



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!

Executive Summary:

The 2005 Report Card to Citizens

Background

The Municipal Performance Measures Program (MPMP) was initiated by the provincial Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing in 2000 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 2005 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 2005 results are consistent with previous years in that the result areas did not report a substantial improvement or decline. Costs to maintain roads have declined and are more in range with our comparison cities. In 2005, Kingston's winter control costs reduced slightly however they remain higher than the comparison cities. This result is directly impacted by the winter control standards adopted by individual municipalities as well as varying weather conditions.

It cost more to provide conventional transit services in 2005 however transit ridership increased by more than 100,000 passenger trips. The cost increase can be attributed to expanded routes and service and higher gas prices.

Summary

It is important that municipal leaders compare their results, 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.

Introduction:

The 2005 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, 2005.

Can Kingston's results be compared to previous years?

Most result areas include Kingston data for the past 5 years, which provides the opportunity to identify trends. 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 2002 and 2003 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 four 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 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.

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

Additional information can be obtained from the City's Organizational Effectiveness office. Your feedback is important to us so feel free to share your comments with your district councillor or email the Organizational Effectiveness team at strategicinitiatives@cityofkingston.ca or by phone at 613-546-4291 extension 2221.

Tables:

Municipal Performance Measures

Local Government

GENERAL GOVERNMENT – EFFICIENCY					
	2005	2004	2003	2002	
Kingston	2.7%	4.4%	4.5%	4.7%	
Comparative Result*			Median 5%	Median 5%	
			Range 3.9% to 6%	Range 4% to 6%	
			Municipalities Reporting 4	Municipalities Reporting 4	
<p>Efficiency Measure Operating costs for governance and corporate management as a percentage of total municipal operating costs.</p> <p>Objective Efficient municipal government.</p>					
<p>Observations</p> <p>General government operating costs for 2005 are reported at \$5,969,065. The total municipal operating costs are \$222,231,487. The decrease in the 2005 General Government percentage is the result of continued measures the municipality is taking to control costs.</p> <p>General government costs are allocated based upon a percentage of total expenditures. As a result, service areas that have the largest budgets are assigned the highest portion of general government costs.</p> <p>Beginning in 2005 the total operating costs include external transfers and an allocation of general government costs to external agencies.</p>					

NOTE: 2002 & 2003 Comparative result for Southern Ontario, Single Tier Municipalities with a Population Greater than 100,000. Source: Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing

Fire Services

FIRE SERVICES – EFFICIENCY					
	2005	2004	2003	2002	2001
Kingston	\$1.94	\$1.53	\$1.59	\$1.48	\$1.45
Comparative Result*			Median \$1.57	Median \$1.48	
			Range \$1.16 to \$2.23	Range \$1.26 to \$2.32	
			Municipalities Reporting 4	Municipalities Reporting 4	
<p>Efficiency Measure Operating costs for fire services per \$1,000 of assessment.</p> <p>Objective Efficient fire services.</p>					
<p>Observations</p> <p>Kingston Fire and Rescue is in the process of reorganizing to meet the service requirements for the three amalgamated communities. The reorganization is scheduled to be completed by the end of 2007. This will continue to have an impact on operating costs as the new organization evolves.</p> <p>The increased investment in Kingston Fire & Rescue services is required to ensure the service meets the Ontario Fire Marshal's recommended performance measures in fire prevention, public education and the minimum response requirements for fire suppression in the City of Kingston.</p> <p>A Master Fire Plan is currently being completed. Costs in future years should level off and become very predictable when the Plan is completed and reported to City Council by the end of 2007.</p>					

NOTE: 2002 & 2003 Comparative result for Southern Ontario, Single Tier Municipalities with a Population Greater than 100,000. Source: Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing

Police Services

POLICE SERVICES – EFFICIENCY					
	2005	2004	2003	2002	2001
Kingston	\$188	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Comparative Result*			Median N/A	Median N/A	
			Range N/A	Range	
			Municipalities Reporting	Municipalities Reporting	
<p>Efficiency Measure Operating costs for police services per household.</p> <p>Objective Efficient police services.</p> <p>Beginning in 2005 measure reflects costs/person. In previous years, measure reflected costs/household.</p>					
<p>Observations</p> <p>This measure changed in 2005 to reflect costs per person rather than costs per household. As a result it is not possible to compare results to previous years.</p>					

NOTE: 2002 & 2003 Comparative result for Southern Ontario, Single Tier Municipalities with a Population Greater than 100,000. Source: Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing

Police Services

VIOLENT CRIME RATE					
	2005	2004	2003	2002	2001
Kingston	11.1	11.5	10.0	9.8	N/A
Comparative Result*			Median 10	Median 10	
			Range 7 to 13	Range 8 to 12	
			Municipalities Reporting 4	Municipalities Reporting 3	
<p>Effectiveness Measure Violent crime rate per 1,000 persons.</p> <p>Objective Safe communities.</p>					
<p>Observations The violent crime rate is down this year. The total number of reported violent crime incidents in 2005 was 1303 as compared to 1349 the previous year.</p>					

PROPERTY CRIME RATE					
	2005	2004	2003	2002	2001
Kingston	55	59	55	52	N/A
Comparative Result*			Median 52	Median 53	
			Range 40 to 71	Range 49 to 65	
			Municipalities Reporting 4	Municipalities Reporting 3	
<p>Effectiveness Measure Property crime rate per 1,000 persons.</p> <p>Objective Safe communities.</p>					
<p>Observations The total number of reported property crimes decreased by 577 in 2005 reflecting a decrease in the property crime rate.</p>					

NOTE: 2002 & 2003 Comparative result for Southern Ontario, Single Tier Municipalities with a Population Greater than 100,000. Source: Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing

Police Services

TOTAL CRIME RATE					
	2005	2004	2003	2002	
Kingston	70	81	79	74	
Comparative Result*			Median 84	Median 81	
			Range 79 to 105	Range 75 to 99	
			Municipalities Reporting 4	Municipalities Reporting 3	
<p>Effectiveness Measure Total crime rate per 1,000 persons (Criminal Code offences excluding traffic).</p> <p>Objective Safe Communities.</p>					
<p>Observations The total number of criminal code offences (excluding traffic) decreased by 1244 in 2005 reflecting a decrease in the property crime rate.</p>					

YOUTHS CHARGED					
	2005	2004	2003	2002	
Kingston	16	12	65	68	
Comparative Result*			Median 84	Median 22	
			Range 79 to 105	Range 22 to 68	
			Municipalities Reporting 3	Municipalities Reporting 2	
<p>Effectiveness Measure Number of youths charged per 1,000 youths.</p> <p>Objective Safe Communities.</p>					
<p>Observations In 2004 the Youth Criminal Justice Act was changed in an effort to keep youth out of the criminal justice system. The changes allow Police to use ex-judicial measures (other forms of intervention), when appropriate, to correct youth behaviour.</p>					

NOTE: 2002 & 2003 Comparative result for Southern Ontario, Single Tier Municipalities with a Population Greater than 100,000. Source: Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing

Roads

PAVED ROADS – EFFICIENCY					
	2005	2004	2003	2002	
Kingston	\$958	\$1191	\$1131	\$1124	
Comparative Result*			Median \$948	Median \$866	
			Range \$445 to \$1425	Range \$500 to \$1493	
			Municipalities Reporting 4	Municipalities Reporting 4	
<p>Efficiency Measure Operating costs for paved (hard top) roads per lane kilometre.</p> <p>Objective Efficient maintenance of paved roads.</p>					
<p>Observations</p> <p>The reduction in costs is a result of a continued emphasis on capital improvements to paved roads that historically require a lot of maintenance. Continued investment in roads infrastructure is helping to reduce maintenance costs.</p> <p>In 2005, weather also reduced the amount of resources required for spring pothole repairs. An increase in sidewalk maintenance further reduced the number of resources allocated to the maintenance of paved roads.</p> <p>The results are consistent year over year and within the range of our municipal comparators.</p>					

NOTE: 2002 & 2003 Comparative result for Southern Ontario, Single Tier Municipalities with a Population Greater than 100,000. Source: Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing

Roads

UNPAVED ROADS – EFFICIENCY					
	2005	2004	2003	2002	
Kingston	\$1559	\$1779	\$2392	\$2593	
Comparative Result*			Median \$1466	Median \$1575	
			Range \$220 to \$6056	Range \$259 to \$6360	
			Municipalities Reporting 4	Municipalities Reporting 4	
<p>Efficiency Measure Operating costs for unpaved (loose top) roads per lane kilometre.</p> <p>Objective Efficient maintenance of unpaved roads.</p>					
<p>Observations</p> <p>Capital upgrades to unpaved roads have enabled Kingston to achieve lower operating costs by reducing the amount of maintenance required. The performance in this area is now approaching the median of the comparator municipalities.</p>					

WINTER MAINTENANCE OF ROADS – EFFICIENCY					
	2005	2004	2003	2002	
Kingston	\$2495	\$2726	\$2552	\$2195	
Comparative Result*			Median \$1248	Median \$1013	
			Range \$601 to \$2552	Range \$442 to \$2195	
			Municipalities Reporting 4	Municipalities Reporting 4	
<p>Efficiency Measure Operating costs for winter maintenance of roadways per lane kilometre maintained in winter.</p> <p>Objective Efficient winter maintenance of roads.</p>					
<p>Observations</p> <p>Operating costs are down slightly from previous years although they remain higher than comparator municipalities. This is because of a higher level of service offered by the City of Kingston and geographic variation resulting in different weather conditions.</p>					

NOTE: 2002 & 2003 Comparative result for Southern Ontario, Single Tier Municipalities with a Population Greater than 100,000. Source: Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing

Roads

ADEQUACY OF PAVED ROADS					
	2005	2004	2003	2002	2001
Kingston	69%	69%	70%	70%	52%
Comparative Result*			Median 39%	Median 37%	
			Range 35% to 70%	Range 35% to 77%	
			Municipalities Reporting 4	Municipalities Reporting 4	
<p>Effectiveness Measure Percentage of paved lane kilometres where the condition is rated as good to very good.</p> <p>Objective Pavement condition meets municipal objectives.</p>					
<p>Observations</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>					

WINTER EVENT RESPONSES					
	2005	2004	2003	2002	2001
Kingston	96%	96%	97%	96%	94%
Comparative Result*			Median 97%	Median 96%	
			Range 95% to 100%	Range 95% to 100%	
			Municipalities Reporting 4	Municipalities Reporting 4	
<p>Effectiveness Measure Percentage of winter events where the response met or exceeded locally determined municipal service levels for road maintenance.</p> <p>Objective Appropriate response to winter storm events.</p>					
<p>Observations</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 in 2005.</p>					

NOTE: 2002 & 2003 Comparative result for Southern Ontario, Single Tier Municipalities with a Population Greater than 100,000. Source: Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing

Conventional Transit

CONVENTIONAL TRANSIT – EFFICIENCY					
	2005	2004	2003	2002	2001
Kingston	\$3.63	\$2.96	\$2.74	\$2.93	\$2.88
Comparative Result*			Median \$2.74	Median \$2.93	
			Range \$2.15 to 4.06	Range \$2.19 to \$3.87	
			Municipalities Reporting 4	Municipalities Reporting 4	
<p>Efficiency Measure Operating costs for conventional transit per regular service passenger trip.</p> <p>Objective Efficient conventional transit services.</p>					
<p>Observations</p> <p>Increases in cost are a result of expanded service levels beginning in September 2005. The expanded service levels provide an additional 8,000 – 10,000 hours of service. Average fuel costs in 2005 were slightly higher than in 2004.</p> <p>It is important to note that although the absolute costs increased, the net costs of operating Kingston Transit remain stable year over year because of increases in revenue through passenger fares and gas tax revenues.</p> <p>Starting in 2005, the operating costs for conventional transit also includes external transfers to Kingston Access Bus in the amount of \$1,402,284. Therefore, direct comparison with previous years is not possible.</p> <p>Kingston Transit expects costs to continue to increase in future years as additional investments are made to prepare for the second phase of expanded service beginning in 2007, to enhance transit accessibility, and to introduce smaller buses on a trial basis.</p>					

NOTE: 2002 & 2003 Comparative result for Southern Ontario, Single Tier Municipalities with a Population Greater than 100,000. Source: Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing

Conventional Transit

CONVENTIONAL TRANSIT RIDERSHIP					
	2005	2004	2003	2002	2001
Kingston	26	25	25	24	23
Comparative Result*			Median 25	Median 24	
			Range 6 to 50	Range 6 to 47	
			Municipalities Reporting 4	Municipalities Reporting 4	
<p>Effectiveness Measure Number of conventional transit passenger trips per person in the service area in a year.</p> <p>Objective Maximum utilization of municipal transit services.</p>					
<p>Observations Ridership increased by 130,843 passenger trips in 2005. This is a direct result of the expanded service levels introduced in September 2005.</p>					

NOTE: 2002 & 2003 Comparative result for Southern Ontario, Single Tier Municipalities with a Population Greater than 100,000. Source: Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing

Wastewater (Sewage)

WASTEWATER INTEGRATED SYSTEM – EFFICIENCY					
	2005	2004	2003	2002	2001
Kingston	\$239	\$214	\$205	\$194	\$210
Comparative Result*			Median \$205	Median \$198	
			Range \$179 to \$367	Range \$194 to \$368	
			Municipalities Reporting 4	Municipalities Reporting 4	
<p>Efficiency Measure Operating costs for the collection, treatment and disposal of wastewater per megalitre (Integrated System).</p> <p>Objective Efficient wastewater system (Integrated System).</p>					
<p>Observations</p> <p>The result in this area is higher because the total megalitres treated was lower than the previous year.</p> <p>Since a significant portion of Kingston’s collection system is a combined sanitary and storm system, the total megalitres treated varies based upon the amount of rainfall. Capital improvements, in particular the refurbishment of the north end trunk sewer have also helped to reduce the volume of megalitres treated.</p> <p>* One mega litre equals 1,000,000 litres or 1,000 cubic metres.</p>					

NOTE: 2002 & 2003 Comparative result for Southern Ontario, Single Tier Municipalities with a Population Greater than 100,000. Source: Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing

Wastewater (Sewage)

WASTEWATER MAIN BACKUPS					
	2005	2004	2003	2002	2001
Kingston	1.4	13.9	24.2	3.6	3.0
Comparative Result*			Median 1.3	Median 3.6	
			Range 1.2 to 24.2	Range 1.2 to 40.4	
			Municipalities Reporting 4	Municipalities Reporting 4	
<p>Effectiveness Measure Number of wastewater main backups per 100 kilometres of wastewater main in a year.</p> <p>Objective Municipal sewage management practices prevent environmental and human health hazards.</p> <p>Observations The increase reported in 2003 and 2004 were the results of heavy rain over a short period of time, including the remnants of hurricanes. Ongoing capital improvement programs, such as trunk-main cleaning, has helped to reduce the number of backups.</p>					

NOTE: 2002 & 2003 Comparative result for Southern Ontario, Single Tier Municipalities with a Population Greater than 100,000. Source: Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing

Wastewater (Sewage)

WASTEWATER BYPASSES TREATMENT					
	2005	2004	2003	2002	2001
Kingston	0.57%	0.66%	0.25%	0.17%	0.28%
Comparative Result*			Median 0.25%	Median 0.05%	
			Range 0 to 1.39%	Range 0.05% to 0.67%	
			Municipalities Reporting 4	Municipalities Reporting 4	
<p>Effectiveness Measure Percentage of wastewater estimated to have by-passed treatment.</p> <p>Objective Municipal sewage management practices prevent environmental and human health hazards.</p> <p>Observations Weather conditions directly impact the quantity of wastewater by-passed. A portion of the increase in 2004 can be attributed to the significant storm experienced in September of that year. These weather conditions overwhelm the system and cause back-ups and overflows. A number of capital improvement programs have helped reduce the incidents and volume of wastewater that is by-passed. There is an ongoing commitment to upgrade our aging infrastructure.</p>					

NOTE: 2002 & 2003 Comparative result for Southern Ontario, Single Tier Municipalities with a Population Greater than 100,000. Source: Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing

Storm Water

URBAN STORM WATER MANAGEMENT – EFFICIENCY					
	2005	2004	2003		
Kingston	\$1417	N/A	N/A		
Comparative Result*			Median		
			Range		
			Municipalities Reporting		
<p>Efficiency Measure Operating costs for urban storm water management (collection, treatment, and disposal) per kilometre of drainage system.</p> <p>Objective Efficient urban storm water management.</p> <p>Observations The total operating costs for 2005 were \$595,315. The result was calculated by dividing the total operating costs by 420 km of drainage pipe. Previous year results are not comparable due to a discrepancy in the calculation of total kilometres of pipe.</p>					

NOTE: 2002 & 2003 Comparative result for Southern Ontario, Single Tier Municipalities with a Population Greater than 100,000. Source: Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing

Drinking Water

DRINKING WATER INTEGRATED SYSTEM – EFFICIENCY					
	2005	2004	2003	2002	2001
Kingston	\$263	\$226	\$226	\$238	\$201
Comparative Result*			Median \$153	Median \$173	
			Range \$119 to \$505	Range \$123 to \$470	
			Municipalities Reporting 4	Municipalities Reporting 4	
<p>Efficiency Measure Operating costs for the treatment and distribution of drinking water per megalitre. (Integrated System)</p> <p>Objective Efficient municipal water system (Integrated System).</p> <p>Observations 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					
	2005	2004	2003	2002	2001
Kingston	0	0	3.0	0	0
Comparative Result*			Median 0	Median 0	
			Range 0 to 3.0	Range 0 to 0.01	
			Municipalities Reporting 4	Municipalities Reporting 2	
<p>Effectiveness Measure Weighted number of days when a boil water advisory issued by the Medical Officer of Health, applicable to a municipal water supply, was in effect.</p> <p>Objective Water is safe and meets local needs.</p> <p>Observations One boil water advisory was issued in 2005 as a precautionary measure due to a serious water main break. Since the calculation is based on weighted number of days, the single incident still reports as zero. The advisory was issued for a limited area of the City.</p>					

NOTE: 2002 & 2003 Comparative result for Southern Ontario, Single Tier Municipalities with a Population Greater than 100,000. Source: Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing

Drinking Water

BREAKS IN WATER MAINS					
	2005	2004	2003	2002	2001
Kingston	14	17	10	14	15
Comparative Result*			Median 11	Median 16	
			Range 10 to 31	Range 14 to 37	
			Municipalities Reporting 4	Municipalities Reporting 4	
<p>Effectiveness Measure Number of water main breaks per 100 kilometres of water distribution pipe in a year.</p> <p>Objective Improve system reliability.</p>					
<p>Observations Weather conditions impact the number of water main breaks. The results in this area are consistent year over year and within range of our comparator cities.</p>					

NOTE: 2002 & 2003 Comparative result for Southern Ontario, Single Tier Municipalities with a Population Greater than 100,000. Source: Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing

Solid Waste Management (Garbage)

GARBAGE COLLECTION – EFFICIENCY					
	2005	2004	2003	2002	2001
Kingston	\$81	\$85	\$79	\$82	\$71
Comparative Result*			Median \$68	Median \$73	
			Range \$39 to \$79	Range \$66 to \$82	
			Municipalities Reporting 4	Municipalities Reporting 3	
<p>Efficiency Measure Operating costs for garbage collection per tonne.</p> <p>Objective Efficient municipal garbage collection services.</p>					
<p>Observations The results in this area are slightly lower for 2005 but consistent with previous years.</p>					

GARBAGE DISPOSAL – EFFICIENCY					
	2005	2004	2003	2002	2001
Kingston	\$82	\$86	\$99	\$100	\$139
Comparative Result*			Median \$46	Median \$56	
			Range \$13 to \$99	Range \$44 to \$100	
			Municipalities Reporting 3	Municipalities Reporting 3	
<p>Efficiency Measure Operating costs for garbage disposal per tonne.</p> <p>Objective Efficient municipal garbage disposal services.</p>					
<p>Observations The disposal costs for 2005 are consistent with the decreased collection costs.</p>					

NOTE: 2002 & 2003 Comparative result for Southern Ontario, Single Tier Municipalities with a Population Greater than 100,000. Source: Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing

Solid Waste Management (Garbage)

SOLID WASTE DIVERSION (RECYCLING) – EFFICIENCY					
	2005	2004	2003	2002	2001
Kingston	\$165	\$157	\$164	\$174	\$144
Comparative Result*			Median \$113	Median \$123	
			Range \$89 - \$164	Range \$87 to \$174	
			Municipalities Reporting 3	Municipalities Reporting 3	
<p>Efficiency Measure Operating costs for solid waste diversion (recycling) per tonne.</p> <p>Objective Efficient municipal solid waste diversion (recycling) services.</p>					
<p>Observations The result in this area is as expected because recycling costs increase as more waste is diverted from the landfill.</p>					

SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT (INTEGRATED SYSTEM) – EFFICIENCY					
	2005	2004	2003	2002	2001
Kingston	\$163	\$163	\$167	\$174	\$185
Comparative Result*			Median \$116	Median \$108	
			Range \$58 to \$167	Range \$57 to \$175	
			Municipalities Reporting 4	Municipalities Reporting 4	
<p>Efficiency Measure Average operating costs for solid waste management (collection, disposal and diversion) per tonne.</p> <p>Objective Efficient municipal solid waste management (Integrated System).</p>					
<p>Observations The operating costs in this section are based on the total costs of collection, disposal and diversion. See notes in the previous section.</p>					

NOTE: 2002 & 2003 Comparative result for Southern Ontario, Single Tier Municipalities with a Population Greater than 100,000. Source: Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing

Solid Waste Management (Garbage)

COMPLAINTS — COLLECTION OF GARBAGE AND RECYCLED MATERIALS					
	2005	2004	2003	2002	2001
Kingston	25	21	22	38	62
Comparative Result*			Median 10	Median 34	
			Range 8 to 58	Range 31 to 58	
			Municipalities Reporting 4	Municipalities Reporting 4	
<p>Effectiveness Measure Number of complaints received in a year concerning the collection of garbage and recycled materials per 1,000 households.</p> <p>Objective Improved garbage collection of garbage and recycled materials.</p>					
<p>Observations The City communicated significant changes to garbage disposal services in the last quarter of 2005, which resulted in a higher number of calls and complaints received in the Customer Service Centre.</p>					

NUMBER OF MUNICIPAL SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT FACILITIES					
	2005	2004	2003	2002	2001
Kingston	12	12	9	8	8
Comparative Result*			Median 3	Median 3	
			Range 2 to 10	Range 2 to 10	
	Number of municipalities reporting 4		Municipalities Reporting 4	Municipalities Reporting 4	
<p>Effectiveness Measure Total number of solid waste management facilities owned by municipality with a Ministry of Environment Certificate of Approval.</p> <p>Objective Context for solid waste management facility compliance measure.</p>					
<p>Observations No change from the previous year.</p>					

NOTE: 2002 & 2003 Comparative result for Southern Ontario, Single Tier Municipalities with a Population Greater than 100,000. Source: Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing

Solid Waste Management (Garbage)

FACILITY COMPLIANCE					
Effectiveness Measure					
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.					
Objective					
Municipal solid waste services do not have an adverse impact on environment.					
Facility Name	Days 2005	Days 2004	Days 2003	Days 2002	Days 2001
Kingston East Landfill	0	0	0	0	0
McAdoo's Lane Landfill (closed)	0	0	0	0	0
Belle Park Landfill (closed)	0	0	0	0	0
Creekford Road Quarry-white goods transfer station (closed)	0	0	N/A	N/A	N/A
Kingston Area Recycling Centre – Material Recovery Facility	0	0	0	0	0
Kingston Area Recycling Centre – Leaf and Yard Waste Composting Site	0	0	0	0	0
Kingston Area Recycling Centre – Household Hazardous Waste Facility	0	0	0	0	0
Kingston East Landfill – Composting Site	0	0	0	0	0
Knox Farm Sediment Storage Facility	0	0	0	N/A	N/A
City Yard Waste Transfer Station	0	0	N/A	N/A	N/A
Rideaucrest Home – soil disposal (closed)	0	0	N/A	N/A	N/A
Ravensview Water Pollution Control Plant – bio-solids collection & transfer (open)	0	0	N/A	N/A	N/A

NOTE: 2002 & 2003 Comparative result for Southern Ontario, Single Tier Municipalities with a Population Greater than 100,000. Source: Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing

Solid Waste Management (Garbage)

DIVERSION OF RESIDENTIAL SOLID WASTE					
	2005	2004	2003	2002	2001
Kingston	43%	41%	43%	42%	38%
Comparative Result*			Median 34%	Median 32%	
			Range 31% to 43%	Range 31% to 42%	
			Municipalities Reporting 4	Municipalities Reporting 4	
<p>Effectiveness Measure Percentage of residential solid waste diverted for recycling.</p> <p>Objective Municipal solid waste reduction programs divert waste from landfills and/or incinerators.</p>					
<p>Observations Kingston's diversion rate for 2005 is consistent with previous years and substantially higher than the comparator municipalities.</p>					

NOTE: 2002 & 2003 Comparative result for Southern Ontario, Single Tier Municipalities with a Population Greater than 100,000. Source: Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing

Parks and Recreation

PARKS – EFFICIENCY					
	2005	2004			
Kingston	\$33	\$26			
<p>Efficiency Measure Operating costs for parks per person.</p> <p>Objective Efficient operation of parks.</p>					
<p>Observations-</p> <p>This is only the second year of reporting on the parks and recreation measures and the methods of allocating costs continue to be refined for accuracy. Year to year comparisons will become more meaningful as cost information is refined in future years.</p>					

RECREATION PROGRAMS – EFFICIENCY					
	2005	2004			
Kingston	\$16	\$11			
<p>Efficiency Measure Operating costs for recreation programs per person.</p> <p>Objective Efficient operation of recreation programs.</p>					
<p>Observations</p> <p>See observations in table above.</p>					

NOTE: 2002 & 2003 Comparative result for Southern Ontario, Single Tier Municipalities with a Population Greater than 100,000. Source: Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing

Parks and Recreation

RECREATION FACILITIES – EFFICIENCY					
	2005	2004			
Kingston	\$38	\$45			
<p>Efficiency Measure Operating costs for recreation facilities per person.</p> <p>Objective Efficient operation of recreation facilities.</p>					
<p>Observations See observations in Table 1 on Page 27.</p>					

PARKS, RECREATION PROGRAMS AND RECREATION FACILITIES - EFFICIENCY					
	2005	2004			
Kingston	\$87	\$82			
<p>Efficiency Measure Operating costs for parks, recreation programs and recreation facilities per person.</p> <p>Objective Efficient operation of parks, recreation programs and recreation facilities.</p>					
<p>Observations See observations in Table 1 on Page 27.</p>					

NOTE: 2002 & 2003 Comparative result for Southern Ontario, Single Tier Municipalities with a Population Greater than 100,000. Source: Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing

Parks and Recreation

PARTICIPANT HOURS FOR RECREATION PROGRAMS					
	2005	2004			
Kingston	10,725	12,013			
<p>Effectiveness Measure Total participant hours for recreation programs per 1,000 persons.</p> <p>Objective Recreation programs serve needs of residents.</p>					
<p>Observations See observations in Table 1 on Page 27.</p>					

OPEN SPACE					
	2005	2004			
Kingston	405	403			
<p>Effectiveness Measure Hectares of open space.</p> <p>Objective Open space is adequate for population.</p>					
	2005	2004			
Kingston	3.4	3.4			
<p>Effectiveness Measure Hectares of open space per 1,000 persons.</p>					
<p>Observations The addition of open space is attributed to new parkland being assumed by the municipality through the development process.</p>					

NOTE: 2002 & 2003 Comparative result for Southern Ontario, Single Tier Municipalities with a Population Greater than 100,000. Source: Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing

Parks and Recreation

TRAILS					
	2005	2004			
Kingston	21	21			
<p>Effectiveness Measure Total kilometres of trails.</p> <p>Objective Trails provide recreation opportunities.</p>					
	2005	2004			
Kingston	0.178	0.179			
<p>Effectiveness Measure Total kilometres of trails per 1,000 persons.</p>					
<p>Observations No trails added in 2005.</p>					

RECREATION FACILITY SPACE					
	2005	2004			
Kingston	47,438	47,438			
<p>Effectiveness Measure Square metres of recreation facility space.</p> <p>Objective Recreation facility space is adequate for population.</p>					
	2005	2004			
Kingston	403	404			
<p>Effectiveness Measure Square metres of recreation facility space per 1,000 persons.</p>					
<p>Observations No recreation space added in 2005.</p>					

NOTE: 2002 & 2003 Comparative result for Southern Ontario, Single Tier Municipalities with a Population Greater than 100,000. Source: Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing

Parks and Recreation

LIBRARY COSTS PER PERSON – EFFICIENCY					
	2005	2004			
Kingston	\$41	\$39			
<p>Efficiency Measure Operating costs for libraries per person.</p> <p>Objective Efficient library services.</p> <p>Observations: Operating costs for library services include expenditures for salaries, wages and employment benefits; materials; contracted services; building maintenance and utilities and other financial expenses. Operating costs for library services are \$41.00 per person. The increase is due to increased staffing, materials, and utility costs.</p>					

LIBRARY COSTS PER USE – EFFICIENCY					
	2005	2004			
Kingston	\$1.76	\$1.58			
<p>Efficiency Measure Operating costs for libraries per use.</p> <p>Objective Efficient library services</p> <p>Observations Total library uses include total annual circulation, library materials use, electronic information use, reference and library visits. Total library uses decreased due largely to lower program attendance and decreased circulation of print materials.</p>					

NOTE: 2002 & 2003 Comparative result for Southern Ontario, Single Tier Municipalities with a Population Greater than 100,000. Source: Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing

Parks and Recreation

LIBRARY USES					
	2005	2004			
Kingston	23	24			
<p>Effectiveness Measure Library uses per person.</p> <p>Objective Increased use of library services.</p>					
<p>Observations Total library uses decreased by 151,255 against a small increase in population of 713 in 2005.</p>					

ELECTRONIC LIBRARY USES					
	2005	2004			
Kingston	12%	8%			
<p>Effectiveness Measure Electronic library uses as a percentage of total library uses.</p> <p>Objective Increased use of library services.</p>					
<p>Observations 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.</p> <p>Total electronic library uses as a percentage of total library uses is 12% in 2005. The increase is due to changing customer demands resulting in an increase in the number of Electronic Resources available, and the amount of information accessible through the Library's web site.</p>					

NOTE: 2002 & 2003 Comparative result for Southern Ontario, Single Tier Municipalities with a Population Greater than 100,000. Source: Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing

Parks and Recreation

NON-ELECTRONIC LIBRARY USES					
	2005	2004			
Kingston	88%	92%			
<p>Effectiveness Measure Non-electronic library uses as a percentage of total library uses.</p> <p>Objective Better information on library usage.</p> <p>Observations 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.</p> <p>Total non-electronic library uses as a percentage of total library uses is 88%. The decrease in non-electronic uses, especially standard reference transactions, is a result of changing customer demands and needs.</p>					

NOTE: 2002 & 2003 Comparative result for Southern Ontario, Single Tier Municipalities with a Population Greater than 100,000. Source: Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing

Land Use Planning

LOCATION OF NEW DEVELOPMENT					
	2005	2004	2003	2002	2001
Kingston	98%	96%	96%	91%	89%
Comparative Result*	Number of municipalities reporting 4		Median	Median 91%	
			Range	Range 89% to 100%	
<p>Effectiveness Measure Percentage of new lots, blocks and/or units with final approval which are located within settlement areas.</p> <p>Objective New lot creation is occurring in settlement areas.</p>					
<p>Observations No change from 2004.</p>					

PRESERVATION OF AGRICULTURAL LAND DURING 2005					
	2005	2004	2003	2002	2001
Kingston	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Comparative Result*	Number of municipalities reporting 3		Median	Median 100%	
			Range	Range 100%	
<p>Effectiveness Measure Percentage of land designated for agricultural purposes which was not re-designated for other uses during the reporting year.</p> <p>Objective Preservation of agricultural land.</p>					
<p>Observations No change from 2004.</p>					

NOTE: 2002 & 2003 Comparative result for Southern Ontario, Single Tier Municipalities with a Population Greater than 100,000. Source: Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing

Land Use Planning

PRESERVATION OF AGRICULTURAL LAND RELATIVE TO 2000					
	2005	2004	2003	2002	2001
Kingston	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Comparative Result*	Number of municipalities reporting 3		Median	Median 100%	
			Range	Range 99% to 100%	
<p>Effectiveness Measure Percentage of land designated for agricultural purposes which was not re-designated for other uses relative to the base year of 2000.</p> <p>Objective Preservation of agricultural land.</p>					
<p>Observations No change from 2004.</p>					

NOTE: 2002 & 2003 Comparative result for Southern Ontario, Single Tier Municipalities with a Population Greater than 100,000. Source: Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing