



Volume

5

THE CITY OF KINGSTON REPORT CARD TO CITIZENS  
M U N I C I P A L   P E R F O R M A N C E   M E A S U R E S

---

Measuring our way to  
Service Excellence!

---

STRATEGIC INITIATIVES AND CORPORATE COMMUNICATIONS

# Executive Summary: The 2004 Report Card to Citizens

## Background

The Municipal Performance Measures Program (MPMP) was initiated by the provincial Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing five years ago as a means of 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 2004 and previous years. Where possible, comparison results are provided for similar municipalities in southern Ontario. This information helps identify trends and the impacts of improvement programs and policy changes that have been implemented to affect positive change.

## What's Noteworthy?

In general, the 2004 results are consistent with previous years in that the result areas did not report a substantial improvement or decline.

The program has been expanded this year to include performance measures for parks, recreation programs and libraries. Although it will take a few years to refine and understand the results in these areas, it is exciting that the program has expanded to measure performance in service areas that are critical to build and maintain community well-being and civic pride.

Comparisons will show that some municipalities are achieving better results than others.

A review of the Ministry's Summary Report indicates that in 2002 it cost the citizens of Kingston more to maintain roads, clear snow and collect garbage than it did in Windsor, London and Chatham-Kent. In all other reporting areas, Kingston appears to be within an acceptable range or better than the comparison cities. It is important that municipal leaders compare their results but it is more important that they explore the reasons for differences and identify the practices that lead 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 Summary Report prepared by the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing which provides a detailed presentation of performance measurement results and factors affecting those results. The Report is available on the Ministry's web site at [www.mah.gov.on.ca](http://www.mah.gov.on.ca) .

# Introduction: The 2004 Report Card to Citizens

## A message from the City of Kingston

MPMP is a management tool that allows municipalities to track performance over time and compare results to other municipalities. It encourages accountability and communication to taxpayers because the annual results must be reported to citizens. It helps municipal Councils to establish priorities and allocate scarce budget dollars to achieve desired results. Most importantly, MPMP can lead to improved service delivery because it focuses on results.

## 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 citizen's of Kingston desire, for the best possible price.

**Efficiency indicators** measure the amount of staff time and money used to deliver a service – the cost of service delivery.

**Effectiveness indicators** measure the extent to which a service is achieving its intended results – service quality, benefits to citizens and impact on the Quality of Life

### *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, 2004.

*Can Kingston's results be compared to previous years?*

The report for 2004 represents the fifth year of the program and results for previous years have been provided wherever possible. Since the program began, some of the performance measures have been refined to make the results more meaningful. In some areas, the costs included in the calculation have been modified. These changes affect the results so comparisons to the previous year would not be meaningful.

*Can Kingston's results be compared to other municipalities?*

Yes. Results for all Ontario municipalities are reported publicly as part of the MPMP program. To make the comparisons meaningful, the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing has prepared a Summary Report using 2001 and 2002 data. Summary statistics are reported for groups of municipalities based on geography, municipal type and population to allow users to compare results published by their municipality with typical results for municipalities of similar size, type and region. Results for Kingston are in a comparison group with Chatham-Kent, London and Windsor, which are single-tier municipalities in Southern Ontario with a population greater than 100,000.

It is important to note that because only 4 municipalities are included in the Kingston grouping the summary statistics may be less reliable for making comparisons. Also, where a municipality's results for any measure appear to be extreme or outlying, they have been excluded from the data set. This is a factor that should be considered when comparing results because it limits the use of the comparison data.

The 2002 comparison results for Kingston and the number of municipalities reporting in each data set is included in the chart section of this report.

*How are the comparative statistics presented?*

Statistics are presented using a median and a range.

The median captures the middle value of a data set that is ordered from low to high. It can be more meaningful than using an average because it is not influenced by extreme values. Half the measurements will be below the median and half will be above it.

The range measures the spread of data by capturing the minimum or lowest to the maximum or highest value.

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

As the Summary Report explains, 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. The Summary Report provides detailed information on these factors.

*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.

Gathering performance data and benchmarking are important steps that can lead to the identification of best practices. The Ontario Centre for Municipal Best Practices (OCMBP), a partnership between the Association of Municipalities of Ontario (AMO) and the Ontario Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing, is committed to assisting municipalities to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of their services. The OCMBP publishes best-practice reports that offer guidance and advice to local government service providers interested in learning about alternative approaches to delivering service.

More information regarding the OCMBP can be accessed at:

[www.municipalbestpractices.ca](http://www.municipalbestpractices.ca)

*How is this report different from previous years?*

The program has been expanded this year to include performance measures for library services and parks and recreation. Over time municipalities will have information that can be used to make decisions on these important service areas.

**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](http://www.cityofkingston.ca/cityhall/reportcard)

Additional information can be obtained from the City's Strategic Initiatives and Communications Office. Your feedback is important to us so feel free to share your comments with your district councillor or email Strategic Initiatives at [strategicinitiatives@cityofkingston.ca](mailto:strategicinitiatives@cityofkingston.ca) or by phone at 546-4291 extension 2221.

# Tables: Municipal Performance Measures Program (MPMP)

## Local Government

GENERAL GOVERNMENT – EFFICIENCY					
	2004	2003	2002		
Kingston	4.4%	4.5%	4.7%		
Comparative Result*	Number of municipalities reporting 4		Median 5%		
			Range 4% to 6%		
<p><b>Efficiency Measure</b> Operating costs for governance and corporate management as a percentage of total municipal operating costs.</p> <p><b>Objective</b> Efficient municipal government.</p>					
<p><b>Observations</b></p> <p>General Government operating costs for 2004 are reported at \$6,786,100. The total municipal operating costs are \$153,696,296. The 2004 General Government percentage reflects the results of measures taken to control costs as part of the efficiencies within the multi-year operating budget objectives.</p> <p>General Government costs are allocated to service area operating costs in all service areas except Police, Library, Water and Sewer. Kingston allocates these costs based upon a percentage of total expenditures. As a result, areas such as waste management and roads that have the largest budgets are also assigned the highest portion of the indirect costs.</p>					

**NOTE:** 2002 Comparative result for Southern Ontario, Single Tier Municipalities with a Population Greater than 100,000. Source: Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing, Summary of 2002 Results

## Fire Services

FIRE SERVICES – EFFICIENCY					
	2004	2003	2002	2001	2000
Kingston	\$1.53	\$1.59	\$1.48	\$1.45	\$1.22
Comparative Result*	Number of municipalities reporting 4		Median \$1.48		
			Range \$1.26 to \$2.32		
<p><b>Efficiency Measure</b> Operating costs for fire services per \$1,000 of assessment.</p> <p><b>Objective</b> Efficient fire services.</p>					
<p><b>Observations</b></p> <p>Kingston Fire and Rescue is in the process of reorganizing to meet the service requirements for the three amalgamated communities within the appropriate fire industry standards. The process began in 2001 and is to be completed in 2005. This will have an impact on operating costs as the new organization evolves.</p>					

**NOTE:** 2002 Comparative result for Southern Ontario, Single Tier Municipalities with a Population Greater than 100,000. Source: Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing, Summary of 2002 Results

## Police Services

POLICE SERVICES – EFFICIENCY					
	2004	2003	2002	2001	
Kingston	\$408	\$373	\$344	\$345	
Comparative Result*	Number of municipalities reporting 4		Median \$344		
			Range \$312 to \$621		
<p><b>Efficiency Measure</b> Operating costs for police services per household.</p> <p><b>Objective</b> Efficient police services.</p>					
<p><b>Observations</b></p> <p>Unfortunately, policing costs continue to rise across the province. As the city grows and offers new opportunities for people, the force will continue to face this issue. This measure does not accurately represent the Kingston situation as the total operating costs are divided by the number of households. The total number of households does not account for the fact that Kingston has seven penitentiaries in the region which adds an ever-growing presence of criminal activity. Further, Kingston faces population swells (approximately 1/3 increase for 8 months of the year) due to students and non-resident workers who add to the total number of people served and protected by the Kingston Police, yet are not represented in the total household count.</p> <p>However, the Kingston Police continue to provide services at a lower cost than other municipalities with similar policing populations. Approximately 90% of the police budget is related to staffing, and staffing levels have a direct relation to service levels.</p> <p>The force is very conscious of the need to ensure that it gets the most benefit from the resources at its disposal and is fully committed to ensuring that these resources are targeted to areas of need. However, resources for the police should keep pace with the city's growing expectations. The force continually explores ways of reducing overhead.</p>					

**NOTE:** 2002 Comparative result for Southern Ontario, Single Tier Municipalities with a Population Greater than 100,000. Source: Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing, Summary of 2002 Results

## Police Services

VIOLENT CRIME RATE					
	2004	2003	2002	2001	
Kingston	11.5	10.0	9.8	N/A	
Comparative Result*	Number of municipalities reporting 3		Median 10		
			Range 8 to 12		
<p><b>Effectiveness Measure</b> Violent crime rate per 1,000 persons.</p> <p><b>Objective</b> Safe communities.</p> <p><b>Observations</b></p> <p>The violent crime rate in Kingston increased slightly again in 2004, although the rate is not as high as in other jurisdictions. The Kingston Police have been working hard to get people to report sexual assaults, and the statistics indicate that this is happening. Most sexual assaults are by non-strangers and acquaintances or relatives, so there is a difference in the perception of the crime and the perceived utility of reporting it. The force is working hard to build alliances with community groups and service providers to raise awareness of sexual assault services and establish the trust that is so critical to service delivery.</p> <p>Similar to sexual assaults, the increase in common assaults may actually reflect the increase in reporting, charging, or victims deciding to deal with cases formally, as opposed to a real change in community behaviour. At least half of the violent crime reported to police involved alcohol consumption by the parties involved. In the past, many such persons would deal with assaults personally and then return home, with usually no formal police intervention. However, the statistics point to the fact that this is no longer the case.</p>					

**NOTE:** 2002 Comparative result for Southern Ontario, Single Tier Municipalities with a Population Greater than 100,000. Source: Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing, Summary of 2002 Results

## Police Services

PROPERTY CRIME RATE					
	2004	2003	2002	2001	
Kingston	59	55	52	N/A	
Comparative Result*	Number of municipalities reporting 3		Median 53		
			Range 49 to 65		
<p><b>Effectiveness Measure</b> Property crime rate per 1,000 persons.</p> <p><b>Objective</b> Safe communities.</p>					
<p><b>Observations</b></p> <p>Property crime increased in 2004 and is a complex problem because this type of crime is linked to a dependency on illicit drugs. The Kingston Police Drug and Street Crimes Unit have been working hard to identify and target this activity, in the hope of turning this trend around. The recent increase in drug seizures and arrests of criminals should begin to show a positive impact on the property crime rate.</p>					
TOTAL CRIME RATE					
	2004	2003	2002		
Kingston	81	79	74		
Comparative Result*	Number of municipalities reporting 3		Median 81		
			Range 75 to 99		
<p><b>Effectiveness Measure</b> Total crime rate per 1,000 persons (Criminal Code offences excluding traffic).</p> <p><b>Objective</b> Safe Communities.</p>					
<p><b>Observations</b></p> <p>Kingston Police responded to well over 46,000 calls for service, which is an increase in the number of calls, responded to in 2003. Kingston is changing almost every day, and the factors behind the crime rate are somewhat complex, ranging from the city's proximity to Toronto, Montreal, and Ottawa to its recent focus on growth and community development. Add to this an increasing illicit drug problem, and you have a recipe for increased crime.</p> <p>Calls for service continue to be influenced by the high transient population related to tourism and post-secondary institutions, as well as by the continuing growth of the resident population. With the Province's new focus on fighting crime and the offer to help finance new police positions, Kingston may eventually get some much-needed help in this area.</p>					

**NOTE:** 2002 Comparative result for Southern Ontario, Single Tier Municipalities with a Population Greater than 100,000. Source: Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing, Summary of 2002 Results

## Police Services

YOUTHS CHARGED					
	2004	2003	2002		
Kingston	12	65	68		
Comparative Result*	Number of municipalities reporting 2		Median 22		
			Range 22 to 68		
<p><b>Effectiveness Measure</b> Number of youths charged per 1,000 youths.</p> <p><b>Objective</b> Safe Communities.</p>					
<p><b>Observations</b></p> <p>The number of youths charged with criminal offences fell again this year. This can be attributed to the Youth Criminal Justice Act and to the work of the Kingston Police in keeping youth out of the criminal justice system. The Kingston Police are doing their part to ensure that only those youth who should be charged with a criminal offence are being charged.</p>					

**NOTE:** 2002 Comparative result for Southern Ontario, Single Tier Municipalities with a Population Greater than 100,000. Source: Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing, Summary of 2002 Results

## Roads

PAVED ROADS – EFFICIENCY					
	2004	2003	2002		
Kingston	\$1191	\$1131	\$1124		
Comparative Result*	Number of municipalities reporting 4		Median \$866		
			Range \$500 to \$1493		
<p><b>Efficiency Measure</b> Operating costs for paved (hard top) roads per lane kilometre.</p> <p><b>Objective</b> Efficient maintenance of paved roads.</p>					
<p><b>Observations</b></p> <p>The increase in 2004 is due to response to demands for increased service on aging municipal roads and streets.</p> <p>Kingston's year-to-year results in the roads area appear to be consistent. However, compared to similar municipalities, Kingston's costs for roads and winter control are well above average. This could be due to many factors, such as the financial reporting practices, age and condition of the road network, percentage of road types (e.g. local roads, residential streets, arterial roads), and service-level decisions. These factors will be explored by municipal leaders.</p>					
UNPAVED ROADS – EFFICIENCY					
	2004	2003	2002		
Kingston	\$2452	\$2392	\$2593		
Comparative Result*	Number of municipalities reporting 4		Median \$1575		
			Range \$259 to \$6360		
<p><b>Efficiency Measure</b> Operating costs for unpaved (loose top) roads per lane kilometre.</p> <p><b>Objective</b> Efficient maintenance of unpaved roads.</p>					
<p><b>Observations</b></p> <p>See note under paved roads-efficiency</p>					

**NOTE:** 2002 Comparative result for Southern Ontario, Single Tier Municipalities with a Population Greater than 100,000. Source: Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing, Summary of 2002 Results

## Roads

WINTER MAINTENANCE OF ROADS – EFFICIENCY					
	2004	2003	2002		
Kingston	\$2649	\$2552	\$2195		
Comparative Result*	Number of municipalities reporting 4		Median \$1013		
			Range \$442 to \$2195		
<p><b>Efficiency Measure</b> Operating costs for winter maintenance of roadways per lane kilometre maintained in winter.</p> <p><b>Objective</b> Efficient winter maintenance of roads.</p>					
<p><b>Observations</b></p> <p>Winter control costs are dependant upon annual weather conditions experienced. Increased costs in 2004 are attributed to a higher number of required winter control event responses, particularly in December 2004. The factors that influence the results in this area will be explored by municipal staff.</p>					
ADEQUACY OF PAVED ROADS					
	2004	2003	2002	2001	
Kingston	69%	70%	70%	52%	
Comparative Result*	Number of municipalities reporting 4		Median 37%		
			Range 35% to 77%		
<p><b>Effectiveness Measure</b> Percentage of paved lane kilometres where the condition is rated as good to very good.</p> <p><b>Objective</b> Pavement condition meets municipal objectives.</p>					
<p><b>Observations</b></p> <p>A review of the existing assessment process is currently underway to determine the best approach to deal with the deficiencies in an affordable manner. This review will explore various scenarios such as weighing the benefits of an expanded overlay program versus expanded reconstruction.</p>					

**NOTE:** 2002 Comparative result for Southern Ontario, Single Tier Municipalities with a Population Greater than 100,000. Source: Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing, Summary of 2002 Results

## Roads

WINTER EVENT RESPONSES					
	2004	2003	2002	2001	2000
Kingston	96%	97%	96%	94%	98%
Comparative Result*	Number of municipalities reporting 4		Median 96%		
			Range 95% - 100%		
<p><b>Effectiveness Measure</b> Percentage of winter events where the response met or exceeded locally determined municipal service levels for road maintenance.</p> <p><b>Objective</b> Appropriate response to winter storm events.</p>					
<p><b>Observations</b></p> <p>The City of Kingston's winter control plan meets or exceeds the minimum maintenance standards established by the Province. Council adopted service standards were achieved 96% of the time, despite an increased number of required winter control event responses in 2004. This indicates an ongoing effort by City road maintenance staff to improve the level of service to meet citizen demand.</p>					

**NOTE:** 2002 Comparative result for Southern Ontario, Single Tier Municipalities with a Population Greater than 100,000. Source: Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing, Summary of 2002 Results

## Conventional Transit

CONVENTIONAL TRANSIT – EFFICIENCY					
	2004	2003	2002	2001	2000
Kingston	\$2.96	\$2.74	\$2.93	\$2.88	\$2.27
Comparative Result*	Number of municipalities reporting 4		Median \$2.93 Range \$2.19 to \$3.87		
<p><b>Efficiency Measure</b> Operating costs for conventional transit per regular service passenger trip.</p> <p><b>Objective</b> Efficient conventional transit services.</p>					
<p><b>Observations</b> Transit rider ship remained stable in 2004 compared to 2003. Increases in the first part of the year were mitigated by a slight decline in the second half of 2004 following a fare increase instituted in June. Inflationary pressures contributed to the marginal increase in this performance measure.</p>					
CONVENTIONAL TRANSIT RIDERSHIP					
	2004	2003	2002	2001	2000
Kingston	25%	25%	24%	23%	22%
Comparative Result*	Number of municipalities reporting 4		Median 24% Range 6% to 47%		
<p><b>Effectiveness Measure</b> Number of conventional transit passenger trips per person in the service area in a year.</p> <p><b>Objective</b> Maximum utilization of municipal transit services.</p>					
<p><b>Observations</b> Stable rider ship levels coupled with population growth yielded a slight decline in this measure.</p>					

**NOTE:** 2002 Comparative result for Southern Ontario, Single Tier Municipalities with a Population Greater than 100,000. Source: Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing, Summary of 2002 Results

## Wastewater (Sewage)

WASTEWATER INTEGRATED SYSTEM – EFFICIENCY					
	2004	2003	2002	2001	
Kingston	\$214	\$205	\$194	\$210	
Comparative Result*	Number of municipalities reporting 4		Median \$198		
			Range \$194 to \$368		
<p><b>Efficiency Measure</b> Operating costs for the collection, treatment and disposal of wastewater per megalitre (Integrated System).</p> <p><b>Objective</b> Efficient wastewater system (Integrated System).</p>					
<p><b>Observations</b></p> <p>The operating costs for waste water treatment have been relatively consistent over the past four years. Minor fluctuations in results can be attributed to yearly operating requirements.</p> <p>*One mega litre equals 1,000,000 litres or 1,000 cubic metres.</p>					
WASTEWATER MAIN BACKUPS					
	2004	2003	2002	2001	
Kingston	13.9	24.2	3.6	3.0	
Comparative Result*	Number of municipalities reporting 4		Median 3.6		
			Range 1.2 to 40.4		
<p><b>Effectiveness Measure</b> Number of wastewater main backups per 100 kilometres of wastewater main in a year.</p> <p><b>Objective</b> Municipal sewage management practices prevent environmental and human health hazards.</p>					
<p><b>Observations</b></p> <p>The results for 2004 are in-line with those recorded in 2003 when steps were taken to improve tracking and reporting of these events.</p>					

**NOTE:** 2002 Comparative result for Southern Ontario, Single Tier Municipalities with a Population Greater than 100,000. Source: Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing, Summary of 2002 Results

## Wastewater (Sewage)

WASTEWATER BYPASSES TREATMENT					
	2004	2003	2002	2001	
Kingston	0.66%	0.25%	0.17%	0.28%	
Comparative Result*	Number of municipalities reporting 2		Median 0.05%		
			Range 0.05% to 0.67%		
<p><b>Effectiveness Measure</b> Percentage of wastewater estimated to have by-passed treatment.</p> <p><b>Objective</b> Municipal sewage management practices prevent environmental and human health hazards.</p> <p><b>Observations</b> Weather conditions directly impact the incidents of waste water by-passes. A portion of the increase in 2004 can be attributed to the significant storm experienced in September 2004. These conditions overwhelm the system and cause both back-ups and overflows. Despite capital work programs to upgrade our aging infrastructure, combined sewers, primarily located in the downtown cannot handle the flow during heavy, prolonged rainfall.</p>					

## Storm Water

URBAN STORM WATER MANAGEMENT – EFFICIENCY					
	2004	2003			
Kingston	\$783	\$681			
<p><b>Efficiency Measure</b> Operating costs for urban storm water management (collection, treatment, and disposal) per kilometre of drainage system.</p> <p><b>Objective</b> Efficient urban storm water management.</p> <p><b>Observations</b> In 2003 the denominator for this measure was changed so that connections and catch basins were included with total kilometres of urban drainage system. Comparison with 2002 is not possible.</p>					

**NOTE:** 2002 Comparative result for Southern Ontario, Single Tier Municipalities with a Population Greater than 100,000. Source: Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing, Summary of 2002 Results

## Drinking Water

DRINKING WATER INTEGRATED SYSTEM – EFFICIENCY					
	2004	2003	2002	2001	
Kingston	\$241	\$226	\$238	\$201	
Comparative Result*	Number of municipalities reporting 4		Median \$173		
			Range \$123 to \$470		
<p><b>Efficiency Measure</b> Operating costs for the treatment and distribution of drinking water per megalitre. (Integrated System)</p> <p><b>Objective</b> Efficient municipal water system (Integrated System).</p>					
<p><b>Observations</b></p> <p>The costs have been fairly consistent over the past 4 years. The increased costs can be attributed to enhanced testing requirements to ensure safe water.</p>					
BOIL WATER ADVISORIES					
	2004	2003	2002	2001	
Kingston	0	3.0	0	0	
Comparative Result*	Number of municipalities reporting 2		Median 0		
			Range 0 to 0.01		
<p><b>Effectiveness Measure</b> 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><b>Objective</b> Water is safe and meets local needs.</p>					
<p><b>Observations</b></p> <p>With the exception of a precautionary advisory that was issued in 2003 during the black-out, Kingston has not issued a boil water advisory during the 2001 to 2004 period.</p>					

**NOTE:** 2002 Comparative result for Southern Ontario, Single Tier Municipalities with a Population Greater than 100,000. Source: Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing, Summary of 2002 Results

## Drinking Water

BREAKS IN WATER MAINS					
	2004	2003	2002	2001	
Kingston	17	10	14	15	
Comparative Result*	Number of municipalities reporting 4		Median 16		
			Range 14 to 37		
<p><b>Effectiveness Measure</b> Number of water main breaks per 100 kilometres of water distribution pipe in a year.</p> <p><b>Objective</b> Improve system reliability.</p>					
<p><b>Observations</b></p> <p>Results in this area are directly related to weather conditions as cold weather often contributes to water main breaks. It is best to review 5 years of data before drawing any conclusion in this area.</p>					

## Solid Waste Management (Garbage)

GARBAGE COLLECTION – EFFICIENCY					
	2004	2003	2002	2001	
Kingston	\$85	\$79	\$82	\$71	
Comparative Result*	Number of municipalities reporting 3		Median \$73		
			Range \$66 to \$82		
<p><b>Efficiency Measure</b> Operating costs for garbage collection per tonne.</p> <p><b>Objective</b> Efficient municipal garbage collection services.</p>					
<p><b>Observations</b></p> <p>The increase in 2004 can be attributed to wage and benefit increases as well as higher allocations for equipment costs.</p>					

**NOTE:** 2002 Comparative result for Southern Ontario, Single Tier Municipalities with a Population Greater than 100,000. Source: Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing, Summary of 2002 Results

## Solid Waste Management (Garbage)

<b>GARBAGE DISPOSAL – EFFICIENCY</b>					
	<b>2004</b>	<b>2003</b>	<b>2002</b>	<b>2001</b>	
Kingston	\$86	\$99	\$100	\$139	
Comparative Result*	Number of municipalities reporting 3		Median \$56 Range \$44 to \$100		
<p><b>Efficiency Measure</b> Operating costs for garbage disposal per tonne.</p> <p><b>Objective</b> Efficient municipal garbage disposal services.</p>					
<p><b>Observations</b></p> <p>Reduced tipping fee from a new disposal contract together with route rationalization resulted in improved efficiencies.</p>					
<b>SOLID WASTE DIVERSION (RECYCLING) – EFFICIENCY</b>					
	<b>2004</b>	<b>2003</b>	<b>2002</b>	<b>2001</b>	
Kingston	\$157	\$164	\$174	\$144	
Comparative Result*	Number of municipalities reporting 3		Median \$123 Range \$87 to \$174		
<p><b>Efficiency Measure</b> Operating costs for solid waste diversion (recycling) per tonne.</p> <p><b>Objective</b> Efficient municipal solid waste diversion (recycling) services.</p>					
<p><b>Observations</b></p> <p>A strong market for the sale of recyclable materials reduced the overall operating cost for recycling in 2004 from the previous year. In 2002, Kingston had the highest diversion rate among its comparison municipalities. Kingston achieves its high diversion rate through an expanded blue box program which results in higher operating costs than comparison cities.</p>					

**NOTE:** 2002 Comparative result for Southern Ontario, Single Tier Municipalities with a Population Greater than 100,000. Source: Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing, Summary of 2002 Results

## Solid Waste Management (Garbage)

<b>SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT (INTEGRATED SYSTEM) – EFFICIENCY</b>					
	<b>2004</b>	<b>2003</b>	<b>2002</b>	<b>2001</b>	
Kingston	\$163	\$167	\$174	\$185	
Comparative Result*	Number of municipalities reporting 4		Median \$108		
			Range \$57 to \$175		
<p><b>Efficiency Measure</b> Average operating costs for solid waste management (collection, disposal and diversion) per tonne.</p> <p><b>Objective</b> Efficient municipal solid waste management (Integrated System).</p>					
<p><b>Observations</b> Overall reduction in 2004 operating costs is due to favourable markets for the sale of recyclable materials and reduced tipping fees for garbage disposal.</p>					
<b>COMPLAINTS — COLLECTION OF GARBAGE AND RECYCLED MATERIALS</b>					
	<b>2004</b>	<b>2003</b>	<b>2002</b>	<b>2001</b>	
Kingston	21	22	38	62	
Comparative Result*	Number of municipalities reporting 4		Median 34		
			Range 31 to 58		
<p><b>Effectiveness Measure</b> Number of complaints received in a year concerning the collection of garbage and recycled materials per 1,000 households.</p> <p><b>Objective</b> Improved garbage collection of garbage and recycled materials.</p>					
<p><b>Observations</b> In 2004, the number of complaints received in the Customer Service Centre has declined from the previous year. The City logs complaints from residents who do not receive the prescribed level of service. The Solid Waste Division and the Client Services Division worked closely together in 2004 to identify and resolve service and communication issues in order to improve citizen satisfaction.</p>					

**NOTE:** 2002 Comparative result for Southern Ontario, Single Tier Municipalities with a Population Greater than 100,000. Source: Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing, Summary of 2002 Results

## Solid Waste Management (Garbage)

NUMBER OF MUNICIPAL SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT FACILITIES					
	2004	2003	2002	2001	
Kingston	12	9	8	8	
Comparative Result*	Number of municipalities reporting 4		Median 3		
			Range 2 to 10		
<p><b>Effectiveness Measure</b></p> <p>Total number of solid waste management facilities owned by municipality with a Ministry of Environment Certificate of Approval.</p> <p><b>Objective</b></p> <p>Context for solid waste management facility compliance measure.</p>					
<p><b>Observations</b></p> <p>Kingston is reporting an increased number due to a better understanding of what constitutes a facility not because more facilities were opened.</p>					

**NOTE:** 2002 Comparative result for Southern Ontario, Single Tier Municipalities with a Population Greater than 100,000. Source: Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing, Summary of 2002 Results

## Solid Waste Management (Garbage)

FACILITY COMPLIANCE				
<b>Effectiveness Measure</b>				
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.				
<b>Objective</b>				
Municipal solid waste services do not have an adverse impact on environment.				
Facility Name	Days 2004	Days 2003	Days 2002	Days 2001
Kingston East Landfill	0	0	0	0
McAdoo's Lane Landfill (closed)	0	0	0	0
Belle Park Landfill (closed)	0	0	0	0
Creekford Road Quarry-white goods transfer station (closed)	0	N/A	N/A	N/A
Kingston Area Recycling Centre – Material Recovery Facility	0	0	0	0
Kingston Area Recycling Centre –Leaf and Yard Waste Composting Site	0	0	0	0
Kingston Area Recycling Centre – Household Hazardous Waste Facility	0	0	0	0
Kingston East Landfill – Composting Site	0	0	0	0
Knox Farm Sediment Storage Facility	0	0	N/A	N/A
City Yard Waste Transfer Station	0	N/A	N/A	N/A
Rideaucrest Home –soil disposal (closed)	0	N/A	N/A	N/A
Ravensview Water Pollution Control Plant – bio-solids collection & transfer (open)	0	N/A	N/A	N/A

**NOTE:** 2002 Comparative result for Southern Ontario, Single Tier Municipalities with a Population Greater than 100,000. Source: Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing, Summary of 2002 Results

## Solid Waste Management (Garbage)

DIVERSION OF RESIDENTIAL SOLID WASTE					
	2004	2003	2002	2001	
Kingston	41%	43%	42%	38%	
Comparative Result*	Number of municipalities reporting 4		Median 32%		
			Range 31% to 42%		
<p><b>Effectiveness Measure</b> Percentage of residential solid waste diverted for recycling.</p> <p><b>Objective</b> Municipal solid waste reduction programs divert waste from landfills and/or incinerators.</p> <p><b>Observations</b>  Diversion decreased slightly in 2004 as a result of fewer organics being delivered by residents to the municipal composting sites and less scrap metal being accounted for at private transfer stations after free large article disposal was eliminated.</p>					

**NOTE:** 2002 Comparative result for Southern Ontario, Single Tier Municipalities with a Population Greater than 100,000. Source: Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing, Summary of 2002 Results

## Parks and Recreation

PARKS – EFFICIENCY					
	2004				
Kingston	\$26				
<p><b>Efficiency Measure</b> Operating costs for parks per person.</p> <p><b>Objective</b> Efficient operation of parks.</p>					
<p><b>Observations</b></p> <p>This result is based on total operating costs of \$3,015,187 divided by total population of 117, 144.</p>					
RECREATION PROGRAMS – EFFICIENCY					
	2004				
Kingston	\$11				
<p><b>Efficiency Measure</b> Operating costs for recreation programs per person.</p> <p><b>Objective</b> Efficient operation of recreation programs.</p>					
<p><b>Observations</b></p> <p>This result is based on total operating costs of \$1,290,305 divided by a total population of 117,144. This measure is based on total population, not the population participating in recreation programs.</p>					
RECREATION FACILITIES – EFFICIENCY					
	2004				
Kingston	\$45				
<p><b>Efficiency Measure</b> Operating costs for recreation facilities per person.</p> <p><b>Objective</b> Efficient operation of recreation facilities.</p>					
<p><b>Observations</b></p> <p>This result is based on total operating costs of \$5,264,497 divided by total population of 117,144.</p>					

**NOTE:** 2002 Comparative result for Southern Ontario, Single Tier Municipalities with a Population Greater than 100,000. Source: Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing, Summary of 2002 Results

## Parks and Recreation

PARKS, RECREATION PROGRAMS AND RECREATION FACILITIES - EFFICIENCY					
	2004				
Kingston	\$82				
<p><b>Efficiency Measure</b> Operating costs for parks, recreation programs and recreation facilities per person.</p> <p><b>Objective</b> Efficient operation of parks, recreation programs and recreation facilities.</p>					
<p><b>Observations</b></p> <p>This result is based on total operating costs of \$9,569,989 divided by total population of 117,144.</p>					
PARTICIPANT HOURS FOR RECREATION PROGRAMS					
	2004				
Kingston	12,013				
<p><b>Effectiveness Measure</b> Total participant hours for recreation programs per 1,000 persons.</p> <p><b>Objective</b> Recreation programs serve needs of residents.</p>					
<p><b>Observations</b></p> <p>This result is based on 1,407,267 total participant hours divided by population of 117,144 and expressed on a per thousand basis.</p> <p>The denominator of this measure is total population divided by 1,000 and does not represent the number of participants in recreation programs.</p>					

**NOTE:** 2002 Comparative result for Southern Ontario, Single Tier Municipalities with a Population Greater than 100,000. Source: Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing, Summary of 2002 Results

## Parks and Recreation

OPEN SPACE					
	<b>2004</b>				
Kingston	423				
<p><b>Effectiveness Measure</b> Hectares of open space.</p> <p><b>Objective</b> Open space is adequate for population.</p>					
	<b>2004</b>				
Kingston	3.6				
<p><b>Effectiveness Measure</b> Hectares of open space per 1,000 persons.</p>					
<p><b>Observations</b></p> <p>This result is based on 423 total hectares divided by population of 117,144 and expressed on a per thousand basis.</p>					
TRAILS					
	<b>2004</b>				
Kingston	21				
<p><b>Effectiveness Measure</b> Total kilometres of trails.</p> <p><b>Objective</b> Trails provide recreation opportunities.</p>					
	<b>2004</b>				
Kingston	0.179				
<p><b>Effectiveness Measure</b> Total kilometres of trails per 1,000 persons.</p>					
<p><b>Observations</b></p> <p>This result is based on 21 km of trails divided by population of 117,144 and expressed on a per thousand basis.</p>					

**NOTE:** 2002 Comparative result for Southern Ontario, Single Tier Municipalities with a Population Greater than 100,000. Source: Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing, Summary of 2002 Results

## Parks and Recreation

RECREATION FACILITY SPACE					
	<b>2004</b>				
Kingston	47,438				
<p><b>Effectiveness Measure</b> Square metres of recreation facility space.</p> <p><b>Objective</b> Recreation facility space is adequate for population.</p>					
	<b>2004</b>				
Kingston	404				
<p><b>Effectiveness Measure</b> Square metres of recreation facility space per 1,000 persons.</p> <p><b>Observations</b>  This result is based on 47,438 divided by population of 117,144 and expressed on a per thousand basis.</p>					
LIBRARY COSTS PER PERSON – EFFICIENCY					
	<b>2004</b>				
Kingston	\$39				
<p><b>Efficiency Measure</b> Operating costs for libraries per person.</p> <p><b>Objective</b> Efficient library services.</p> <p><b>Observations</b>  This result is based on \$4,518,169 total operating costs divided by population of 117,144.</p>					

**NOTE:** 2002 Comparative result for Southern Ontario, Single Tier Municipalities with a Population Greater than 100,000. Source: Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing, Summary of 2002 Results

## Parks and Recreation

LIBRARY COSTS PER USE – EFFICIENCY					
	<b>2004</b>				
Kingston	\$1.58				
<p><b>Efficiency Measure</b> Operating costs for libraries per use.</p> <p><b>Objective</b> Efficient library services</p>					
<p><b>Observations</b> This result is based on \$4,518,169 total operating costs divided by 2,863,175 uses.</p>					
LIBRARY USES					
	<b>2004</b>				
Kingston	24				
<p><b>Effectiveness Measure</b> Library uses per person.</p> <p><b>Objective</b> Increased use of library services.</p>					
<p><b>Observations</b> This result is based on 2,863,175 total uses divided by population of 117,144.</p>					
ELECTRONIC LIBRARY USES					
	<b>2004</b>				
Kingston	8%				
<p><b>Effectiveness Measure</b> Electronic library uses as a percentage of total library uses.</p> <p><b>Objective</b> Increased use of library services.</p>					
<p><b>Observations</b> N/A</p>					

**NOTE:** 2002 Comparative result for Southern Ontario, Single Tier Municipalities with a Population Greater than 100,000. Source: Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing, Summary of 2002 Results

## Parks and Recreation

NON-ELECTRONIC LIBRARY USES					
	<b>2004</b>				
Kingston	92%				
<p><b>Effectiveness Measure</b>                      Non-electronic library uses as a percentage of total library uses.</p> <p><b>Objective</b>                      Better information on library usage.</p>					
<p><b>Observations</b>                      N / A</p>					

**NOTE:** 2002 Comparative result for Southern Ontario, Single Tier Municipalities with a Population Greater than 100,000. Source: Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing, Summary of 2002 Results

## Land-Use Planning

LOCATION OF NEW DEVELOPMENT					
	2004	2003	2002	2001	
Kingston	96%	96%	91%	89%	
Comparative Result*	Number of municipalities reporting 4		Median 91%		
			Range 89% to 100%		
<p><b>Effectiveness Measure</b> Percentage of new lots, blocks and/or units with final approval which are located within settlement areas.</p> <p><b>Objective</b> New lot creation is occurring in settlement areas.</p>					
<p><b>Observations</b> The City's Urban Growth Strategy has been adopted in principle by City Council. The Urban Growth Strategy is being implemented through amendments to each of the City's three Official Plans. The proposed amendments will further encourage the majority of new development to occur in settlement areas.</p>					
PRESERVATION OF AGRICULTURAL LAND DURING 2004					
	2004	2003	2002	2001	
Kingston	100%	100%	100%	100%	
Comparative Result*	Number of municipalities reporting 3		Median 100%		
			Range 100%		
<p><b>Effectiveness Measure</b> Percentage of land designated for agricultural purposes which was not re-designated for other uses during the reporting year.</p> <p><b>Objective</b> Preservation of agricultural land.</p>					
<p><b>Observations</b> N/A</p>					

**NOTE:** 2002 Comparative result for Southern Ontario, Single Tier Municipalities with a Population Greater than 100,000. Source: Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing, Summary of 2002 Results

## Land-Use Planning

PRESERVATION OF AGRICULTURAL LAND RELATIVE TO 2000					
	2004	2003	2002	2001	
Kingston	100%	100%	100%	100%	
Comparative Result*	Number of municipalities reporting 3		Median 100%		
			Range 99% to 100%		
<p><b>Effectiveness Measure</b> Percentage of land designated for agricultural purposes which was not re-designated for other uses relative to the base year of 2000.</p> <p><b>Objective</b> Preservation of agricultural land.</p>					
<p><b>Observations</b> N/A</p>					

**NOTE:** 2002 Comparative result for Southern Ontario, Single Tier Municipalities with a Population Greater than 100,000. Source: Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing, Summary of 2002 Results