatment, disposal) per kilometre of drainage system.	\$ 1,137.83	\$ 1,138.16
7.2 b) Total costs for rural storm water management (collection, treatment, disposal) per kilometre of drainage system.	\$ 1,137.83	\$ 1,138.16

OBJECTIVE:

Efficient rural storm water management.

NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:

Total costs for 2010 were \$927,333 to service 815 KM's of drainage system. This compares to \$927,602 to service 815 KM's of drainage system in 2009. 2009 operating/total costs were adjusted to reclassify costs between urban storm water management and rural storm water management to reflect correct reporting treatment and to allow for better comparability between years.

REFERENCE:

- The efficiency measure based on total costs were new for 2009. Total costs are operating costs as defined in MPMP plus amortization and interest on long-term debt.
- Financial Information Return: 91 3210 35 (Operating costs measure) and 91 3210 45 (Total costs measure).

Line numbers for 2010 and prior years:

If amounts for unfunded liabilities are not material for the rural storm water system and there are no changes in what are deemed to be capital expenses, then,

- The efficiency measure based on operating costs for rural storm water management in 91 3210 35 for 2009 and 2010 is comparable to the measure in 91 3208 13 for 2006 to 2008.

Drinking Water

K Riley, Manager, Waste and Wastewater Operations, 613-546-1181 ext. 2224

8.1 DRINKING WATER TREATMENT

	2010	2009	2008	2007	2006	2005
8.1 a) Operating costs for the treatment of drinking water per megalitre.	\$ 242.95	\$ 218.31	\$ 89.52	\$ 79.76	\$ 72.59	\$ 68.91
8.1 b) Total costs for the treatment of drinking water per megalitre.	\$ 317.60	\$ 274.97				

OBJECTIVE:

Efficient municipal water treatment services.

NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:

Operating costs for the treatment of drinking water for 2010 were \$6,121,583 to service 25,197 megalitres of drinking water. This compares to costs of \$6,012,243 to service 27,539.54 megalitres for 2009. Due to changes in the accounting treatment, the efficiency measures are not easily comparable to 2008 and prior years. If we compare 2010 to 2009, operating costs for the treatment of drinking water per megalitre have increased. The increase is largely due to contracted services expenses which have increased to \$6,107,473 in 2010 as compared to \$6,012,243 in 2009, while total megalitres of drinking water treated has decreased. 2009 operating/total costs were adjusted to reclassify contracted services between drinking water treatment and drinking water distribution to reflect correct reporting treatment and to allow for better comparability between years.

REFERENCE:

- The efficiency measure based on total costs were new for 2009. Total costs are operating costs as defined in MPMP plus amortization and interest on long-term debt.
- Financial Information Return: 91 3311 35 (Operating costs measure) and 91 3311 45 (Total costs measure).

Line numbers for 2010 and prior years:

If amounts for unfunded liabilities are not material for drinking water treatment and there are no changes in what are deemed to be capital expenses, then,

- The efficiency measure based on operating costs for drinking water treatment in 91 3311 35 for 2009 and 2010 will be comparable to the measure in 91 3307 13 for 2005 to 2008.

8.2 DRINKING WATER DISTRIBUTION/TRANSMISSION

	2010	2009	2008	2007	2006
8.2 a) Operating costs for the distribution/transmission of drinking water per kilometre of water distribution pipe.	\$ 5,787.13	\$ 6,801.40	\$ 10,365.00	\$ 9,888.00	\$ 10,289.00
8.2 b) Total costs for the distribution/transmission of drinking water per kilometre of water distribution pipe.	\$ 12,384.63	\$ 13,246.43			

OBJECTIVE:

Efficient municipal water distribution/transmission services.

NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:

Operating costs for the distribution/transmission of drinking water for 2010 were \$3,651,682 to service 631 KM of water distribution/transmission pipe. This compares to costs of \$4,108,044 to service 604 KM of water distribution/transmission pipe for 2009. Due to changes in the accounting treatment, the efficiency measures are not easily comparable to 2008 and prior years. If we compare 2010 to 2009, operating costs for the treatment of drinking water per megalitre have decreased. The decrease is largely due to contracted services expenses which have decreased to \$2,977,986 in 2010 as compared to \$3,446,345 in 2009, while total KM's of water distribution/transmission pipe has increased. It should be noted that increased capital replacement of water infrastructure has also contributed to the decrease in maintenance costs. 2009 operating/total costs were adjusted to reclassify contracted services between drinking water treatment and drinking water distribution to reflect correct reporting treatment and to allow for better comparability between years.

REFERENCE:

- The efficiency measure based on total costs were new for 2009. Total costs are operating costs as defined in MPMP plus amortization and interest on long-term debt.
- Financial Information Return: 91 3312 35 (Operating costs measure) and 91 3312 45 (Total costs measure).

Line numbers for 2010 and prior years:

If amounts for unfunded liabilities are not material for drinking water distribution/transmission and there are no changes in what are deemed to be capital expenses, then,

- The efficiency measure based on operating costs for drinking water distribution/transmission in 91 3312 35 for 2009 and 2010 is comparable to the measure in 91 3310 13 for 2006 to 2008.

8.3 DRINKING WATER INTEGRATED SYSTEM						
	2010	2009	2008	2007	2006	2005
8.3 a) Operating costs for the treatment and distribution/transmission of drinking water per megalitre (integrated system).	\$ 387.87	\$ 367.48	\$ 316.00	\$ 298.00	\$ 282.00	\$ 263.00
8.3 b) Total costs for the treatment and distribution/transmission of drinking water per megalitre (integrated system).	\$ 627.74	\$ 565.49				
OBJECTIVE: Efficient municipal water system (integrated system).						
NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS: Total operating costs for the treatment and distribution/transmission of drinking water for 2010 were \$9,773,265 to service 25,197 megalitres of water. This compares to 2009 costs of \$10,120,287 to service 27,539.54 megalitres. As a result of changes in the accounting treatment, the efficiency measures are not easily comparable to 2008 and prior years. Although the 2010 operating costs have decreased as compared to 2009, the total megalitres of drinking water treated has decreased. The decrease in operational costs can also be attributed to efficiencies found in the treatment of water and in the distribution and transmission of water due to chemical use and emergency repairs.						
REFERENCE: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The efficiency measure based on total costs were new for 2009. Total costs are operating costs as defined in MPMP plus amortization and interest on long-term debt. • Financial Information Return: 91 3313 35 (Operating costs measure) and 91 3313 45 (Total costs measure). 						
Line numbers for 2010 and prior years: If amounts for unfunded liabilities are not material for an integrated drinking water system and there are no changes in what are deemed to be capital expenses, then, <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The efficiency measure based on operating costs for the integrated drinking water system in 91 3313 35 for 2009 and 2010 is comparable to the measure in 91 3309 13 for 2005 to 2008. 						

8.4 BOIL WATER ADVISORIES

	2010	2009	2008	2007	2006	2005
8.4 Weighted number of days when a boil water advisory issued by the medical officer of health, applicable to a municipal water supply, was in effect.	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
OBJECTIVE: Water is safe and meets local needs.						
NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS: For 2010 there were no instances in which a boil water advisory was needed. This reflects on the quality of the service provided to the water customers.						
REFERENCE: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Financial Information Return: 92 3355 07. 						

8.5 BREAKS IN WATER MAINS

	2010	2009	2008	2007	2006	2005
8.5 Number of water main breaks per 100 kilometres of water distribution pipe in a year.	10.30	9.44	13.10	14.60	11.60	14.00
OBJECTIVE: Improve system reliability.						
NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS: Slight increase from 2009. Increased maintenance and replacement programs including main rehabilitation has decreased the number of failures reported in 2009 and 2010.						
REFERENCE: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Financial Information Return: 92 3356 07. 						

Solid Waste Management (Garbage)

J Giles, Manager, Solid Waste, 613-546-4291 ext. 2701

9.1 GARBAGE COLLECTION

	2010	2009	2008	2007	2006	2005
9.1 a) Operating costs for garbage collection per tonne.	\$ 107.71	\$ 103.44	\$ 95.00	\$ 97.00	\$ 95.00	\$ 81.00
9.1 b) Total costs for garbage collection per tonne.	\$ 107.71	\$ 103.44				

OBJECTIVE:

Efficient municipal garbage collection services.

NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:

Total costs for garbage collection for 2010 were: \$2,002,274 for the collection of 18,589.15 tonnes. This compares to costs of \$1,962,852 in 2009, for the collection of 18,975.7 tonnes. While a correlation between tonnes collected and costs to collect is evident, it is not a direct or strong correlation and many other factors, not least the type of packaging used and changes to how suppliers package goods, determine weight. Furthermore, bulk of packaging may stay the same or even increase, despite weighing less, rendering comparison over time based on weight less reliable unless taken into context with industry requirements and householder habits.

REFERENCE:

- The efficiency measure based on total costs were new for 2009. Total costs are operating costs as defined in MPMP plus amortization and interest on long-term debt.
- Financial Information Return: 91 3404 35 (Operating costs measure) and 91 3404 45 (Total costs measure).

Line numbers for 2010 and prior years:

If amounts for unfunded liabilities are not material for garbage collection and there are no changes in what are deemed to be capital expenses, then,

- The efficiency measure based on operating costs for garbage collection in 91 3404 35 for 2009 and 2010 is comparable to the measure in 91 3403 13 for 2005 to 2008.

9.2 GARBAGE DISPOSAL

	2010	2009	2008	2007	2006	2005
9.2 a) Operating costs for garbage disposal per tonne.	\$ 66.32	\$ 84.99	\$ 53.00	\$ 67.00	\$ 75.00	\$ 82.00
9.2 b) Total costs for garbage disposal per tonne.	\$ 92.64	\$ 108.01				

OBJECTIVE:

Efficient municipal garbage disposal services.

NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:

Operating costs for garbage disposal per tonne for 2010 were \$1,292,169 for 19,483.3 tonnes. This compares to \$1,640,872 in 2009 to dispose of 19,306.3 tonnes. The garbage disposal contract increased by \$27 per tonne, the previous 5-year fixed term contract expired in 2008, and market cost raised through a competitive tendering exercise for contractual arrangements from 2009 onwards. In 2009, there was an accounting change relating to the reclassification of rents and financial expenses for Landfill of \$221K (being a contingent liability allowance previously not disclosed within operating expenses). If we reduce 2009 costs by this new charge, we achieve an efficiency measure of \$73.52 per tonne of garbage disposed from all property classes for 2009. If we compare this to 2010, operating costs for garbage disposal per tonne have decreased. The decrease is largely a result of increased revenues. In 2010, the sale of materials in Recyclables for the residential process market were \$1.6M as compared to \$1.1M in 2009. In 2009, \$100K less revenue for Kingston East Landfill was received. There are occasional one-off large deposits to the landfill; 2008 had a larger than expected disposal (\$50K), and 2010 also had a large deposit of this kind, which generated \$74K. How

REFERENCE:

- The efficiency measure based on total costs were new for 2009. Total costs are operating costs as defined in MPMP plus amortization and interest on long-term debt.
- Financial Information Return: 91 3504 35 (Operating costs measure) and 91 3504 45 (Total costs measure).

Line numbers for 2010 and prior years:

If amounts for unfunded liabilities are not material for garbage disposal and there are no changes in what are deemed to be capital expenses, then,

- The efficiency measure based on operating costs for garbage disposal in 91 3504 35 for 2009 and 2010 is comparable to the measure in 91 3503 13 for 2005 to 2008.

9.3 SOLID WASTE DIVERSION (RECYCLING)

	2010	2009	2008	2007	2006	2005
9.3 a) Operating costs for solid waste diversion per tonne.	\$ 146.73	\$ 235.11	\$ 126.00	\$ 126.00	\$ 147.00	\$ 165.00
9.3 b) Total costs for solid waste diversion per tonne.	\$ 146.73	\$ 235.11				

OBJECTIVE:

Efficient solid waste diversion (recycling) services.

NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:

Operating costs for solid waste diversion for 2010 were \$3,925,729, to divert 26,754 tonnes. This compares to costs of \$5,712,258 for 2009 to divert 24,296.1 tonnes. In 2009, some types of costs, as previously stated within the MPMP report, have been attributed to operating expense disclosures, whereas in previous years these would have been attributable to capital lines and so not form part of the total efficiency cost calculation. For solid waste diversion, a total of \$1.59M had been added to operating costs that was previously treated as a capital expense in 2009. If we reduce the operating cost total by this amount to allow equitable comparison with 2010 and prior years, we arrive at an efficiency measure of \$169.58 per tonne for 2009. If we compare this to 2010, operating costs for solid waste diversion per tonne have decreased. The decrease is largely a result of increased revenues received from diverted waste. In 2010, \$1.8M was received as compared to \$1.28M for 2009 and \$2.06M for 2008. This inherent volatility in the market value and price for recyclables has a direct impact on the relative efficiency of the service over time.

REFERENCE:

- The efficiency measure based on total costs were new for 2009. Total costs are operating costs as defined in MPMP plus amortization and interest on long-term debt.
- Financial Information Return: 91 3606 35 (Operating costs measure) and 91 3606 45 (Total costs measure).

Line numbers for 2010 and prior years:

If amounts for unfunded liabilities are not material for solid waste diversion and there are no changes in what are deemed to be capital expenses, then,

- The efficiency measure based on operating costs for solid waste diversion in 91 3606 35 for 2009 and 2010 is comparable to the measure in 91 3604 13 for 2005 to 2008.

9.4 SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT (INTEGRATED SYSTEM)

	2010	2009	2008	2007	2006	2005
9.4 a) Average operating costs for solid waste management (collection, disposal and diversion) per tonne.	\$ 156.15	\$ 213.66	\$ 134.00	\$ 147.00	\$ 158.00	\$ 163.00
9.4 b) Average total costs for solid waste management (collection, disposal and diversion) per tonne.	\$ 167.25	\$ 223.85				

OBJECTIVE:

Efficient solid waste management (integrated system).

NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:

Total operating costs for 2010 were \$7,220,172 to service 46,237.3 tonnes as compared to \$9,315,982 for 2009 to service 43,602.4 tonnes. As indicated in reference 9.2 and 9.3, changes to cost classifications in 2009 have made comparisons with other years difficult. All other things being equal, if we extract from the 2009 total cost the amounts relating to accounting change and Landfill liability charges now disclosed as operating expenses, the overall average operating costs for solid waste management (item 9.4 a) would have been \$170.92 per tonne. Levels of diverted waste revenues and income received for recyclables has a significant impact on statistical performance for Solid Waste.

REFERENCE:

- The efficiency measure based on total costs were new for 2009. Total costs are operating costs as defined in MPMP plus amortization and interest on long-term debt as reported in the FIR.
- Financial Information Return: 91 3607 35 (Operating costs measure) and 91 3607 45 (Total costs measure).

Line numbers for 2010 and prior years:

If amounts for unfunded liabilities are not material for solid waste management and there are no changes in what are deemed to be capital expenses, then,

- The efficiency measure based on operating costs for solid waste management in 91 3607 35 for 2009 and 2010 is comparable to the measure in 91 3605 13 for 2005 to 2008.

9.5 COMPLAINTS

	2010	2009	2008	2007	2006	2005
9.5 Number of complaints received in a year concerning the collection of garbage and recycled materials per 1,000 households.	31.9	16.9	12.5	20.8	25.1	25.0
OBJECTIVE: Improved collection of garbage and recycled materials.						
NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS: In 2009, the Green Bin program started which accounts for the increased number.						
REFERENCE: • Financial Information Return: 92 3452 07.						

9.6 NUMBER OF MUNICIPAL SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT FACILITIES EFFECTIVENESS

		2010	2009	2008	2007	2006	2005
9.6	Total number of solid waste management facilities owned by the municipality with a Ministry of Environment certificate of approval.	12	12	12	12	12	12
OBJECTIVE: Context for solid waste management facility compliance measure.							
NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS: Unchanged from previous years.							
REFERENCE: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Financial Information Return: 92 3552 07. 							

9.7 FACILITY COMPLIANCE

9.7	Number of days per year when a Ministry of Environment compliance order for remediation concerning an air or groundwater standard was in effect for a municipally owned solid waste management facility, by facility.						
FIR line #	Facility Name	Days 2010	Days 2009	Days 2008	Days 2007	Days 2006	Days 2005
3553	Kingston East Landfill	0	0	0	0	0	0
3554	Kingston Area Recycling - Material Recovery	0	0	0	0	0	0
3555	Kingston Area Recycling - Leaf and Yard	0	0	0	0	0	0
3556	Kingston Area Recycling - HHSW	0	0	0	0	0	0
3557	Kingston East Landfill - Composting	0	0	0	0	0	0
3558	Knox Farm Sediment Storage	0	0	0	0	0	0
3559	City Yard Waste Transfer Station	0	0	0	0	0	0
3560	Ravensview Water Pollution Control	0	0	0	0	0	0
List facilities in the order they appear in the 2009 Financial Information Return (FIR).							
OBJECTIVE: Municipal solid waste services do not have an adverse impact on environment.							
NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS: Consistent with prior years.							
REFERENCE: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Facility Name: 92 3553 03 to 92 3560 03 in Financial Information Return. • Days: 92 3553 07 to 92 3560 07. 							

**9.8 DIVERSION OF RESIDENTIAL SOLID WASTE
EFFECTIVENESS**

	2010	2009	2008	2007	2006	2005
9.8 Percentage of residential solid waste diverted for recycling.	58.4%	46.6%	42.3%	42.3%	42.4%	43.0%
OBJECTIVE: Municipal solid waste reduction programs divert waste from landfills and/or incinerators.						
NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS: In 2009, the Green Bin program started which helped to increase the diversion rate.						
REFERENCE: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Financial Information Return: 92 3655 07. 						

**9.9 DIVERSION OF RESIDENTIAL SOLID WASTE
(Based on Combined Residential and Industrial/Commercial/Institutional Tonnage)
EFFECTIVENESS**

	2010	2009	2008	2007	2006	2005
9.9 Percentage of residential solid waste diverted for recycling (based on combined residential and ICI tonnage).	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
OBJECTIVE: Municipal solid waste reduction programs divert waste from landfills and/or incinerators.						
NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS: n/a						
REFERENCE: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ICI means Industrial/Commercial/Institutional. Financial Information Return: 92 3656 07. 						

Parks and Recreation

D Wells, Director, Public Works, 613-546-4291 ext. 2313 (Parks), L Hurdle, Director, Recreation and Leisure Services, 613-546-4291 ext. 1231 (Recreation and Recreation Facilities)

10.1 PARKS

	2010	2009	2008	2007	2006	2005
10.1 a) Operating costs for parks per person.	\$ 42.42	\$ 40.50	\$ 30.34	\$ 27.21	\$ 34.09	\$ 33.00
10.1 b) Total costs for parks per person.	\$ 47.54	\$ 43.74				

OBJECTIVE:

Efficient operation of parks.

NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:

Operating costs for parks for 2010 were \$5,077,808, compared with \$4,823,330 for 2009. Due to changes in the accounting treatment, the efficiency measures are not easily comparable to 2008 and prior years. If we compare 2010 to 2009, operating costs for parks per person have increased. The increase is largely due to salaries and benefits expenses which have increased to \$2,818,136 in 2010 as compared to \$2,377,735 in 2009. If we compare 2010 to 2009, total costs for parks per person have increased. The increase is largely due to amortization expense which has increased to \$612,950 in 2010 as compared to \$384,806 in 2009. Growth of parks system, weather and effort put into parks maintenance, year to year, all have an impact on these cost measures.

REFERENCE:

- The efficiency measure based on total costs were new for 2009. Total costs are operating costs as defined in MPMP plus amortization and interest on long-term debt.
- Financial Information Return: 91 7103 35 (Operating costs measure) and 91 7103 45 (Total costs measure).

Line numbers for 2010 and prior years:

- If amounts for unfunded liabilities are not material for parks and there are no changes in what are deemed to be capital expenses, then,
The efficiency measure based on operating costs for parks in 91 7103 35 for 2009 and 2010 is comparable to the measure in 91 7102 13 for 2005 to 2008.

10.2 RECREATION PROGRAMS

	2010	2009	2008	2007	2006	2005
10.2 a) Operating costs for recreation programs per person.	\$ 26.84	\$ 21.93	\$ 19.17	\$ 15.58	\$ 17.19	\$ 16.00
10.2 b) Total costs for recreation programs per person.	\$ 26.94	\$ 25.20				

OBJECTIVE:

Efficient operation of recreation programs.

NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:

Increase is due to additional staffing and instructor costs.

REFERENCE:

- The efficiency measure based on total costs were new for 2009. Total costs are operating costs as defined in MPMP plus amortization and interest on long-term debt as reported in the FIR.
- Financial Information Return: 91 7203 35 (Operating costs measure) and 91 7203 45 (Total costs measure).

Line numbers for 2010 and prior years:

If amounts for unfunded liabilities are not material for recreation programs and there are no changes in what are deemed to be capital expenses, then,

- The efficiency measure based on operating costs for recreation programs in 91 7203 35 for 2009 and 2010 will be comparable to the measure in 91 7202 13 for 2005 to 2008.

10.3 RECREATION FACILITIES

	2010	2009	2008	2007	2006	2005
10.3 a) Operating costs for recreation facilities per person.	\$ 72.72	\$ 74.45	\$ 57.93	\$ 51.62	\$ 39.71	\$ 38.00
10.3 b) Total costs for recreation facilities per person.	\$ 123.24	\$ 103.71				

OBJECTIVE:

Efficient operation of recreation facilities.

NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:

The increase is due to attributing factors such as increased utility charges in all facilities.

REFERENCE:

- The efficiency measure based on total costs were new for 2009. Total costs are operating costs as defined in MPMP plus amortization and interest on long-term debt.
- Financial Information Return: 91 7306 35 (Operating costs measure) and 91 7306 45 (Total costs measure).

Line numbers for 2010 and prior years:

If amounts for unfunded liabilities are not material for recreation facilities and there are no changes in what are deemed to be capital expenses, then,

- The efficiency measure based on operating costs for recreation facilities in 91 7306 35 for 2009 and 2010 is comparable to the measure in 91 7303 13 for 2005 to 2008.

**10.4 RECREATION PROGRAMS AND RECREATION FACILITIES (SUBTOTAL)
EFFICIENCY**

	2010	2009	2008	2007
10.4 a) Operating costs for recreation programs and recreation facilities per person (Subtotal)	\$ 99.56	\$ 96.38	\$ 77.10	\$ 67.20
10.4 b) Total costs for recreation programs and recreation facilities per person (Subtotal)	\$ 150.18	\$ 128.91		
OBJECTIVE: Efficient operation of recreation programs and facilities.				
NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS: Operating costs for recreation programs and recreation facilities is the total of Sections 10.2 (Recreation Programs) and 10.3 (Recreation Facilities) of the MPMP report.				
REFERENCE: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The efficiency measure based on total costs were new for 2009. Total costs are operating costs as defined in MPMP plus amortization and interest on long-term debt. Financial Information Return: 91 7320 35 (Operating costs measure) and 91 7320 45 (Total costs measure). 				
Line numbers for 2010 and prior years: If amounts for unfunded liabilities are not material for recreation programs and recreation facilities and there are no changes in what are deemed to be capital expenses, then, <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The efficiency measure based on operating costs for recreation programs and recreation facilities in 91 7320 35 for 2009 and 2010 is comparable to the measure in 91 7305 13 for 2007 to 2008. 				

10.5 TRAILS

	2010	2009	2008	2007	2006	2005
10.5 Total kilometres of trails	50	50	50	50	49	21
10.5 Total kilometres of trails per 1,000 persons	0.418	0.420	0.422	0.424	0.418	0.178

OBJECTIVE:

Trails provide recreation opportunities.

NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:

Consistent with prior year.

REFERENCE:

- Financial Information Return: 92 7152 05 and 92 7152 07.

10.6 OPEN SPACE

	2010	2009	2008	2007	2006	
10.6 Hectares of open space	529	474	474	429	429	
10.6 Hectares of open space per 1,000 persons	4.4	4.0	4.0	3.6	3.7	

OBJECTIVE:

Open space is adequate for population.

NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:

Consistent with prior year.

REFERENCE:

- Financial Information Return: 92 7155 05 and 92 7155 07.

10.7 PARTICIPANT HOURS FOR RECREATION PROGRAMS EFFECTIVENESS

	2010	2009	2008	2007	2006	2005
10.7 Total participant hours for recreation programs per 1,000 persons.	12.7	12.4	12.3	11.2	10.5	10.7
OBJECTIVE: Recreation programs serve needs of residents.						
NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS: Consistent with prior year.						
REFERENCE: • Financial Information Return: 92 7255 07.						

10.8 INDOOR RECREATION FACILITY SPACE

	2010	2009	2008	2007	2006	
10.8 Square metres of indoor recreation facilities (municipally owned)	59,008	59,008	59,008	30,023	30,023	
10.8 Square metres of indoor recreation facilities per 1,000 persons (municipally owned)	492.9	495.5	498.2	254.8	256.2	
OBJECTIVE: Indoor recreation facility space is adequate for population.						
NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS: Consistent with prior year.						
REFERENCE: • Financial Information Return: 92 7356 05 and 92 7356 07.						

10.9 OUTDOOR RECREATION FACILITY SPACE

	2010	2009	2008	2007	2006
10.9 Square metres of outdoor recreation facility space (municipally owned)	17,415	17,415	17,415	17,415	17,415
10.9 Square metres of outdoor recreation facility space per 1,000 persons (municipally owned)	145.5	146.2	147.0	148.0	149.0

OBJECTIVE:

Outdoor recreation facility space is adequate for population.

NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:

Consistent with prior year.

REFERENCE:

- Financial Information Return: 92 7359 05 and 92 7359 07.

Libraries

D Defoe, Chief Librarian / CEO 613-549-8888 ext. 1230 ddefoe@kfpl.ca

11.1 LIBRARY COSTS PER PERSON

	2010	2009	2008	2007	2006	2005
11.1 a) Operating costs for library services per person.	\$ 44.98	\$ 47.44	\$ 46.00	\$ 45.00	\$ 40.00	\$ 41.00
11.1 b) Total costs for library services per person.	\$ 53.85	\$ 54.08				

OBJECTIVE:

Efficient library services.

NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:

Operating costs for library services include expenditures for salaries, wages and employment benefits, materials, contracted services, building maintenance and utilities and other financial expenses. Library costs have remained relatively constant, while population figures increased slightly.

REFERENCE:

- The efficiency measure based on total costs were new for 2009. Total costs are operating costs as defined in MPMP plus amortization and interest on long-term debt as reported in the FIR.
- Financial Information Return: 91 7405 35 (Operating costs measure) and 91 7405 45 (Total costs measure).

Line numbers for 2010 and prior years:

If amounts for unfunded liabilities are not material for library services and there are no changes in what are deemed to be capital expenses, then,

- The efficiency measure based on operating costs for library services in 91 7405 35 for 2009 and 2010 is comparable to the measure in 91 7403 13 for 2005 to 2008.

11.2 LIBRARY COSTS PER USE

	2010	2009
11.2 a) Operating costs for library services per use.	\$ 2.01	\$ 2.03
11.2 b) Total costs for library services per use.	\$ 2.40	\$ 2.32
OBJECTIVE: Efficient library services.		
NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS: Total library uses include total annual circulation, library materials use, electronic information use, reference and library visits.		
REFERENCE: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The efficiency measure based on total costs were new for 2009. Total costs are operating costs as defined in MPMP plus amortization and interest on long-term debt. • The calculation of electronic library uses was updated in 2009 to include the number of people using the public library wireless connection. Therefore, the efficiency measure based on operating costs for library services per use is not comparable with prior years. • Financial Information Return: 91 7406 35 (Operating costs measure) and 91 7406 45 (Total costs measure). 		
Line numbers for 2010 and prior years: If amounts for unfunded liabilities are not material for the service area measured and there are no changes in what are deemed to be capital expenses, then, <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The efficiency measure based on operating costs for library services per use in 91 7406 35 for 2009 and 2010 may be compared to the efficiency measure in 91 7404 13 for the years 2005 to 2008, but only if the number of people using the library wireless connection is included in the calculation of library uses in the denominator. Note that this data may not be available. 		

11.3 LIBRARY USES

	2010	2009
11.3 Library uses per person.	22.4	22.2
OBJECTIVE: Increased use of library services.		
NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS: The increase is partially due to our refurbished branches and partially due to increased library use during economic downturns.		
REFERENCE: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In the 2009 FIR, the definition of library uses was changed to add the number of people using the library's wireless connection. Therefore, this effectiveness measure, library uses per person, is not comparable to prior years. • Financial Information Return: 92 7460 07. 		
Line numbers for prior years: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The FIR reference for the measure, library uses per person, was 92 7460 07 for 2005 to 2010. 		

11.4 ELECTRONIC LIBRARY USES

		2010	2009
11.4	Electronic library uses as a percentage of total library uses.	18.5%	17.9%
OBJECTIVE: Better information on library usage.			
NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS: Total electronic library uses are defined as the sum of the number of people using library computer workstations, the number of times electronic databases are accessed by library users, the number of electronic reference transactions, and the number of electronic visits to the library.			
REFERENCE: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In the 2009 FIR, the definition of library uses was changed to add the number of people using the library's wireless connection. Therefore, the effectiveness measure for the percentage of electronic library uses is not comparable to prior years. Financial Information Return: 92 7463 07. 			
Line numbers for prior years: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The FIR reference for the measure, electronic library uses as a percentage of total library uses, was 92 7463 07 in 2009-2010 and 92 7261 07 for 2005 to 2008. 			

11.5 NON - ELECTRONIC LIBRARY USES

		2010	2009
11.5	Non-electronic library uses as a percentage of total library uses.	81.5%	82.1%
OBJECTIVE: Better information on library usage.			
NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS: Non-electronic library uses consist of total annual circulation, annual program attendance, total library materials use, number of standard reference transactions, and number of visits to the library made in person.			
REFERENCE: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Financial Information Return: 92 7462 07. In the 2009 FIR, the definition of electronic library uses was changed to add the number of people using the library's wireless connection. Therefore, the effectiveness measure for the percentage of non-electronic library uses is not comparable to prior years. 			
Line numbers for prior years: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The FIR reference for the measure, non-electronic library uses as a percentage of total library uses, was 92 7262 07 for 2005 to 2010. 			

Land Use Planning

G. Bain, Director, Planning and Development, 613-546-4291 ext. 3252 gbain@cityofkingston.ca

12.1 LOCATION OF NEW DEVELOPMENT

	2010	2009	2008	2007
12.1 Percentage of new residential units located within settlement areas	96.1%	97.8%	97.1%	96.7%

OBJECTIVE:

New residential development is occurring within settlement areas.

NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:

There were 521 new residential units that were constructed within the settlement area of the City of Kingston in 2010 (618 in 2009). The settlement area refers to those lands located within the urban boundary as indicated in the City of Kingston Official Plan, which was approved on January 27, 2010. The total number of new residential units within the entire municipality (which include the urban and rural area) in 2010 was 542 (632 in 2009). Residential units consist of detached, semi-detached, row housing and apartment dwellings.

REFERENCE:

- Financial Information Return: 92 8170 07.

12.2 PRESERVATION OF AGRICULTURAL LAND DURING REPORTING YEAR EFFECTIVENESS

	2010	2009	2008	2007	2006	2005
12.2 Percentage of land designated for agricultural purposes which was not re-designated for other uses during the reporting year.	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

OBJECTIVE:

Preservation of agricultural land.

NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:

There were no development applications approved in 2010 to re-designate agricultural lands. As a result of the approval of the City's new Official Plan by the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing, the amount of land designated as Prime Agricultural has increased substantially. Under the former Official Plans, approximately 3,500 hectares of land was designated as Prime Agricultural. Under the new Official Plan, approximately 6,800 hectares are designated as Prime Agricultural. The new Official Plan also contains a policy framework that protects the Prime Agricultural areas and recognizes these areas as being an important component of the City's economic base, providing a source of employment and a local source of fresh food which contributes to the sustainability of the City.

REFERENCE:

- Financial Information Return: 92 8163 07.

12.3 PRESERVATION OF AGRICULTURAL LAND RELATIVE TO 2000 EFFECTIVENESS

	2010	2009	2008	2007	2006	2005
12.3 Percentage of land designated for agricultural purposes which was not re-designated for other uses relative to the base year of 2000.	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
OBJECTIVE: Preservation of agricultural land.						
NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS: See comments under 12.2.						
REFERENCE: • Financial Information Return: 92 8164 07.						

12.4 CHANGE IN NUMBER OF AGRICULTURAL HECTARES DURING REPORTING YEAR EFFECTIVENESS

	2010	2009	2008	2007	2006	2005
12.4 Number of hectares of land originally designated for agricultural purposes which was re-designated for other uses during the reporting year.	0	0	0	0	0	0
OBJECTIVE: Preservation of agricultural land.						
NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS: See comments under 12.2.						
REFERENCE: • Financial Information Return: 92 8165 07.						

**12.5 CHANGE IN NUMBER OF AGRICULTURAL HECTARES SINCE 2000
EFFECTIVENESS**

	2010	2009	2008	2007	2006	2005
12.5 Number of hectares of land originally designated for agricultural purposes which was re-designated for other uses since January 1, 2000.	0	0	0	0	0	0
OBJECTIVE: Preservation of agricultural land.						
NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS: See comments under 12.2.						
REFERENCE: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Financial Information Return: 92 8166 07. 						