



City of Kingston

**Municipal Performance Measurement Program (MPMP) Report
for the 2012 Reporting Year**

Volume 13

KINGSTON

Municipal Performance Measurement Program • 2012 RESULTS

Background

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

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

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

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

Purpose of this Report

This report card provides a summary of the Kingston MPMP results for the year 2012 and previous years. It is important that municipal leaders compare their reports, explore the reasons for differences and understand the actions taken that led to the results.

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

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

Additional Information

We encourage you to review the results and share your comments. Reports from previous years are available on the City of Kingston's web site at: <http://www.cityofkingston.ca/city-hall/departments>

KINGSTON

Municipal Performance Measurement Program • 2012 RESULTS

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

Frequently Asked Questions

What is being measured?

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

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

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

Are Performance Measures for all municipal services being reported?

Municipalities deliver a wide range of services and programs. To date, only the service areas that have the greatest impact on citizens are being measured. The criteria used to determine the service areas include major cost, high interest and value to the public and data that is relatively easy to collect. Performance results published in this report are for the calendar year ending December 31, 2012.

Can Kingston's results be compared to previous years?

Large scale accounting changes imposed on all municipalities in 2009 has meant that 2009 to 2012 costs are not, in many instances, comparable to previous years. The changes relate to how capital (e.g. costs of building assets) and operating (e.g. salaries, general supplies) costs are classified. Where there have been changes to how costs are disclosed in this way, the report has tried to demonstrate this.

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

KINGSTON

Municipal Performance Measurement Program • 2012 RESULTS

Can Kingston's results be compared to other municipalities?

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

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

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

How can performance data help improve service delivery?

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

MUNICIPALITY

Municipal Performance Measurement Program (MPMP) • 2012 RESULTS

Questions about MPMP results should be addressed to:

Name: Customer Service Department	Phone: 613-546-0000
Title:	
Municipality: City of Kingston	
E-mail: contactus@cityofkingston.ca	

Related documents and links:

MUNICIPALITY

Municipal Performance Measurement Program (MPMP) • 2012 RESULTS

Local Government

S. Dickey, Deputy Treasurer, Financial Services, 613-546-4291 ext.2370 sdickey@cityofkingston.ca

1.1 GENERAL GOVERNMENT - EFFICIENCY

	2012	2011	2010	2009
1.1 a) Operating costs for governance and corporate management as a percentage of total municipal operating costs.	3.7%	3.7%	3.6%	4.0%
1.1 b) Total costs for governance and corporate management as a percentage of total municipal costs.	3.8%	3.5%	3.7%	4.0%

OBJECTIVE:

Efficient local government.

NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:

Total operating costs for governance and corporate management for 2012 are reported at \$12,171,579. The total municipal operating costs are \$325,243,379. The proportion of governance and corporate management costs relative to total municipal costs has remained consistent with prior years.

REFERENCE:

- The total costs efficiency measure was new for 2009. Total costs are operating costs as defined in MPMP plus amortization and interest on long-term debt.
- The 2009-2012 formulas for operating costs and total costs were changed to net out payments to the Municipal Property Assessment Corporation (MPAC) and tax write-offs & allowances reported in Schedule 40, Consolidated Statement of Operations: Expenses.

- Financial Information Return: 91 0206 35 (Operating costs measure) and 91 0206 45 (Total costs measure).

MUNICIPALITY

Municipal Performance Measurement Program (MPMP) • 2012 RESULTS

Fire Services

R. Chaput, Fire Chief, 613-548-4001 ext.5203 rchaput@cityofkingston.ca

2.1 FIRE SERVICES – EFFICIENCY

	2012	2011	2010	2009	2008	2007	2006
2.1 a) Operating costs for fire services per \$1,000 of assessment.	\$ 1.82	\$ 1.81	\$ 1.87	\$ 1.95	\$ 2.04	\$ 2.01	\$ 1.86
2.1 b) Total costs for fire services per \$1,000 of assessment.	\$ 1.87	\$ 1.87	\$ 1.93	\$ 2.02			

OBJECTIVE:

Efficient fire services.

NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:

The Kingston Fire & Rescue continues to evaluate its fire service delivery to optimize operational efficiency in order to improve fire and life safety within the community. KFR strives to create effective modern business processes which aid in improving service and reducing cost where possible. KFR has redefined operations to include a stronger focus on the first two lines of defence, Public Education and Fire Inspection and Enforcement, which enhances fire safety in a cost effective manner.

REFERENCE:

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

Line number for 2012 and prior years:

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

- The efficiency measure based on operating costs for fire services in 91 1103 35 for 2009 to 2012 is comparable to the efficiency measure in 91 1102 13 for the years 2006 to 2008.

MUNICIPALITY

Municipal Performance Measurement Program (MPMP) • 2012 RESULTS

2.2 & 2.3 CIVILIAN FIRE RELATED INJURIES

	2012	2011	2010	2009	
2.2 Number of residential fire related injuries per 1,000 persons.	0.032	0.049	0.042	0.042	
2.3 Number of residential fire related injuries averaged over 5 years per 1,000 persons.	0.048	0.043	0.050	0.034	

OBJECTIVE:

Minimize the number of civilian injuries in residential fires.

NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:

Focus is being placed on high risk groups within the community with an increased emphasis on specific public education and enforcement. Existing fire prevention programs are being reviewed and improved where required to enhance effectiveness. The 2011 2.3 measure has been corrected from originally reported.

REFERENCE:

- The effectiveness measures for fire services were new for 2009.
- Measures 2.2 and 2.3 refer to the number of civilian injuries.
- Financial Information Return: 92 1151 07 (2.2) and 92 1152 07 (2.3).

MUNICIPALITY

Municipal Performance Measurement Program (MPMP) • 2012 RESULTS

2.4 & 2.5 CIVILIAN FIRE RELATED FATALITIES - EFFECTIVENESS

	2012	2011	2010	2009	
2.4 Number of residential fire related fatalities per 1,000 persons.	0.016	0.000	0.008	0.000	
2.5 Number of residential fire related fatalities averaged over 5 years per 1,000 persons.	0.008	0.000	0.000	0.008	

OBJECTIVE:

Minimize the number of civilian fatalities in residential fires.

NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:

Special emphasis is placed on public education programs in fire service operations. This includes a smoke alarm program which increases fire safety awareness and enhances smoke alarm compliance by installing working smoke alarms at all residences which we attend within identified areas of the municipality.

REFERENCE:

- The effectiveness measures for fire services were new for 2009.
- Measures 2.4 and 2.5 refer to the number of civilian fatalities.
- Financial Information Return: 92 1155 07 (2.4) and 92 1156 07 (2.5).

MUNICIPALITY

Municipal Performance Measurement Program (MPMP) • 2012 RESULTS

2.6 NUMBER OF RESIDENTIAL STRUCTURAL FIRES

	2012	2011	2010	2009	
2.6 Number of residential structural fires per 1,000 households.	1.524	1.297	1.398	1.630	

OBJECTIVE:

Minimize the number of residential structural fires.

NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:

Special emphasis is placed on public education with social media, smoke alarm program and targeted fire prevention campaigns for high risk groups.

REFERENCE:

- The effectiveness measures for fire services were new for 2009.
- Financial Information Return: 92 1160 07.

MUNICIPALITY

Municipal Performance Measurement Program (MPMP) • 2012 RESULTS

Police Services

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

3.1 POLICE SERVICES

	2012	2011	2010	2009
3.1 a) Operating costs for police services per person.	\$ 264.50	\$ 256.28	\$ 255.35	\$ 240.61
3.1 b) Total costs for police services per person.	\$ 286.24	\$ 282.20	\$ 281.48	\$ 262.47

OBJECTIVE:

Efficient police services.

NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:

The operating cost per person of \$264.50 as compared to a 2011 cost of \$256.28 represents an increase of 3.21%. This increase is primarily related to contractual wage increases, since staffing levels have remained unchanged while population levels increased by only 1%.

REFERENCE:

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

Line numbers for 2012 and prior years:

Report results for 2009 to 2012 only, unless results for prior years are restated. In determining whether to restate the efficiency measure based on operating costs for police services, consider whether amounts for unfunded liabilities are material and whether there are changes in what are deemed to be capital expenses.

- The efficiency measure based on operating costs for police services in 91 1204 35 for 2009 to 2012 may be compared to the measure in 91 1203 13 for 2006 to 2008, provided costs for prisoner transportation and court security are included.

MUNICIPALITY

Municipal Performance Measurement Program (MPMP) • 2012 RESULTS

3.2 VIOLENT CRIME RATE

	2012	2011	2010	2009	
3.2 Violent crime rate per 1,000 persons. ¹	11.36	11.53	11.31	12.37	

OBJECTIVE:

Safe communities.

NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:

Violent crime rates were down 1.5% in 2012. The slight decrease is consistent with the long-term trend.

REFERENCE:

- ¹ Statistics Canada has expanded the definition of violent crime. Therefore, years prior to 2009 are not comparable unless restated.
-
- Financial Information Return: 92 1258 07.

3.3 PROPERTY CRIME RATE

	2012	2011	2010	2009	
3.3 Property crime rate per 1,000 persons. ¹	38.8	40.4	42.5	40.4	

OBJECTIVE:

Safe communities.

NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:

Property crime rates decreased 3.9% in 2012. The slight decrease is consistent with the long-term trend.

REFERENCE:

- ¹ Statistics Canada has expanded the definition of property crime. Therefore, years prior to 2009 are not comparable unless restated.
-
- Financial Information Return: 92 1259 07.

MUNICIPALITY

Municipal Performance Measurement Program (MPMP) • 2012 RESULTS

3.4 TOTAL CRIME RATE

		2012	2011	2010	2009	2008	2007	2006
3.4	Total crime rate per 1,000 persons (<i>Criminal Code</i> offences, excluding traffic).	58.5	58.4	61.4	59.6	66.0	68.0	76.0
OBJECTIVE: Safe communities.								
NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS: Total crime rates have continued to trend slightly downward over the last seven years from a high of 76 (2006) to 58.5 (2012), a decrease of 23% from the high.								
REFERENCE: • Financial Information Return: 92 1263 07.								

3.5 YOUTH CRIME RATE

		2012	2011	2010	2009	2008	2007	2006
3.5	Youth crime rate per 1,000 youths.	28.0	30.7	36.2	44.5	37.0	38.0	43.0
OBJECTIVE: Safe communities.								
NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS: Youth crime rates have continued to trend downward over the last few years and have decreased 35% from 2006.								
REFERENCE: • Financial Information Return: 92 1265 07.								

MUNICIPALITY

Municipal Performance Measurement Program (MPMP) • 2012 RESULTS

Roads

D Wells, Director, Public Works, 613-546-4291 ext. 2313 dwells@cityofkingston.ca, M Campbell, Construction Manager, Engineering, 613-546-4921 ext.. 3139 mcampbell@cityofkingston.ca (4.3, 4.5 and 4.6)

4.1 PAVED ROADS

	2012	2011	2010	2009	2008	2007	2006
4.1 a) Operating costs for paved (hard top) roads per lane kilometre.	\$ 3,882.75	\$ 3,141.29	\$ 3,073.03	\$ 2,751.75	\$ 1,153.00	\$ 965.00	\$ 1,082.00
4.1 b) Total costs for paved (hard top) roads per lane kilometre.	\$ 9,335.52	\$ 8,503.06	\$ 8,510.01	\$ 8,406.49			

OBJECTIVE:

Efficient maintenance of paved roads.

NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:

Total operating costs for paved (hard top) roads for 2012 were \$6,841,399. This compares to \$5,484,700 for 2011. The 2012 results reflect a focus on additional maintenance activities for paved roads. Due to changes in the accounting treatment of previously capitalized costs as operating expenses, the efficiency measures are not easily comparable to 2008 and prior years. The 2009 operating/total costs were adjusted to realign costs from paved roads (roadside maintenance - ditches & culverts) to rural storm water management to reflect correct reporting treatment and to allow for better comparability between years.

REFERENCE:

- The efficiency measure based on total costs was new for 2009. Total costs are operating costs as defined in MPMP plus amortization and interest on long-term debt.
- Financial Information Return: 91 2111 35 (Operating costs measure) and 91 2111 45 (Total costs measure).

Line numbers for 2012 and prior years:

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

- The efficiency measure based on operating costs for paved roads in 91 2109 35 for 2009 to 2012 is comparable to the measure in 91 2107 13 for 2006 to 2008.

MUNICIPALITY

Municipal Performance Measurement Program (MPMP) • 2012 RESULTS

4.2 UNPAVED ROADS							
	2012	2011	2010	2009	2008	2007	2006
4.2 a) Operating costs for unpaved (loose top) roads per lane kilometre.	\$ 2,516.02	\$ 1,997.22	\$ 2,018.81	\$ 1,698.86	\$ 1,597.00	\$ 1,991.00	\$ 1,703.00
4.2 b) Total costs for unpaved (loose top) roads per lane kilometre.	\$ 3,129.12	\$ 2,610.31	\$ 2,608.77	\$ 2,328.67			
OBJECTIVE: Efficient maintenance of unpaved roads.							
NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS: Operating costs for unpaved roads were \$128,317 in 2012. This compares to \$101,858 in 2011. The total unpaved lane KM's remained unchanged at 51.							
REFERENCE: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The efficiency measure based on total costs was new for 2009. Total costs are operating costs as defined in MPMP plus amortization and interest on long-term debt. • Financial Information Return: 91 2110 35 (Operating costs measure) and 91 2110 45 (Total costs measure). 							
Line numbers for 2012 and prior years: If amounts for unfunded liabilities are not material for unpaved roads and there are no changes in what are deemed to be capital expenses, then, <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The efficiency measure based on operating costs for unpaved roads in 91 2110 35 for 2009 to 2012 is comparable to the measure in 91 2108 13 for 2006 to 2008. 							

MUNICIPALITY

Municipal Performance Measurement Program (MPMP) • 2012 RESULTS

4.3 BRIDGES AND CULVERTS

	2012	2011	2010	2009
4.3 a) Operating costs for bridges and culverts per square metre of surface area.	\$ 2.29	\$ 8.32	\$ 6.36	\$ 2.48
4.3 b) Total costs for bridges and culverts per square metre of surface area.	\$ 30.21	\$ 32.97	\$ 29.42	\$ 24.28

OBJECTIVE:

Efficient maintenance of bridges and culverts.

NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:

Total operating costs for Bridges and Culverts for 2012 were \$44,236, to service 19,317 square metres of bridges/culverts. This compares to \$160,680 to service 19,317 square metres of bridges/culverts in 2011. If we compare 2012 to 2011, operating costs for bridges and culverts per square metre have decreased. Bridge remediation has been an active component of the capital program, resulting in lower operating costs for 2012.

REFERENCE:

- The efficiency measures for bridges and culverts were new for 2009. Total costs are operating costs as defined in MPMP plus amortization and interest on long-term debt.
- Financial Information Return: 91 2130 35 (Operating costs measure) and 91 2130 45 (Total costs measure).

MUNICIPALITY

Municipal Performance Measurement Program (MPMP) • 2012 RESULTS

4.4 WINTER MAINTENANCE OF ROADS

	2012	2011	2010	2009	2008	2007	2006
4.4 a) Operating costs for winter maintenance of roadways per lane kilometre maintained in winter.	\$ 2,535.50	\$ 3,070.57	\$ 2,299.94	\$ 2,654.56	\$ 4,125.00	\$ 3,785.00	\$ 1,902.00
4.4 b) Total costs for winter maintenance of roadways per lane kilometre maintained in winter.	\$ 2,535.50	\$ 3,070.57	\$ 2,299.94	\$ 2,654.56			

OBJECTIVE:

Efficient winter maintenance of roads.

NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:

Operating costs for winter maintenance of roadways (excluding sidewalks and parking lots) for 2012 were \$4,568,979 to service 1,802 KM's of roadway. This compares to costs of \$5,517,814 to service 1,797 KM's of roadway in 2011. If we compare 2012 to 2011, total operating costs for winter maintenance have decreased. The decrease is primarily due to salaries and benefits which have decreased by 17.9%, and costs for contracted services which have decreased by 29.8% from 2011. Winter maintenance costs are a direct function of the winter weather experienced and can vary significantly year over year. January to March 2011 saw significant winter control (maintenance) activity and specifically significant snow removal costs. As reported in the 2008 MPMP report, 2008 costs were unusually high due to a long winter season which necessitated starting winter control shifts early.

REFERENCE:

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

Line numbers for 2012 and prior years:

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

- The efficiency measure based on operating costs for winter maintenance of roads in 91 2205 35 for 2009 to 2012 is comparable to the efficiency measure in 91 2204 13 for the years 2006 to 2008.

MUNICIPALITY

Municipal Performance Measurement Program (MPMP) • 2012 RESULTS

4.5 ADEQUACY OF PAVED ROADS

		2012	2011	2010	2009	2008	2007	2006
4.5	Percentage of paved lane kilometres where the condition is rated as good to very good. ¹	69.1%	69.3%	69.4%	68.2%	70.5%	70.4%	71.7%
OBJECTIVE:								
Pavement condition meets municipal objectives.								
NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:								
Actual road inspections were conducted in 2008 and 2011 (once every 3 years). Changes from year over year reflect the continued aging of roads which are derived through computer modeling as well as the improvement of roads where work has been completed under the capital program. Road length measurements taken as part of the inspections have been used to accurately update values in the road database since the 2009 MPMP report. The decrease in adequacy from 2008 to 2009 was largely a result of database corrections.								
REFERENCE:								
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ¹Pavement condition is rated using a Pavement Condition Index (PCI) such as the Index used by the Ontario Good Roads Association (OGRA) or the Ministry of Transportation's Roads Inventory Management System (RIMS). • Financial Information Return: 92 2152 07. 								

MUNICIPALITY

Municipal Performance Measurement Program (MPMP) • 2012 RESULTS

4.6 ADEQUACY OF BRIDGES AND CULVERTS

		2012	2011	2010	2009
4.6	Percentage of bridges and culverts where the condition is rated as good to very good. ¹	92.1%	88.8%	88.8%	88.8%

OBJECTIVE:

Safe bridges and culverts.

NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:

As with all Ontario municipalities a regulated process (OSIM) is utilized to evaluate all of the City's bridges and culverts. All of the bridges have been ranked as good or very good. Forty-eight (48) of the fifty-five (55) culverts in the City have been rated as good or very good.

REFERENCE:

- The effectiveness measure for bridges and culverts was new for 2009.
 - ¹A bridge or culvert is rated in good to very good condition if distress to the primary components is minimal, requiring only maintenance. Primary components are the main load carrying components of the structure, including the deck, beams, girders, abutments, foundations, etc.
-
- Financial Information Return: 92 2165 07.

MUNICIPALITY

Municipal Performance Measurement Program (MPMP) • 2012 RESULTS

4.7 WINTER EVENT RESPONSES

	2012	2011	2010	2009	2008	2007	2006
4.7 Percentage of winter events where the response met or exceeded locally determined municipal service levels for road maintenance.	91%	94%	95%	96%	94%	95%	95%

OBJECTIVE:

Response to winter storm events meets locally determined service levels for winter road maintenance.

NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:

Consistent with prior years.

REFERENCE:

- Financial Information Return: 92 2251 07.

MUNICIPALITY

Municipal Performance Measurement Program (MPMP) • 2012 RESULTS

Conventional Transit

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

5.1 CONVENTIONAL TRANSIT

	2012	2011	2010	2009	2008	2007	2006
5.1 a) Operating costs for conventional transit per regular service passenger trip.	4.05	\$ 3.91	\$ 3.71	\$ 3.68	\$ 4.11	\$ 4.03	\$ 3.90
5.1 b) Total costs for conventional transit per regular service passenger trip.	4.49	\$ 4.33	\$ 4.08	\$ 4.04			

OBJECTIVE:

Efficient conventional transit services.

NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:

There were no changes to Kingston Transit service levels in 2012. The increase in operating costs and total costs are reflective of general operating cost increases.

REFERENCE:

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

Line numbers for 2012 and prior years:

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

- The efficiency measure based on operating costs for transit in 91 2303 35 for 2009 to 2012 is comparable to the efficiency measure in 91 2302 13 for the years 2006 to 2008.

MUNICIPALITY

Municipal Performance Measurement Program (MPMP) • 2012 RESULTS

5.2 CONVENTIONAL TRANSIT RIDERSHIP

	2012	2011	2010	2009	2008	2007	2006
5.2 Number of conventional transit passenger trips per person in the service area in a year.	32.1	31.6	31.0	30.0	30.0	29.0	27.0

OBJECTIVE:

Maximum utilization of municipal transit services.

NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:

The continued positive trend in ridership reflects the sustained investments made to improve Kingston Transit from 2005-2008, and the continued positive ridership growth of Route 7, introduced in September 2010. The Kingston Transit service improvements planned for September 2013 are expected to have a positive impact on passenger trips in future years.

REFERENCE:

- Financial Information Return: 92 2351 07.

MUNICIPALITY

Municipal Performance Measurement Program (MPMP) • 2012 RESULTS

Wastewater (Sewage)

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

6.1 WASTEWATER COLLECTION/CONVEYANCE

	2012	2011	2010	2009	2008	2007	2006
6.1 a) Operating costs for the collection/conveyance of wastewater per kilometre of wastewater main.	\$ 12,671.09	\$ 16,938.47	\$ 11,533.17	\$ 11,877.21	\$ 4,795.00	\$ 5,392.00	\$ 5,065.00
6.1 b) Total costs for the collection/conveyance of wastewater per kilometre of wastewater main.	\$ 15,360.27	\$ 19,718.30	\$ 14,211.98	\$ 14,446.49			

OBJECTIVE:

Efficient municipal wastewater collection/conveyance.

NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:

Total operating costs for the collection/conveyance of wastewater for 2012 were \$6,703,009 to service 529 KM of wastewater mains. This compares to operating costs of \$8,909,637 to service 526 KM of wastewater mains in 2011. Due to changes in accounting treatment, the efficiency measures are not easily comparable to 2008 and prior years. A large variance between 2009-2012 as compared to 2008 and prior years is related to the classification of costs between wastewater collection/conveyance, and wastewater treatment and disposal. This is almost entirely related to contracted services cost classifications. It is also the case that as priorities change between collection and treatment over time, variances in the cost to manage these two separately disclosed, but jointly dependent parts of the same system will also change. 2008 was unusually low due to the requirement for less emergency repair and greater pumping station efficiency. The increase in operating costs per kilometre of wastewater main in 2011 was the result of increased asset maintenance expenses, increased inspections and monitoring expenses, and increased repairs, maintenance and utilities expenses at pumping stations and treatment plants. From 2009 to 2012 the average annual increase in the operating cost per kilometre of wastewater main has been 2.2%.

REFERENCE:

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

Line numbers for 2012 and prior years:

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

- The efficiency measure based on operating costs for wastewater collection/conveyance in 91 3111 35 for 2009 to 2012 is comparable to the measure in 91 3110 13 for 2006 to 2008.

MUNICIPALITY

Municipal Performance Measurement Program (MPMP) • 2012 RESULTS

6.2 WASTEWATER TREATMENT AND DISPOSAL

	2012	2011	2010	2009	2008	2007	2006
6.2 a) Operating costs for the treatment and disposal of wastewater per megalitre.	\$ 207.04	\$ 147.74	\$ 154.80	\$ 117.81	\$ 188.00	\$ 200.00	\$ 160.00
6.2 b) Total costs for the treatment and disposal of wastewater per megalitre.	\$ 686.91	\$ 439.44	\$ 448.60	\$ 326.77			

OBJECTIVE:

Efficient municipal wastewater treatment and disposal.

NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:

Total operating costs for the treatment and disposal of wastewater for 2012 were \$6,032,226 to service 29,136 megalitres of water. This compares to costs of \$4,930,225 to service 33,371 megalitres of wastewater in 2011. If we compare 2012 to 2011, operating costs for the treatment and disposal of wastewater per megalitre have increased by 40.0%. The increase was driven by both a decrease in wastewater volume and a 22% increase in contracted services associated with extraneous flow reduction. The increase in treatment costs in 2012 can also be associated with an increase in equipment repairs at the treatment facilities.

2009 total costs were restated to realign interest on long term debt from wastewater collection/conveyance to wastewater treatment and disposal to reflect correct reporting treatment and to allow for better comparability between years.

REFERENCE:

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

Line numbers for 2012 and prior years:

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

- The efficiency measure based on operating costs for the treatment and disposal of wastewater in 91 3112 35 for 2009 to 2012 is comparable to the measure in 91 3108 13 for 2006 to 2008.

MUNICIPALITY

Municipal Performance Measurement Program (MPMP) • 2012 RESULTS

6.3 WASTEWATER INTEGRATED SYSTEM

	2012	2011	2010	2009	2008	2007	2006
6.3 a) Operating costs for the collection/conveyance, treatment, and disposal of wastewater per megalitre (integrated system).	\$ 437.10	\$ 414.73	\$ 357.09	\$ 295.76	\$ 253.00	\$ 279.00	\$ 222.00
6.3 b) Total costs for the collection/conveyance, treatment, and disposal of wastewater per megalitre (integrated system).	\$ 965.80	\$ 750.24	\$ 697.87	\$ 543.21			

OBJECTIVE:

Efficient municipal wastewater system (integrated system).

NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:

See items 6.1 and 6.2 above. Total operating costs for this service in 2012 were \$12,735,235 to service 29,136 megalitres of wastewater. Total operating costs for 2011 were \$13,839,862, to service 33,371 megalitres of wastewater.

REFERENCE:

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

Line numbers for 2012 and prior years:

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

- The efficiency measure based on operating costs for the integrated wastewater system in 91 3113 35 for 2009 to 2012 will be comparable to the measure in 91 3109 13 for 2006 to 2008.

MUNICIPALITY

Municipal Performance Measurement Program (MPMP) • 2012 RESULTS

6.4 WASTEWATER MAIN BACKUPS

	2012	2011	2010	2009	2008	2007	2006
6.4 Number of wastewater main backups per 100 kilometres of wastewater main in a year.	0.38	0.38	0.00	1.16	14.80	13.50	10.70

OBJECTIVE:

Municipal sewage management practices prevent environmental and human health hazards.

NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:

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

REFERENCE:

- Financial Information Return: 92 3154 07.

6.5 WASTEWATER BYPASSES TREATMENT

	2012	2011	2010	2009	2008	2007	2006
6.5 Percentage of wastewater estimated to have by-passed treatment.	0.603%	1.605%	0.829%	0.943%	1.726%	2.641%	7.028%

OBJECTIVE:

Municipal sewage management practices prevent environmental and human health hazards.

NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:

From 2011 to 2012 there was a significant decrease in the volume of wastewater which was estimated to have bypassed treatment. The decrease in 2012 was due to a reduction in total flows through the system, system improvements and fewer large storm events. In 2011, a few very large storm events (which were unusual in intensity) greatly increased this parameter. The trend has been fewer by-passes, which is based on more normal weather conditions.

REFERENCE:

- Financial Information Return: 92 3155 07.

MUNICIPALITY

Municipal Performance Measurement Program (MPMP) • 2012 RESULTS

Storm Water

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

7.1 URBAN STORM WATER MANAGEMENT

	2012	2011	2010	2009	2008	2007	2006
7.1 a) Operating costs for urban storm water management (collection, treatment, disposal) per kilometre of drainage system.	\$ 464.56	\$ 1,142.66	\$ 1,809.00	\$ 1,782.71	\$ 1,971.00	\$ 1,977.00	\$ 1,723.00
7.1 b) Total costs for urban storm water management (collection, treatment, disposal) per kilometre of drainage system.	\$ 5,322.86	\$ 5,939.01	\$ 7,550.00	\$ 7,164.17			

OBJECTIVE:

Efficient urban storm water management.

NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:

Total costs for urban storm water management (collection, treatment, disposal) for 2012 were \$197,439 as compared to \$481,058, for 2011. Total KM's of urban drainage system serviced was 425 KM's in 2012, compared to 421 KM's in 2011. Year to year expenses will continue to fluctuate based on identified needs.

REFERENCE:

- The efficiency measure based on total costs were new for 2009. Total costs are operating costs as defined in MPMP plus amortization and interest on long-term debt.
- Financial Information Return: 91 3209 35 (Operating costs measure) and 91 3209 45 (Total costs measure).

Line numbers for 2012 and prior years:

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

- The efficiency measure based on operating costs for urban storm water management in 91 3209 35 for 2009 to 2012 is comparable to the measure in 91 3207 13 for 2006 to 2008.

MUNICIPALITY

Municipal Performance Measurement Program (MPMP) • 2012 RESULTS

7.2 RURAL STORM WATER MANAGEMENT

	2012	2011	2010	2009
7.2 a) Operating costs for rural storm water management (collection, treatment, disposal) per kilometre of drainage system.	\$ 1,177.27	\$ 874.39	\$ 1,137.83	\$ 1,138.16
7.2 b) Total costs for rural storm water management (collection, treatment, disposal) per kilometre of drainage system.	\$ 1,177.27	\$ 874.39	\$ 1,137.83	\$ 1,138.16

OBJECTIVE:

Efficient rural storm water management.

NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:

Total operating costs for 2012 were \$959,475 to service 815 KM of drainage system. This compares to \$712,630 to service 815 KM of drainage system in 2011. Operating costs for rural storm water management per kilometre returned to a level which is consistent with 2010 and 2009 levels. The decrease in 2011 was due, in large part, to a 74% reduction in contracted services. Year to year expenses will continue to fluctuate based on identified needs.

REFERENCE:

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

Line numbers for 2012 and prior years:

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

- The efficiency measure based on operating costs for rural storm water management in 91 3210 35 for 2009 to 2012 is comparable to the measure in 91 3208 13 for 2006 to 2008.

MUNICIPALITY

Municipal Performance Measurement Program (MPMP) • 2012 RESULTS

Drinking Water

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

8.1 DRINKING WATER TREATMENT

	2012	2011	2010	2009	2008	2007	2006
8.1 a) Operating costs for the treatment of drinking water per megalitre.	\$279.01	\$ 259.32	\$ 242.95	\$ 218.31	\$ 89.52	\$ 79.76	\$ 72.59
8.1 b) Total costs for the treatment of drinking water per megalitre.	\$356.41	\$ 347.22	\$ 317.60	\$ 274.97			

OBJECTIVE:

Efficient municipal water treatment services.

NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:

Operating costs for the treatment of drinking water for 2012 were \$7,030,478 to service 25,198 megalitres of drinking water. This compares to costs of \$6,511,630 to service 25,110 megalitres for 2011. Total operating costs per megalitre have increased by 7.6%. The increase was primarily driven by an 8.0% increase in contracted services expenses while total megalitres of drinking water treated has remained steady. It should be noted that there was an increase in maintenance costs at the treatment plants in 2012 due to equipment age.

Due to changes in the accounting treatment, the efficiency measures are not easily comparable to 2008 and prior years. 2009 operating/total costs were adjusted to reclassify contracted services between drinking water treatment and drinking water distribution to reflect correct reporting treatment and to allow for better comparability between years.

REFERENCE:

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

Line numbers for 2012 and prior years:

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

- The efficiency measure based on operating costs for drinking water treatment in 91 3311 35 for 2009 to 2012 will be comparable to the measure in 91 3307 13 for 2006 to 2008.

MUNICIPALITY

Municipal Performance Measurement Program (MPMP) • 2012 RESULTS

8.2 DRINKING WATER DISTRIBUTION/TRANSMISSION							
	2012	2011	2010	2009	2008	2007	2006
8.2 a) Operating costs for the distribution/ transmission of drinking water per kilometre of water distribution pipe.	\$6,519.86	\$ 6,579.42	\$ 5,787.13	\$ 6,801.40	\$ 10,365.00	\$ 9,888.00	\$ 10,289.00
8.2 b) Total costs for the distribution/ transmission of drinking water per kilometre of water distribution pipe.	\$13,193.22	\$ 13,672.82	\$ 12,384.63	\$ 13,246.43			

OBJECTIVE:

Efficient municipal water distribution/transmission services.

NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:

Operating costs for the distribution/transmission of drinking water for 2012 were \$4,153,154 to service 637 KM's of water distribution/transmission pipe. This compares to costs of \$4,171,351 to service 634 KM's of water distribution/transmission pipe in 2011.

Due to changes in the accounting treatment, the efficiency measures are not easily comparable to 2008 and prior years. 2009 operating/total costs were adjusted to reclassify contracted services between drinking water treatment and drinking water distribution to reflect correct reporting treatment and to allow for better comparability between years.

REFERENCE:

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

Line numbers for 2012 and prior years:

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

- The efficiency measure based on operating costs for drinking water distribution/transmission in 91 3312 35 for 2009 to 2012 is comparable to the measure in 91 3310 13 for 2006 to 2008.

MUNICIPALITY

Municipal Performance Measurement Program (MPMP) • 2012 RESULTS

8.3 DRINKING WATER INTEGRATED SYSTEM

	2012	2011	2010	2009	2008	2007	2006
8.3 a) Operating costs for the treatment and distribution/transmission of drinking water per megalitre (integrated system).	\$ 443.83	\$ 425.44	\$ 387.87	\$ 367.48	\$ 316.00	\$ 298.00	\$ 282.00
8.3 b) Total costs for the treatment and distribution/transmission of drinking water per megalitre (integrated system).	\$ 689.94	\$ 692.44	\$ 627.74	\$ 565.49			

OBJECTIVE:

Efficient municipal water system (integrated system).

NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:

Total operating costs for the treatment and distribution/transmission of drinking water for 2012 were \$11,183,632 to service 25,193 megalitres of water. This compares to 2011 costs of \$10,682,981 to service 25,110.3 megalitres of water. As a result of changes in the accounting treatment, the efficiency measures are not easily comparable to 2008 and prior years. Please see 8.1 and 8.2 above.

REFERENCE:

- The efficiency measure based on total costs were new for 2009. Total costs are operating costs as defined in MPMP plus amortization and interest on long-term debt.
- Financial Information Return: 91 3313 35 (Operating costs measure) and 91 3313 45 (Total costs measure).

Line numbers for 2012 and prior years:

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

- The efficiency measure based on operating costs for the integrated drinking water system in 91 3313 35 for 2009 to 2012 is comparable to the measure in 91 3309 13 for 2006 to 2008.

MUNICIPALITY

Municipal Performance Measurement Program (MPMP) • 2012 RESULTS

8.4 BOIL WATER ADVISORIES

	2012	2011	2010	2009	2008	2007	2006
8.4 Weighted number of days when a boil water advisory issued by the medical officer of health, applicable to a municipal water supply, was in effect.	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000

OBJECTIVE:

Water is safe and meets local needs.

NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:

In 2012, there were no instances in which a boil water advisory was needed. This reflects on the quality of the service provided to water customers.

REFERENCE:

- Financial Information Return: 92 3355 07.

8.5 BREAKS IN WATER MAINS

	2012	2011	2010	2009	2008	2007	2006
8.5 Number of water main breaks per 100 kilometres of water distribution pipe in a year.	5.34	9.31	10.30	9.44	13.10	14.60	11.60

OBJECTIVE:

Improve system reliability.

NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:

Water main breaks decreased from fifty-nine (59) in 2011 to thirty-four (34) in 2012. Increased maintenance and replacement programs (including main rehabilitation) have decreased the number of failures reported from 2009 through 2012.

REFERENCE:

- Financial Information Return: 92 3356 07.

MUNICIPALITY

Municipal Performance Measurement Program (MPMP) • 2012 RESULTS

Solid Waste Management (Garbage)

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

9.1 GARBAGE COLLECTION

	2012	2011	2010	2009	2008	2007	2006
9.1 a) Operating costs for garbage collection per tonne.	\$ 124.19	\$ 114.42	\$ 107.71	\$ 103.44	\$ 95.00	\$ 97.00	\$ 95.00
9.1 b) Total costs for garbage collection per tonne.	\$ 124.19	\$ 114.42	\$ 107.71	\$ 103.44			

OBJECTIVE:

Efficient municipal garbage collection services.

NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:

Total costs for garbage collection for 2012 were \$2,151,788 for the collection of 17,326.3 tonnes. This compares to costs of \$2,137,242 in 2011 for the collection of 18,679.3 tonnes. While a correlation between tonnes collected and costs to collect is evident, it is not a direct or strong correlation. Many other factors determine weight, such as the type of packaging used and changes to how suppliers package goods. The bulk of packaging may stay the same or even increase, despite weighing less, rendering comparison over time less reliable unless taken into context within industry requirements and householder habits.

REFERENCE:

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

Line numbers for 2012 and prior years:

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

- The efficiency measure based on operating costs for garbage collection in 91 3404 35 for 2009 to 2012 is comparable to the measure in 91 3403 13 for 2006 to 2008.

MUNICIPALITY

Municipal Performance Measurement Program (MPMP) • 2012 RESULTS

9.2 GARBAGE DISPOSAL

	2012	2011	2010	2009	2008	2007	2006
9.2 a) Operating costs for garbage disposal per tonne.	\$ 53.22	\$ 88.76	\$ 66.32	\$ 84.99	\$ 53.00	\$ 67.00	\$ 75.00
9.2 b) Total costs for garbage disposal per tonne.	\$ 80.48	\$ 116.23	\$ 92.64	\$ 108.01			

OBJECTIVE:

Efficient municipal garbage disposal services.

NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:

Operating costs for garbage disposal per tonne for 2012 were \$922,114 to dispose of 17,326.3 tonnes. This compares to \$1,658,046 in 2011 to dispose of 18,679.3 tonnes. In 2011, the future landfill obligation was increased by \$145K, therefore, increasing the total operating/total costs per tonne. In 2012, the future landfill obligation was decreased by \$630K, therefore decreasing the total operating/total costs per tonne. A total of \$470K was received for garbage disposal in 2012, compared to \$549K in 2011. An accounting change for 2009 and onwards included a contingent liability allowance previously not disclosed within operating expenses.

REFERENCE:

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

Line numbers for 2012 and prior years:

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

- The efficiency measure based on operating costs for garbage disposal in 91 3504 35 for 2009 to 2012 is comparable to the measure in 91 3503 13 for 2006 to 2008.

MUNICIPALITY

Municipal Performance Measurement Program (MPMP) • 2012 RESULTS

9.3 SOLID WASTE DIVERSION (RECYCLING)

	2012	2011	2010	2009	2008	2007	2006
9.3 a) Operating costs for solid waste diversion per tonne.	163.23	\$ 144.08	\$ 146.73	\$ 235.11	\$ 126.00	\$ 126.00	\$ 147.00
9.3 b) Total costs for solid waste diversion per tonne.	163.79	\$ 144.08	\$ 146.73	\$ 235.11			

OBJECTIVE:

Efficient solid waste diversion (recycling) services.

NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:

Operating costs for solid waste diversion for 2012 were \$4,124,423 to divert 25,267 tonnes. This compares to costs of \$3,586,253 to divert 24,890.3 tonnes in 2011. The increase in cost per tonne is due to a significant reduction in revenues from the sale of recyclables. In 2012, revenues from the sale of recyclables were \$1.9M, down 20.4% from \$2.4M in 2011.

This inherent volatility in the market value and price for recyclables has a direct impact on the relative efficiency of the service over time. Ignoring revenues earned from the sale of recyclables, costs per tonne have decreased slightly from \$241 in 2011 to \$239 in 2012.

REFERENCE:

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

Line numbers for 2012 and prior years:

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

- The efficiency measure based on operating costs for solid waste diversion in 91 3606 35 for 2009 to 2012 is comparable to the measure in 91 3604 13 for 2006 to 2008.

MUNICIPALITY

Municipal Performance Measurement Program (MPMP) • 2012 RESULTS

9.4 SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT (INTEGRATED SYSTEM)							
	2012	2011	2010	2009	2008	2007	2006
9.4 a) Average operating costs for solid waste management (collection, disposal and diversion) per tonne.	\$ 169.00	\$ 169.42	\$ 156.15	\$ 213.66	\$ 134.00	\$ 147.00	\$ 158.00
9.4 b) Average total costs for solid waste management (collection, disposal and diversion) per tonne.	\$ 180.42	\$ 181.20	\$ 167.25	\$ 223.85			

OBJECTIVE:

Efficient solid waste management (integrated system).

NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:

Total operating costs for 2012 were \$7,198,325 to service 42,593.3 tonnes as compared to \$7,381,541 for 2011 to service 43,569.6 tonnes. Levels of diverted waste revenues and income received for recyclables has a significant impact on statistical performance for Solid Waste. Please refer to sections 9.1, 9.2 and 9.3 above.

REFERENCE:

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

Line numbers for 2012 and prior years:

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

- The efficiency measure based on operating costs for solid waste management in 91 3607 35 for 2009 to 2012 is comparable to the measure in 91 3605 13 for 2006 to 2008.

MUNICIPALITY

Municipal Performance Measurement Program (MPMP) • 2012 RESULTS

9.5 COMPLAINTS

	2012	2011	2010	2009	2008	2007	2006
9.5 Number of complaints received in a year concerning the collection of garbage and recycled materials per 1,000 households.	8.4	10.5	31.9	16.9	12.5	20.8	25.1

OBJECTIVE:

Improved collection of garbage and recycled materials.

NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:

In 2009 the Green Bin program was implemented, which accounted for the increased number in 2009 and 2010.

REFERENCE:

- Financial Information Return: 92 3452 07.

9.6 NUMBER OF MUNICIPAL SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT FACILITIES EFFECTIVENESS

	2012	2011	2010	2009	2008	2007	2006
9.6 Total number of solid waste management facilities owned by the municipality with a Ministry of Environment certificate of approval.	12	12	12	12	12	12	12

OBJECTIVE:

Context for solid waste management facility compliance measure.

NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:

Unchanged from previous years.

REFERENCE:

- Financial Information Return: 92 3552 07.

MUNICIPALITY

Municipal Performance Measurement Program (MPMP) • 2012 RESULTS

9.7 FACILITY COMPLIANCE

9.7 Number of days per year when a Ministry of Environment compliance order for remediation concerning an air or groundwater standard was in effect for a municipally owned solid waste management facility, by facility.

FIR line #	Facility Name	Days 2012	Days 2011	Days 2010	Days 2009	Days 2008	Days 2007	Days 2006
3553	Kingston East Landfill	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3554	Kingston Area Recycling - Material Recovery	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3555	Kingston Area Recycling - Leaf and Yard	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3556	Kingston Area Recycling - HHSW	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3557	Kingston East Landfill - Composting	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3558	Knox Farm Sediment Storage	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3559	City Yard Waste Transfer Station	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3560	Ravensview Water Pollution Control	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

List facilities in the order they appear in the 2012 Financial Information Return (FIR).

OBJECTIVE:

Municipal solid waste services do not have an adverse impact on environment.

NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:

Consistent with prior years.

REFERENCE:

- Facility Name: 92 3553 03 to 92 3560 03 in Financial Information Return.
- Days: 92 3553 07 to 92 3560 07.

MUNICIPALITY

Municipal Performance Measurement Program (MPMP) • 2012 RESULTS

9.8 DIVERSION OF RESIDENTIAL SOLID WASTE EFFECTIVENESS

		2012	2011	2010	2009	2008	2007	2006
9.8	Percentage of residential solid waste diverted for recycling.	57.9%	55.6%	58.4%	46.6%	42.3%	42.3%	42.4%

OBJECTIVE:

Municipal solid waste reduction programs divert waste from landfills and/or incinerators.

NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:

In 2009, the Green Bin program started which helped to increase the diversion rate.

REFERENCE:

- Financial Information Return: 92 3655 07.

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

		2012	2011	2010	2009	2008	2007	2006
9.9	Percentage of residential solid waste diverted for recycling (based on combined residential and ICI tonnage).	n/a						

OBJECTIVE:

Municipal solid waste reduction programs divert waste from landfills and/or incinerators.

NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:

n/a

REFERENCE:

- ICI means Industrial/Commercial/Institutional.
- Financial Information Return: 92 3656 07.

MUNICIPALITY

Municipal Performance Measurement Program (MPMP) • 2012 RESULTS

Parks and Recreation

**L Hurdle, Commissioner, Community Services, 613-546-4291 ext. 1321 (Recreation and Recreation Facilities),
D Wells, Director, Public Works, 613-546-4291 ext. 2313 (Parks).**

10.1 PARKS

	2012	2011	2010	2009	2008	2007	2006
10.1 a) Operating costs for parks per person.	\$ 50.03	\$ 48.47	\$ 48.71	\$ 47.08	\$ 30.34	\$ 27.21	\$ 34.09
10.1 b) Total costs for parks per person.	\$ 58.03	\$ 54.14	\$ 53.83	\$ 50.31			

OBJECTIVE:

Efficient operation of parks.

NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:

Operating costs for parks in 2012 were \$6,236,433, as compared to \$5,979,517 in 2011. Operating costs for parks per person increased slightly in 2012. Growth of parks system, weather, and effort put into parks maintenance, year to year, all have an impact on these cost measures. Due to changes in the accounting treatment, the efficiency measures are not easily comparable to 2008 and prior years. The 2009 and 2010 operating/total costs were adjusted to include Sports Fields and Facilities Maintenance costs (previously reported under Recreation Facilities) to reflect correct reporting treatment and to allow for better comparability between years.

REFERENCE:

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

Line numbers for 2012 and prior years:

- If amounts for unfunded liabilities are not material for parks and there are no changes in what are deemed to be capital expenses, then, The efficiency measure based on operating costs for parks in 91 7103 35 for 2009 to 2012 is comparable to the measure in 91 7102 13 for 2006 to 2008.

MUNICIPALITY

Municipal Performance Measurement Program (MPMP) • 2012 RESULTS

10.2 RECREATION PROGRAMS

	2012	2011	2010	2009	2008	2007	2006
10.2 a) Operating costs for recreation programs per person.	\$ 31.01	\$ 27.85	\$ 26.84	\$ 21.93	\$ 19.17	\$ 15.58	\$ 17.19
10.2 b) Total costs for recreation programs per person.	\$ 31.19	\$ 28.03	\$ 26.94	\$ 25.20			

OBJECTIVE:

Efficient operation of recreation programs.

NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:

Increase is due to additional staffing and instructor costs.

REFERENCE:

- The efficiency measure based on total costs were new for 2009. Total costs are operating costs as defined in MPMP plus amortization and interest on long-term debt as reported in the FIR.

- Financial Information Return: 91 7203 35 (Operating costs measure) and 91 7203 45 (Total costs measure).

Line numbers for 2012 and prior years:

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

- The efficiency measure based on operating costs for recreation programs in 91 7203 35 for 2009 to 2012 will be comparable to the measure in 91 7202 13 for 2006 to 2008.

MUNICIPALITY

Municipal Performance Measurement Program (MPMP) • 2012 RESULTS

10.3 RECREATION FACILITIES

	2012	2011	2010	2009	2008	2007	2006
10.3 a) Operating costs for recreation facilities per person.	\$ 58.55	\$ 60.58	\$ 66.43	\$ 67.88	\$ 57.93	\$ 51.62	\$ 39.71
10.3 b) Total costs for recreation facilities per person.	\$ 109.88	\$ 110.06	\$ 116.94	\$ 97.14			

OBJECTIVE:

Efficient operation of recreation facilities.

NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:

Operating costs for recreation facilities in 2012 were \$7,297,872, as compared to \$7,472,782 in 2011. The decrease in operating costs per person in 2012 is largely a result of decreased salaries and decreased contracted services expenses associated with the City arenas and Artillery Park. Due to changes in the accounting treatment, the efficiency measures are not easily comparable to 2008 and prior years. The 2009 and 2010 operating/total costs were adjusted to realign Sports Fields and Facilities Maintenance costs to Parks (previously reported under Recreation Facilities) to reflect correct reporting treatment and to allow for better comparability between years.

REFERENCE:

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

Line numbers for 2012 and prior years:

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

- The efficiency measure based on operating costs for recreation facilities in 91 7306 35 for 2009 to 2012 is comparable to the measure in 91 7303 13 for 2006 to 2008.

MUNICIPALITY

Municipal Performance Measurement Program (MPMP) • 2012 RESULTS

10.4 RECREATION PROGRAMS AND RECREATION FACILITIES (SUBTOTAL)						
EFFICIENCY						
	2012	2011	2010	2009	2008	2007
10.4 a) Operating costs for recreation programs and recreation facilities per person (Subtotal)	\$ 89.56	\$ 88.43	\$ 93.27	\$ 89.81	\$ 77.10	\$ 67.20
10.4 b) Total costs for recreation programs and recreation facilities per person (Subtotal)	\$ 141.08	\$ 138.08	\$ 143.89	\$ 122.34		

OBJECTIVE:

Efficient operation of recreation programs and facilities.

NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:

Operating costs for recreation programs and recreation facilities is the total of Sections 10.2 (Recreation Programs) and 10.3 (Recreation Facilities) of the MPMP report. The 2009 and 2010 operating/total costs were adjusted to realign Sports Fields and Facilities Maintenance costs to Parks (previously reported under Recreation Facilities) to reflect correct reporting treatment and to allow for better comparability between years.

REFERENCE:

- The efficiency measure based on total costs were new for 2009. Total costs are operating costs as defined in MPMP plus amortization and interest on long-term debt.
- Financial Information Return: 91 7320 35 (Operating costs measure) and 91 7320 45 (Total costs measure).

Line numbers for 2012 and prior years:

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

- The efficiency measure based on operating costs for recreation programs and recreation facilities in 91 7320 35 for 2009 to 2012 is comparable to the measure in 91 7305 13 for 2007 to 2008.

MUNICIPALITY

Municipal Performance Measurement Program (MPMP) • 2012 RESULTS

10.5 TRAILS

	2012	2011	2010	2009	2008	2007	2006
10.5 Total kilometres of trails	52	52	50	50	50	50	49
10.5 Total kilometres of trails per 1,000 persons	0.417	0.422	0.418	0.420	0.422	0.424	0.418

OBJECTIVE:

Trails provide recreation opportunities.

NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:

Consistent with prior years.

REFERENCE:

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

10.6 OPEN SPACE

	2012	2011	2010	2009	2008	2007	2006
10.6 Hectares of open space	534	529	529	474	474	429	429
10.6 Hectares of open space per 1,000 persons	4.3	4.3	4.4	4.0	4.0	3.6	3.7

OBJECTIVE:

Open space is adequate for population.

NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:

Consistent with prior years.

REFERENCE:

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

MUNICIPALITY

Municipal Performance Measurement Program (MPMP) • 2012 RESULTS

10.7 PARTICIPANT HOURS FOR RECREATION PROGRAMS

	2012	2011	2010	2009	2008	2007	2006
10.7 Total participant hours for recreation programs per 1,000 persons.	13,642	12,720	12,722	12,362	12,300	11,200	10,500

OBJECTIVE:

Recreation programs serve needs of residents.

NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:

Total participant hours for recreation programs increased from 1,569,207 hours in 2011 to 1,700,432 hours in 2012. This is consistent with the long-term trend of increasing participation in recreation programs.

REFERENCE:

- Financial Information Return: 92 7255 07.

MUNICIPALITY

Municipal Performance Measurement Program (MPMP) • 2012 RESULTS

10.8 INDOOR RECREATION FACILITY SPACE

	2012	2011	2010	2009	2008	2007	2006
10.8 Square metres of indoor recreation facilities (municipally owned)	59,656	59,452	59,008	59,008	59,008	30,023	30,023
10.8 Square metres of indoor recreation facilities per 1,000 persons (municipally owned)	478.6	481.9	492.9	495.5	498.2	254.8	256.2

OBJECTIVE:

Indoor recreation facility space is adequate for population.

NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:

Consistent with prior years.

REFERENCE:

- Financial Information Return: 92 7356 05 and 92 7356 07.

10.9 OUTDOOR RECREATION FACILITY SPACE

	2012	2011	2010	2009	2008	2007	2006
10.9 Square metres of outdoor recreation facility space (municipally owned)	43,315	18,915	17,415	17,415	17,415	17,415	17,415
10.9 Square metres of outdoor recreation facility space per 1,000 persons (municipally owned)	347.5	161.4	145.5	146.2	147.0	148.0	149.0

OBJECTIVE:

Outdoor recreation facility space is adequate for population.

NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:

In 2012, 24,400 square metres of outdoor recreation facility space was added due to the completion of CaraCo Home Field (a 24,400 square metre track and field facility).

REFERENCE:

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

MUNICIPALITY

Municipal Performance Measurement Program (MPMP) • 2012 RESULTS

Libraries

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

11.1 LIBRARY COSTS PER PERSON

	2012	2011	2010	2009	2008	2007	2006
11.1 a) Operating costs for library services per person.	\$ 43.55	\$ 43.06	\$ 44.98	\$ 47.44	\$ 46.00	\$ 45.00	\$ 40.00
11.1 b) Total costs for library services per person.	\$ 53.62	\$ 52.43	\$ 53.85	\$ 54.08			

OBJECTIVE:

Efficient library services.

NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:

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

REFERENCE:

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

Line numbers for 2012 and prior years:

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

- The efficiency measure based on operating costs for library services in 91 7405 35 for 2009 to 2012 is comparable to the measure in 91 7403 13 for 2006 to 2008.

MUNICIPALITY

Municipal Performance Measurement Program (MPMP) • 2012 RESULTS

11.2 LIBRARY COSTS PER USE

	2012	2011	2010	2009
11.2 a) Operating costs for library services per use.	\$ 1.69	\$ 1.68	\$ 2.01	\$ 2.03
11.2 b) Total costs for library services per use.	\$ 2.08	\$ 2.05	\$ 2.40	\$ 2.32

OBJECTIVE:

Efficient library services.

NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:

While operating/total costs remained relatively consistent, total library uses increased from 3,154,749 in 2011 to 3,218,585 in 2012. There was a significant increase in electronic database, eBook and WIFI use which is due to expanded WIFI access at some branches and to the growing trend to use technology to access library materials. Total library uses includes total annual circulation, in library materials use, electronic information use, reference transactions, program attendance and library visits.

REFERENCE:

- The efficiency measure based on total costs were new for 2009. Total costs are operating costs as defined in MPMP plus amortization and interest on long-term debt.
- The calculation of electronic library uses was updated in 2009 to include the number of people using the public library wireless connection. Therefore, the efficiency measure based on operating costs for library services per use is not comparable with prior years.

- Financial Information Return: 91 7406 35 (Operating costs measure) and 91 7406 45 (Total costs measure).

Line numbers for 2012 and prior years:

If amounts for unfunded liabilities are not material for the service area measured and there are no changes in what are deemed to be capital expenses, then,

- The efficiency measure based on operating costs for library services per use in 91 7406 35 for 2009 to 2012 may be compared to the efficiency measure in 91 7404 13 for the years 2006 to 2008, but only if the number of people using the library wireless connection is included in the calculation of library uses in the denominator. Note that this data may not be available.

MUNICIPALITY

Municipal Performance Measurement Program (MPMP) • 2012 RESULTS

11.3 LIBRARY USES

	2012	2011	2010	2009
11.3 Library uses per person.	25.8	25.6	22.4	22.2

OBJECTIVE:

Increased use of library services.

NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:

The increase is the result of the growing trend to use technology to access library materials (e-books, e-audiobooks, electronic databases). The use of wireless connection to access the Internet has also increased.

REFERENCE:

- In the 2009 FIR, the definition of library uses was changed to add the number of people using the library's wireless connection. Therefore, this effectiveness measure, library uses per person, is not comparable to prior years.

- Financial Information Return: 92 7460 07.

Line numbers for 2012 and prior years:

- The FIR reference for the measure, library uses per person, was 92 7460 07 for 2006 to 2012.

MUNICIPALITY

Municipal Performance Measurement Program (MPMP) • 2012 RESULTS

11.4 ELECTRONIC LIBRARY USES

	2012	2011	2010	2009
11.4 Electronic library uses as a percentage of total library uses.	33.2%	24.8%	18.5%	17.9%

OBJECTIVE:

Better information on library usage.

NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:

Total electronic library uses are defined as the sum of the number of people using library computer workstations and accessing wireless connection, 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. We see a continuing trend towards increased use of technology to access library resources.

REFERENCE:

- In the 2009 FIR, the definition of library uses was changed to add the number of people using the library's wireless connection. Therefore, the effectiveness measure for the percentage of electronic library uses is not comparable to prior years.

- Financial Information Return: 92 7463 07.

Line numbers for 2012 and prior years:

- The FIR reference for the measure, electronic library uses as a percentage of total library uses, was 92 7463 07 for 2009 to 2012 and 92 7261 07 for 2006 to 2008.

MUNICIPALITY

Municipal Performance Measurement Program (MPMP) • 2012 RESULTS

11.5 NON - ELECTRONIC LIBRARY USES

	2012	2011	2010	2009
11.5 Non-electronic library uses as a percentage of total library uses.	66.8%	75.2%	81.5%	82.1%

OBJECTIVE:

Better information on library usage.

NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:

Non-electronic library uses consist of total annual circulation, annual program attendance, total library materials use, number of standard reference transactions, and number of visits to the library made in person.

REFERENCE:

- Financial Information Return: 92 7462 07.
- In the 2009 FIR, the definition of electronic library uses was changed to add the number of people using the library's wireless connection. Therefore, the effectiveness measure for the percentage of non-electronic library uses is not comparable to prior years.

Line numbers for 2012 and prior years:

- The FIR reference for the measure, non-electronic library uses as a percentage of total library uses, was 92 7262 07 for 2006 to 2012.

MUNICIPALITY

Municipal Performance Measurement Program (MPMP) • 2012 RESULTS

Land Use Planning

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

12.1 LOCATION OF NEW DEVELOPMENT

	2012	2011	2010	2009	2008	2007
12.1 Percentage of new residential units located within settlement areas	96.9%	95.8%	96.1%	97.8%	97.1%	96.7%

OBJECTIVE:

New residential development is occurring within settlement areas.

NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:

There were 615 new residential units that were constructed within the settlement area in 2012 (638 in 2011). The settlement area refers to those lands located within the urban boundary as indicated in the City of Kingston Official Plan, which was approved on January 27, 2010. The total number of new residential units within the entire municipality (which include the urban and rural area) in 2012 was 635 (666 in 2011). Residential units consist of detached, semi-detached, row housing and apartment dwellings.

REFERENCE:

- Financial Information Return: 92 8170 07.

MUNICIPALITY

Municipal Performance Measurement Program (MPMP) • 2012 RESULTS

12.2 PRESERVATION OF AGRICULTURAL LAND DURING REPORTING YEAR EFFECTIVENESS							
	2012	2011	2010	2009	2008	2007	2006
12.2 Percentage of land designated for agricultural purposes which was not re-designated for other uses during the reporting year.	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
OBJECTIVE: Preservation of agricultural land.							
NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS: In 2011, under the new Official Plan, approximately 6789 hectares were designated as Prime Agricultural Area. At the time of approval of the new Official Plan, the Province requested that the City re-examine the boundaries of some of the Prime Agricultural Area designations. This resulted in a City initiated Official Plan Amendment in 2012. The purpose of this Amendment was to change some of the Rural and Prime Agricultural Area designations on the land use schedules (maps) in the Official Plan based on the recommendations of the 2011 Agricultural Land Review. As a result of this amendment, the amount of land that is designated as Prime Agricultural Area has slightly increased. Under the Official Plan, consolidated as of June 1, 2013, there is approximately 6875 hectares of land that is designated as Prime Agricultural Area.							
REFERENCE: • Financial Information Return: 92 8163 07.							

MUNICIPALITY

Municipal Performance Measurement Program (MPMP) • 2012 RESULTS

12.3 PRESERVATION OF AGRICULTURAL LAND RELATIVE TO 2000 EFFECTIVENESS

	2012	2011	2010	2009	2008	2007	2006
12.3 Percentage of land designated for agricultural purposes which was not re-designated for other uses relative to the base year of 2000	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
OBJECTIVE: Preservation of agricultural land.							
NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS: See comments under 12.2.							
REFERENCE: • Financial Information Return: 92 8164 07.							

12.4 CHANGE IN NUMBER OF AGRICULTURAL HECTARES DURING REPORTING YEAR EFFECTIVENESS

	2012	2011	2010	2009	2008	2007	2006
12.4 Number of hectares of land originally designated for agricultural purposes which was re-designated for other uses during the reporting year.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
OBJECTIVE: Preservation of agricultural land.							
NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS: See comments under 12.2.							
REFERENCE: • Financial Information Return: 92 8165 07.							

MUNICIPALITY

Municipal Performance Measurement Program (MPMP) • 2012 RESULTS

12.5 CHANGE IN NUMBER OF AGRICULTURAL HECTARES SINCE 2000 EFFECTIVENESS							
	2012	2011	2010	2009	2008	2007	2006
12.5 Number of hectares of land originally designated for agricultural purposes which was re-designated for other uses since January 1, 2000.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
OBJECTIVE: Preservation of agricultural land.							
NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS: See comments under 12.2.							
REFERENCE: • Financial Information Return: 92 8166 07.							

MUNICIPALITY

Municipal Performance Measurement Program (MPMP) • 2012 RESULTS

Building Services

D Stowe, Manager, Building Services, 613-546-4291 ext. 3261

13.1 BUILDING PERMITS AND INSPECTION SERVICES (BASED ON PERMITS ISSUED)

	2012	2011
13.1 a) Operating costs for building permits and inspection services per \$1,000 of construction activity (based on permits issued).	14.39	\$ 14.15
13.1 b) Total costs for building permits and inspection services per \$1,000 of construction activity (based on permits issued).	14.39	\$ 14.15

OBJECTIVE:

Efficient building services (building permits and inspection services).

NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:

Total operating costs for building permits and inspection services in 2012 were \$3,122,197, compared to \$3,074,221 in 2011.

REFERENCE:

- The efficiency measure based on total costs was new for 2011. Total costs are operating costs as defined in MPMP plus amortization and interest on long-term debt.
- Financial Information Return: 91 1301 35 (Operating costs measure) and 91 1301 45 (Total costs measure).

MUNICIPALITY

Municipal Performance Measurement Program (MPMP) • 2012 RESULTS

13.2 BUILDING PERMITS AND INSPECTIONS

Review of Complete Building Permit Applications: Median number of working days to review a complete building permit application and issue a permit or not issue a permit, and provide all reasons for refusal (by Category)

	Days 2012	Days 2011	
13.2 a) Category 1: Houses (houses not exceeding 3 storeys/600 square metres) Reference: provincial standard is 10 working days	6	7	
13.2 b) Category 2: Small Buildings (small commercial/industrial not exceeding 3 storeys/600 square metres) Reference: provincial standard is 15 working days	11	13	
13.2 c) Category 3: Large Buildings (large residential/commercial/industrial/institutional) Reference: provincial standard is 20 working days	15	12	
13.2 d) Category 4: Complex Buildings (post disaster buildings, including hospitals, power/water, fire/police/EMS, communications) Reference: provincial standard is 30 working days	21	21	

OBJECTIVE:

Timely review of completed building permit applications.

NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:

Results exceed provincial standard in all categories.

REFERENCE:

- The effectiveness measures for Building Services are new for 2011.
- Days: 92 1351 07 to 92 1354 07.