



City of Kingston

**Municipal Measurement Performance Program (MPMP) Report
for the 2006 Reporting Year**

Volume 7

Background

The Municipal Performance Measures Program (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 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.

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 2006 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.

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.

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 so feel free to share your comments with your district councillor or by contacting the Organizational Effectiveness 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 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, 2006.

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 without understanding all of the underlying calculations.

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 more meaningful, the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing has prepared Summary Reports using 2002 - 2004 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 compared with other single-tier municipalities in Southern Ontario with a population greater than 100,000.

It is important to note that, because only a small number of 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.

Local Government

GENERAL GOVERNMENT – EFFICIENCY					
	2006	2005	2004	2003	2002
Kingston	4.3%	2.7%	4.4%	4.5%	4.7%
Comparative Result*			Median 3.8%	Median 5%	Median 5%
			Range 2.0% to 5.0%	Range 3.9% to 6%	Range 4% to 6%
			Municipalities Reporting 5	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 2006 are reported at \$10,047,313. The total municipal operating costs are \$234,455,449.</p> <p>The increase in 2006 is a result of including several City departments (Taxation and Revenue, Legal Services, Leased Properties) that were excluded from the calculation in 2005.</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>Note: Formulas for all efficiency measures were changed in 2005 to improve the definition of operating costs. Therefore, comparison of 2006 & 2005 results to prior results is not directly possible.</p>					

* 2002 - 2004 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					
	2006	2005	2004	2003	2002
Kingston	\$1.86	\$1.94	\$1.53	\$1.59	\$1.48
Comparative Result*			Median \$1.53	Median \$1.57	Median \$1.48
			Range \$1.15 to \$2.16	Range \$1.16 to \$2.23	Range \$1.26 to \$2.32
			Municipalities Reporting 5	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>A Master Fire Plan is currently being completed. The appropriate 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>Note: Formulas for all efficiency measures were changed in 2005 to improve the definition of operating costs. Therefore, comparison of 2006 & 2005 results to prior results is not directly possible.</p>					

* 2002 - 2004 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					
	2006	2005	2004	2003	2002
Kingston	\$203	\$188	N/A	N/A	N/A
Comparative Result*			Median N/A	Median N/A	Median N/A
			Range N/A	Range N/A	Range
			Municipalities Reporting	Municipalities Reporting	Municipalities Reporting
<p>Efficiency Measure Operating costs for police services per person.</p> <p>Objective Efficient police services.</p>					
<p>Observations 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>					

VIOLENT CRIME RATE					
	2006	2005	2004	2003	2002
Kingston	11.09	11.1	11.5	10.0	9.8
Comparative Result*			Median 11	Median 10	Median 10
			Range 8 to 13	Range 7 to 13	Range 8 to 12
			Municipalities Reporting 5	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 approximately the same this year. The total number of reported violent crime incidents in 2006 was 1300 as compared to 1303 the previous year.</p>					

* 2002 - 2004 Comparative result for Southern Ontario, Single Tier Municipalities with a Population Greater than 100,000. Source: Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing

KINGSTON
Municipal Performance Measurement Program • 2006 RESULTS

PROPERTY CRIME RATE					
	2006	2005	2004	2003	2002
Kingston	56	55	59	55	52
Comparative Result*			Median 48	Median 52	Median 53
			Range 41 to 75	Range 40 to 71	Range 49 to 65
			Municipalities Reporting 5	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 increased by 118 in 2006 reflecting an increase in the property crime rate.</p>					

TOTAL CRIME RATE					
	2006	2005	2004	2003	2002
Kingston	76	70	81	79	74
Comparative Result*			Median 82	Median 84	Median 81
			Range 77 to 111	Range 79 to 105	Range 75 to 99
			Municipalities Reporting 5	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) increased by 498 in 2006 reflecting an increase in the crime rate. The 2006 result is based data submitted to Statistics Canada. If the same methodology had been used in 2005, the Total Crime Rate restated would be 76.</p>					

* 2002 - 2004 Comparative result for Southern Ontario, Single Tier Municipalities with a Population Greater than 100,000. Source: Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing

KINGSTON
Municipal Performance Measurement Program • 2006 RESULTS

YOUTHS CHARGED					
	2006	2005	2004	2003	2002
Kingston	43	16	12	65	68
Comparative Result*			Median 39	Median 84	Median 22
			Range 12 to 51	Range 79 to 105	Range 22 to 68
			Municipalities Reporting 4	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</p> <p>The 2006 result is based on the data requirements set out by the Canadian Centre of Justice Statistics (a division of Statistics Canada). If the same methodology had been used in 2005, the number of youths restated would be 34.</p>					

* 2002 - 2004 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					
	2006	2005	2004	2003	2002
Kingston	\$1082	\$958	\$1191	\$1131	\$1124
Comparative Result*			Median \$972	Median \$948	Median \$866
			Range \$538 to \$1340	Range \$445 to \$1425	Range \$500 to \$1493
			Municipalities Reporting 4	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 increase in costs is a result of an aggressive pavement maintenance program that continued late into December due to favourable temperatures. The backlog of rehabilitation needs demands increased maintenance expenditures to maintain the driving surface, until capital improvements can be made.</p> <p>Continued investment in roads infrastructure can help to maintain and/or reduce maintenance costs.</p> <p>Asphalt, being an oil based product, was subject to oil price increases, in line with the fuel price increases experienced.</p>					
<p>Note: Formulas for all efficiency measures were changed in 2005 to improve the definition of operating costs. Therefore, comparison of 2006 & 2005 results to prior results is not directly possible.</p>					

KINGSTON
Municipal Performance Measurement Program • 2006 RESULTS

UNPAVED ROADS – EFFICIENCY					
	2006	2005	2004	2003	2002
Kingston	\$1703	\$1559	\$1779	\$2392	\$2593
Comparative Result*			Median \$1541	Median \$1466	Median \$1575
			Range \$205 to \$6021	Range \$220 to \$6056	Range \$259 to \$6360
			Municipalities Reporting 4	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>The increase in costs is a result of an aggressive gravel maintenance program that continued late into December 2006 due to milder, but wetter weather conditions.</p>					
<p>Note: Formulas for all efficiency measures were changed in 2005 to improve the definition of operating costs. Therefore, comparison of 2006 & 2005 results to prior results is not directly possible.</p>					

* 2002 - 2004 Comparative result for Southern Ontario, Single Tier Municipalities with a Population Greater than 100,000. Source: Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing

KINGSTON
Municipal Performance Measurement Program • 2006 RESULTS

WINTER MAINTENANCE OF ROADS – EFFICIENCY					
	2006	2005	2004	2003	2002
Kingston	\$1902	\$2495	\$2726	\$2552	\$2195
Comparative Result*			Median \$1196	Median \$1248	Median \$1013
			Range \$650 to \$4437	Range \$601 to \$2552	Range \$442 to \$2195
			Municipalities Reporting 4	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 from the previous year, mainly as a result of the moderate weather experienced in January - March 2006 and December 2006.</p> <p>While the costs remain higher than comparator municipalities, a higher level of winter service has been a long term goal of the department and geographic location and variation also results in different weather conditions experienced.</p>					
<p>Note: Formulas for all efficiency measures were changed in 2005 to improve the definition of operating costs. Therefore, comparison of 2006 & 2005 results to prior results is not directly possible.</p>					

* 2002 - 2004 Comparative result for Southern Ontario, Single Tier Municipalities with a Population Greater than 100,000. Source: Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing

KINGSTON
Municipal Performance Measurement Program • 2006 RESULTS

ADEQUACY OF PAVED ROADS					
	2006	2005	2004	2003	2002
Kingston	71.7%	69%	69%	70%	70%
Comparative Result*			Median 69%	Median 39%	Median 37%
			Range 39% to 73%	Range 35% to 70%	Range 35% to 77%
			Municipalities Reporting 5	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>Prior to 2006, road evaluations were completed manually. The 2006 result was completed using automated road evaluation equipment (a special van with sensors and cameras).</p> <p>The same evaluation criteria was used under both processes. The added precision of the automated process rated the roads in slightly better condition than the manual process.</p>					

* 2002 - 2004 Comparative result for Southern Ontario, Single Tier Municipalities with a Population Greater than 100,000. Source: Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing

KINGSTON
Municipal Performance Measurement Program • 2006 RESULTS

WINTER EVENT RESPONSES					
	2006	2005	2004	2003	2002
Kingston	95%	96%	96%	97%	96%
Comparative Result*			Median 100%	Median 97%	Median 96%
			Range 91% to 100%	Range 95% to 100%	Range 95% to 100%
			Municipalities Reporting 5	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 The City of Kingston's winter control plan meets or exceeds the minimum response standards established by the Province. The City of Kingston's winter response standards were achieved 95% of the time in 2006.</p>					

* 2002 - 2004 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					
	2006	2005	2004	2003	2002
Kingston	\$3.90	\$3.63	\$2.96	\$2.74	\$2.93
Comparative Result*			Median \$3.28	Median \$2.74	Median \$2.93
			Range \$2.46 to 3.85	Range \$2.15 to 4.06	Range \$2.19 to \$3.87
			Municipalities Reporting 5	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 2006 were slightly higher than in 2005.</p> <p>It is important to note that although the absolute costs increased, the net costs of operating Kingston Transit remain relatively stable year over year because of increases in revenue through passenger fares and gas tax revenues.</p> <p>Kingston Transit expects costs to continue to increase in future years as additional investments are made to prepare for the 2nd phase of expanded service beginning in 2007, to enhance transit accessibility, and to introduce smaller buses on a trial basis.</p>					
<p>Note: Formulas for all efficiency measures were changed in 2005 to improve the definition of operating costs. Therefore, comparison of 2006 & 2005 results to prior results is not directly possible.</p>					

* 2002 - 2004 Comparative result for Southern Ontario, Single Tier Municipalities with a Population Greater than 100,000. Source: Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing

KINGSTON
Municipal Performance Measurement Program • 2006 RESULTS

CONVENTIONAL TRANSIT RIDERSHIP					
	2006	2005	2004	2003	2002
Kingston	27	26	25	25	24
Comparative Result*			Median 25	Median 25	Median 24
			Range 6 to 53	Range 6 to 50	Range 6 to 47
			Municipalities Reporting 5	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</p> <p>Ridership increased by 115,243 passenger trips in 2006. This is a direct result of the expanded service levels introduced in September 2005.</p>					

* 2002 - 2004 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					
	2006	2005	2004	2003	2002
Kingston	\$222	\$239	\$214	\$205	\$194
Comparative Result*			Median \$198	Median \$205	Median \$198
			Range \$66 to \$467	Range \$179 to \$367	Range \$194 to \$368
			Municipalities Reporting 5	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>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. However, 2006 had higher than average rainfall which in turn increased the volume of wastewater treated.</p> <p>*One mega litre equals 1,000,000 litres or 1,000 cubic metres.</p>					
<p>Note: Formulas for all efficiency measures were changed in 2005 to improve the definition of operating costs. Therefore, comparison of 2006 & 2005 results to prior results is not directly possible.</p>					

* 2002 - 2004 Comparative result for Southern Ontario, Single Tier Municipalities with a Population Greater than 100,000. Source: Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing

KINGSTON
Municipal Performance Measurement Program • 2006 RESULTS

WASTEWATER MAIN BACKUPS					
	2006	2005	2004	2003	2002
Kingston	10.7	1.4	13.9	24.2	3.6
Comparative Result*			Median 1.5	Median 1.3	Median 3.6
			Range 0.6 to 13.9	Range 1.2 to 24.2	Range 1.2 to 40.4
			Municipalities Reporting 5	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 2006 was the result of heavy rain events over a short period of time. Ongoing capital improvement programs, such as sewage pumping station improvements will assist in reducing the number in future years.</p> <p>Note: Formulas for all efficiency measures were changed in 2005 to improve the definition of operating costs. Therefore, comparison of 2006 & 2005 results to prior results is not directly possible.</p>					

* 2002 - 2004 Comparative result for Southern Ontario, Single Tier Municipalities with a Population Greater than 100,000. Source: Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing

KINGSTON
Municipal Performance Measurement Program • 2006 RESULTS

WASTEWATER BYPASSES TREATMENT					
	2006	2004	2003	2002	2001
Kingston	7.028%	0.57%	0.66%	0.25%	0.17%
Comparative Result*			Median 0.01%	Median 0.25%	Median 0.05%
			Range 0 to 2.48%	Range 0 to 1.39%	Range 0.05% to 0.67%
			Municipalities Reporting 4	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 The apparent increase in the percentage of wastewater estimated to have bypassed treatment in 2006 is a result of the increase data collection capability provided by additional monitoring equipment installed in 2006. Direct comparison of 2006 to previous years is not possible.</p> <p>Weather conditions directly impact the quantity of wastewater by-passed. 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>					

* 2002 - 2004 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					
	2006	2005	2004	2003	
Kingston	\$1723	\$1417	N/A	N/A	
Comparative Result*			Median N/A	Median N/A	
			Range N/A	Range N/A	
			Municipalities Reporting N/A	Municipalities Reporting N/A	
<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 Although the km of drainage remained relatively constant more labour and equipment costs were allocated to culverts in 2006 resulting in higher costs.</p>					
<p>Note: Formulas for all efficiency measures were changed in 2005 to improve the definition of operating costs. Therefore, comparison of 2006 & 2005 results to prior results is not directly possible.</p>					

Drinking Water

DRINKING WATER INTEGRATED SYSTEM – EFFICIENCY					
	2006	2005	2004	2003	2002
Kingston	\$282	\$263	\$226	\$226	\$238
Comparative Result*			\$380	Median \$153	Median \$173
			Range \$163 to \$523	Range \$119 to \$505	Range \$123 to \$470
			Municipalities Reporting 5	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 and increased electrical charges.</p> <p>Note: Formulas for all efficiency measures were changed in 2005 to improve the definition of operating costs. Therefore, comparison of 2006 & 2005 results to prior results is not directly possible.</p>					

* 2002 - 2004 Comparative result for Southern Ontario, Single Tier Municipalities with a Population Greater than 100,000. Source: Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing

KINGSTON
Municipal Performance Measurement Program • 2006 RESULTS

BOIL WATER ADVISORIES					
	2006	2005	2004	2003	2002
Kingston	0	0	0	3.0	0
Comparative Result*			Median 0	Median 0	Median 0
			Range 0 to 0.2	Range 0 to 3.0	Range 0 to 0.01
			Municipalities Reporting 5	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 There were no boil water advisories issued in 2006.</p>					

BREAKS IN WATER MAINS					
	2006	2005	2004	2003	2002
Kingston	12	14	17	10	14
Comparative Result*			Median 11	Median 11	Median 16
			Range 5 to 17	Range 10 to 31	Range 14 to 37
			Municipalities Reporting 5	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>					

* 2002 - 2004 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					
	2006	2005	2004	2003	2002
Kingston	\$95	\$81	\$85	\$79	\$82
Comparative Result*			Median \$67	Median \$68	Median \$73
			Range \$29 to \$85	Range \$39 to \$79	Range \$66 to \$82
			Municipalities Reporting 5	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 Costs increased in 2006 due to an increased labour costs and increased administrative costs associated with service changes for commercials, multi-residential, and condominium properties. In addition, the tonnage was down due to the elimination of most commercial garbage.</p> <p>Note: Formulas for all efficiency measures were changed in 2005 to improve the definition of operating costs. Therefore, comparison of 2006 & 2005 results to prior results is not directly possible.</p>					

* 2002 - 2004 Comparative result for Southern Ontario, Single Tier Municipalities with a Population Greater than 100,000. Source: Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing

KINGSTON
Municipal Performance Measurement Program • 2006 RESULTS

GARBAGE DISPOSAL – EFFICIENCY					
	2006	2005	2004	2003	2002
Kingston	\$80	\$82	\$86	\$99	\$100
Comparative Result*			Median \$60	Median \$46	Median \$56
			Range \$11 to \$86	Range \$13 to \$99	Range \$44 to \$100
			Municipalities Reporting 5	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 reduction in cost is due to reduced administrative and program support costs.</p> <p>Note: Formulas for all efficiency measures were changed in 2005 to improve the definition of operating costs. Therefore, comparison of 2006 & 2005 results to prior results is not directly possible.</p>					

* 2002 - 2004 Comparative result for Southern Ontario, Single Tier Municipalities with a Population Greater than 100,000. Source: Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing

KINGSTON
Municipal Performance Measurement Program • 2006 RESULTS

SOLID WASTE DIVERSION (RECYCLING) – EFFICIENCY					
	2006	2005	2004	2003	2002
Kingston	\$147	\$165	\$157	\$164	\$174
Comparative Result*			Median \$146	Median \$113	Median \$123
			Range \$47 to \$157	Range \$89 - \$164	Range \$87 to \$174
			Municipalities Reporting 5	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 Recycling collection and processing was re-tendered in 2006 resulting in lower cost for the 2nd half of the year. Also, the City of Kingston started a grey box program in September which reduced costs further.</p>					
<p>Note: Formulas for all efficiency measures were changed in 2005 to improve the definition of operating costs. Therefore, comparison of 2006 & 2005 results to prior results is not directly possible.</p>					

* 2002 - 2004 Comparative result for Southern Ontario, Single Tier Municipalities with a Population Greater than 100,000. Source: Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing

KINGSTON
Municipal Performance Measurement Program • 2006 RESULTS

SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT (INTEGRATED SYSTEM) – EFFICIENCY					
	2006	2005	2004	2003	2002
Kingston	\$160	\$163	\$163	\$167	\$174
Comparative Result*			Median \$118	Median \$116	Median \$108
			Range \$52 to \$163	Range \$58 to \$167	Range \$57 to \$175
			Municipalities Reporting 5	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</p> <p>The operating costs in this section are based on the total costs of collection, disposal and diversion. See notes in the previous section.</p> <p>The reduction of costs in 2006 was due to lower recycling expenses.</p>					
<p>Note: Formulas for all efficiency measures were changed in 2005 to improve the definition of operating costs. Therefore, comparison of 2006 & 2005 results to prior results is not directly possible.</p>					

* 2002 - 2004 Comparative result for Southern Ontario, Single Tier Municipalities with a Population Greater than 100,000. Source: Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing

KINGSTON
Municipal Performance Measurement Program • 2006 RESULTS

COMPLAINTS — COLLECTION OF GARBAGE AND RECYCLED MATERIALS					
	2006	2005	2004	2003	2002
Kingston	25	25	21	22	38
Comparative Result*			Median 15	Median 10	Median 34
			Range 10 to 57	Range 8 to 58	Range 31 to 58
			Municipalities Reporting 5	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 implemented a grey box recycling program in October 2006. The Solid Waste Division worked closely with the Client Services Division to communicate the new program, in an effort to minimize the impact on the residents.</p>					

* 2002 - 2004 Comparative result for Southern Ontario, Single Tier Municipalities with a Population Greater than 100,000. Source: Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing

KINGSTON
Municipal Performance Measurement Program • 2006 RESULTS

NUMBER OF MUNICIPAL SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT FACILITIES					
	2006	2005	2004	2003	2002
Kingston	12	12	12	9	8
Comparative Result*			Median 3	Median 3	Median 3
			Range 1 to 12	Range 2 to 10	Range 2 to 10
			Municipalities Reporting 5	Municipalities Reporting 4	Municipalities Reporting 4
<p>Effectiveness Measure</p> <p>Total number of solid waste management facilities owned by municipality with a Ministry of Environment Certificate of Approval.</p> <p>Objective</p> <p>Context for solid waste management facility compliance measure.</p>					
<p>Observations</p> <p>No change from the previous year.</p>					

* 2002 - 2004 Comparative result for Southern Ontario, Single Tier Municipalities with a Population Greater than 100,000. Source: Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing

KINGSTON
Municipal Performance Measurement Program • 2006 RESULTS

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 2006	Days 2005	Days 2004	Days 2003	Days 2002
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
Creeford Road Quarry-white goods transfer station (closed)	0	0	0	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	0	N/A
City Yard Waste Transfer Station	0	0	0	N/A	N/A
Rideaucrest Home – soil disposal (closed)	0	0	0	N/A	N/A
Ravensview Water Pollution Control Plant – bio-solids collection & transfer (open)	0	0	0	N/A	N/A

* 2002 - 2004 Comparative result for Southern Ontario, Single Tier Municipalities with a Population Greater than 100,000. Source: Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing

KINGSTON
Municipal Performance Measurement Program • 2006 RESULTS

DIVERSION OF RESIDENTIAL SOLID WASTE					
	2006	2005	2004	2003	2002
Kingston	42%	43%	41%	43%	42%
Comparative Result*			Median 35%	Median 34%	Median 32%
			Range 28% to 41%	Range 31% to 43%	Range 31% to 42%
			Municipalities Reporting 4	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 2006 is consistent with previous years and remains substantially higher than comparator municipalities.</p>					

* 2002 - 2004 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					
	2006	2005	2004		
Kingston	\$34	\$33	\$26		
Comparative Result*			Median \$26		
			Range \$19 to \$62		
			Municipalities Reporting 5		
<p>Efficiency Measure Operating costs for parks per person.</p> <p>Objective Efficient operation of parks.</p>					
<p>Observations-</p> <p>In the third year of reporting on the parks and recreation measures, the method for allocating costs is becoming more consistent with year to year results comparisons being more meaningful.</p>					

KINGSTON
Municipal Performance Measurement Program • 2006 RESULTS

RECREATION PROGRAMS – EFFICIENCY					
	2006	2005	2004		
Kingston	\$17	\$16	\$11		
Comparative Result*			Median \$20		
			Range \$8 to \$31		
			Municipalities Reporting 5		
<p>Efficiency Measure Operating costs for recreation programs per person.</p> <p>Objective Efficient operation of recreation programs.</p>					
<p>Observations See note in previous section.</p>					

* 2002 - 2004 Comparative result for Southern Ontario, Single Tier Municipalities with a Population Greater than 100,000. Source: Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing

KINGSTON
Municipal Performance Measurement Program • 2006 RESULTS

RECREATION FACILITIES – EFFICIENCY					
	2006	2005	2004		
Kingston	\$40	\$38	\$45		
Comparative Result*			Median \$49		
			Range \$30 to \$54		
			Municipalities Reporting 5		
<p>Efficiency Measure Operating costs for recreation facilities per person.</p> <p>Objective Efficient operation of recreation facilities.</p>					
<p>Observations See note in previous section.</p>					

PARKS, RECREATION PROGRAMS AND RECREATION FACILITIES - EFFICIENCY					
	2006	2005	2004		
Kingston	\$91	\$87	\$82		
Comparative Result*			Median \$93		
			Range \$81 to \$122		
			Municipalities Reporting 5		
<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 note in previous section.</p>					

* 2002 - 2004 Comparative result for Southern Ontario, Single Tier Municipalities with a Population Greater than 100,000. Source: Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing

KINGSTON
Municipal Performance Measurement Program • 2006 RESULTS

PARTICIPANT HOURS FOR RECREATION PROGRAMS					
	2006	2005	2004		
Kingston	10,475	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</p>					

* 2002 - 2004 Comparative result for Southern Ontario, Single Tier Municipalities with a Population Greater than 100,000. Source: Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing

KINGSTON
Municipal Performance Measurement Program • 2006 RESULTS

OPEN SPACE					
	2006	2005	2004		
Kingston	429	405	403		
Comparative Result*			Median 1134		
			Range \$252 to \$1822		
			Municipalities Reporting 5		
<p>Effectiveness Measure Hectares of open space.</p> <p>Objective Open space is adequate for population.</p>					
	2006	2005	2004		
Kingston	3.7	3.4	3.4		
Comparative Result*			Median 5		
			Range 2.3 to 9		
			Municipalities Reporting 5		
<p>Effectiveness Measure Hectares of open space per 1,000 persons.</p>					
<p>Observations</p> <p>The increase in 2006 reflects more accurate reporting of open space.</p>					

* 2002 - 2004 Comparative result for Southern Ontario, Single Tier Municipalities with a Population Greater than 100,000. Source: Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing

KINGSTON
Municipal Performance Measurement Program • 2006 RESULTS

TRAILS					
	2006	2005	2004		
Kingston	49	21	21		
Comparative Result*			Median 38		
			Range 21 to 116		
			Municipalities Reporting 5		
<p>Effectiveness Measure Total kilometres of trails.</p> <p>Objective Trails provide recreation opportunities.</p>					
	2006	2005	2004		
Kingston	.418	0.178	0.179		
Comparative Result*			Median 0.3		
			Range 0.2 to 0.4		
			Municipalities Reporting 5		
<p>Effectiveness Measure Total kilometres of trails per 1,000 persons.</p>					
<p>Observations The increase in trails is the result of the Waterfront Regeneration Trust trail which runs from west to east in the city being added in 2006</p>					

* 2002 - 2004 Comparative result for Southern Ontario, Single Tier Municipalities with a Population Greater than 100,000. Source: Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing

KINGSTON
Municipal Performance Measurement Program • 2006 RESULTS

RECREATION FACILITY SPACE					
	2006	2005	2004		
Kingston	47,438	47,438	47,438		
Comparative Result*			Median 50,865		
			Range 40,322 – 122,060		
			Municipalities Reporting 5		
<p>Effectiveness Measure Square metres of recreation facility space.</p> <p>Objective Recreation facility space is adequate for population.</p>					
	2006	2005	2004		
Kingston	405	403	404		
Comparative Result*			Median 405		
			Range 187 – 536		
			Municipalities Reporting 5		
<p>Effectiveness Measure Square metres of recreation facility space per 1,000 persons.</p>					
<p>Observations No recreation space added in 2006.</p>					

* 2002 - 2004 Comparative result for Southern Ontario, Single Tier Municipalities with a Population Greater than 100,000. Source: Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing

KINGSTON
Municipal Performance Measurement Program • 2006 RESULTS

LIBRARY COSTS PER PERSON – EFFICIENCY					
	2006	2005	2004		
Kingston	\$43	\$41	\$39		
Comparative Result*			Median \$37		
			Range \$25 to \$39		
			Municipalities Reporting 3		
<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 \$42 per person. The increase is due to increased materials and utilities costs.</p>					

LIBRARY COSTS PER USE – EFFICIENCY					
	2006	2005	2004		
Kingston	\$1.68	\$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>					

* 2002 - 2004 Comparative result for Southern Ontario, Single Tier Municipalities with a Population Greater than 100,000. Source: Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing

KINGSTON
Municipal Performance Measurement Program • 2006 RESULTS

LIBRARY USES					
	2006	2005	2004		
Kingston	25	23	24		
Comparative Result*			Median 18		
			Range 10 to 28		
			Municipalities Reporting 4		
<p>Effectiveness Measure Library uses per person.</p> <p>Objective Increased use of library services.</p>					
<p>Observations: The increase in total library uses is largely due to increased use of electronic information resources, and an increase in the number of in-person visits to the library.</p>					

* 2002 - 2004 Comparative result for Southern Ontario, Single Tier Municipalities with a Population Greater than 100,000. Source: Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing

KINGSTON
Municipal Performance Measurement Program • 2006 RESULTS

ELECTRONIC LIBRARY USES					
	2006	2005	2004		
Kingston	18%	12%	8%		
Comparative Result*			Median 17%		
			Range 1% to 28%		
			Municipalities Reporting 5		
<p>Effectiveness Measure Electronic library uses as a percentage of total library uses.</p> <p>Objective Increased use of library services.</p>					
<p>Observations</p> <p>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. Electronic uses increased by 207,249 over 2005.</p> <p>Total electronic library uses as a percentage of total library uses is 18%. The increase is due to a significant increase in the number of subscriptions to electronic databases available and to the amount of information accessible through the Library's web site.</p>					

* 2002 - 2004 Comparative result for Southern Ontario, Single Tier Municipalities with a Population Greater than 100,000. Source: Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing

KINGSTON
Municipal Performance Measurement Program • 2006 RESULTS

NON-ELECTRONIC LIBRARY USES					
	2006	2005	2004		
Kingston	82%	88%	92%		
Comparative Result*			Median 83%		
			Range 72% to 99%		
			Municipalities Reporting 5		
<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 82%. The decrease in non-electronic uses, especially standard reference transactions, is a result of changing customer demands and mode of accessing information.</p>					

* 2002 - 2004 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					
	2006	2005	2004	2003	2002
Kingston	95%	98%	96%	96%	91%
Comparative Result*			Median 96%	Median 96%	Median 91%
			Range 95% to 100%	Range 96% to 100%	Range 89% to 100%
			Municipalities Reporting 4	Municipalities Reporting 4	Municipalities Reporting 4
<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 significant change from 2005. Results are consistent year over year.</p>					

PRESERVATION OF AGRICULTURAL LAND DURING 2005					
	2006	2005	2004	2003	2002
Kingston	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Comparative Result*			Median 100%	Median 100%	Median 100%
			Range 100%	Range 100%	Range 100%
			Municipalities Reporting 4	Municipalities Reporting 3	Municipalities Reporting 4
<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 2005.</p>					

* 2002 - 2004 Comparative result for Southern Ontario, Single Tier Municipalities with a Population Greater than 100,000. Source: Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing

KINGSTON
Municipal Performance Measurement Program • 2006 RESULTS

PRESERVATION OF AGRICULTURAL LAND RELATIVE TO 2000					
	2006	2005	2004	2003	2002
Kingston	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Comparative Result*			Median 100%	Median 100%	Median 100%
			Range 99% to 100%	Range 99% to 100%	Range 99% to 100%
			Municipalities Reporting 3	Municipalities Reporting 3	Municipalities Reporting 4
<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 2005.</p>					

* 2002 - 2004 Comparative result for Southern Ontario, Single Tier Municipalities with a Population Greater than 100,000. Source: Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing