

**MUNICIPALITY**  
**Municipal Performance Measurement Program (MPMP) • 2011 RESULTS**

Questions about MPMP results should be addressed to:

Name: Linda Van Alstine	Phone: 613-267-6500
Title: Treasurer	
Municipality: Township of Drummond/North Elmsley	
Email: lvanalstine@dnetownship.ca	

**Local Government**

1.1 GENERAL GOVERNMENT - EFFICIENCY			
	2011	2010	2009
1.1 a) Operating costs for governance and corporate management as a percentage of total municipal operating costs.	11.9%	13.3%	10.0%
1.1 b) Total costs for governance and corporate management as a percentage of total municipal	10.5%	11.4%	
<b>OBJECTIVE:</b> Efficient local government.			
<b>NOTES &amp; KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:</b>			
<b>REFERENCE:</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The formulas for efficiency measures were revised in 2009 to reflect changes in the reporting of expenses consistent with accrual accounting concepts. New total cost measures were introduced and revised in 2010. Total costs mean operating costs as defined in MPMP, plus amortization and interest on long-term debt, less revenue received from other municipalities for tangible capital assets.</li> <li>• Financial Information Return: 91 0206 35 (Operating costs measure) and 91 0206 45 (Total costs measure).</li> </ul>			

**MUNICIPALITY**  
**Municipal Performance Measurement Program (MPMP) • 2011 RESULTS**

**Fire Services**

<b>2.1 FIRE SERVICES – EFFICIENCY</b>				
	2011	2010	2009	
2.1 a) Operating costs for fire services per \$1,000 of assessment.	\$ 0.35	\$ 0.33	\$ 0.32	
2.1 b) Total costs for fire services per \$1,000 of assessment.	\$ 0.39	\$ 0.37		
<b>OBJECTIVE:</b> Efficient fire services.				
<b>NOTES &amp; KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:</b>				
<b>REFERENCE:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The formulas for efficiency measures were revised in 2009 to reflect changes in the reporting of expenses consistent with accrual accounting concepts. New total cost measures were introduced and revised in 2010. Total costs mean operating costs as defined in MPMP, plus amortization and interest on long-term debt, less revenue received from other municipalities for tangible capital assets.</li> <li>• Financial Information Return: 91 1103 35 (Operating costs measure) and 91 1103 45 (Total costs</li> </ul>				

<b>2.2 &amp; 2.3 CIVILIAN FIRE RELATED INJURIES – EFFECTIVENESS</b>				
	2011	2010	2009	
2.2 Number of residential fire related civilian injuries per 1,000 persons.	0.000	0.000	0.000	
2.3 Number of residential fire related civilian injuries averaged over 5 years per 1,000 persons.	0.000	0.000	0.000	
<b>OBJECTIVE:</b> Minimize the number of civilian injuries in residential fires.				
<b>NOTES &amp; KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:</b>				
<b>REFERENCE:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Financial Information Return: 92 1151 07 (2.2) and 92 1152 07 (2.3).</li> </ul>				

**MUNICIPALITY**  
**Municipal Performance Measurement Program (MPMP) • 2011 RESULTS**

2.4 & 2.5 CIVILIAN FIRE RELATED FATALITIES - EFFECTIVENESS				
	2011	2010	2009	
2.4 Number of residential fire related civilian fatalities per 1,000 persons.	0.000	0.000	0.000	
2.5 Number of residential fire related civilian fatalities averaged over 5 years per 1,000 persons.	0.000	0.000	0.000	
<b>OBJECTIVE:</b> Minimize the number of civilian fatalities in residential fires.				
<b>NOTES &amp; KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:</b>				
<b>REFERENCE:</b> • Financial Information Return: 92 1155 07 (2.4) and 92 1156 07 (2.5).				

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

2.6 NUMBER OF RESIDENTIAL STRUCTURAL FIRES – EFFECTIVENESS				
	2011	2010	2009	
2.6 Number of residential structural fires per 1,000 households.	1.414	0.572	0.292	
<b>OBJECTIVE:</b> Minimize the number of residential structural fires.				
<b>NOTES &amp; KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:</b> There were 5 residential structural fires in 2011 but only 2 in 2010 and 1 in 2009.				
<b>REFERENCE:</b> • Financial Information Return: 92 1160 07.				

**MUNICIPALITY**  
**Municipal Performance Measurement Program (MPMP) • 2011 RESULTS**

**Police Services**

<b>3.1 POLICE SERVICES – EFFICIENCY</b>			
	2011	2010	2009
3.1 a) Operating costs for police services per person. <sup>1</sup>	\$ 103.76	\$ 119.08	\$ 99.25
3.1 b) Total costs for police services per person.	\$ 103.76	\$ 119.08	
<b>OBJECTIVE:</b> Efficient police services.			
<b>NOTES &amp; KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:</b>			
<b>REFERENCE:</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The formulas for efficiency measures were revised in 2009 to reflect changes in the reporting of expenses consistent with accrual accounting concepts. New total cost measures were introduced and revised in 2010. Total costs mean operating costs as defined in MPMP, plus amortization and interest on long-term debt, less revenue received from other municipalities for tangible capital assets.</li> <li>• <sup>1</sup> As of 2009, the efficiency measures for police services do not include expenses for prisoner transportation or court security since expenses for these services are being uploaded to the Province over a number of years. The efficiency measures for police services align with effectiveness measures based on crime rates.</li> </ul>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Financial Information Return: 91 1204 35 (Operating costs measure) and 91 1204 45 (Total costs</li> </ul>			

**MUNICIPALITY**  
**Municipal Performance Measurement Program (MPMP) • 2011 RESULTS**

<b>3.2 VIOLENT CRIME RATE – EFFECTIVENESS</b>					
		2011	2010	2009	
3.2	Violent crime rate per 1,000 persons. <sup>1</sup>	3.6	5.4	2.9	
<b>OBJECTIVE:</b> Safe communities.					
<b>NOTES &amp; KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:</b>					
<b>REFERENCE:</b>					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <sup>1</sup> Statistics Canada has expanded the definition of violent crime. Therefore, prior years are not comparable unless restated.</li> </ul>					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Financial Information Return: 92 1258 07.</li> </ul>					

<b>3.3 PROPERTY CRIME RATE – EFFECTIVENESS</b>					
		2011	2010	2009	
3.3	Property crime rate per 1,000 persons. <sup>1</sup>	13.5	17.1	16.5	
<b>OBJECTIVE:</b> Safe communities.					
<b>NOTES &amp; KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:</b>					
<b>REFERENCE:</b>					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <sup>1</sup> Statistics Canada has expanded the definition of property crime. Therefore, prior years are not comparable unless restated.</li> </ul>					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Financial Information Return: 92 1259 07.</li> </ul>					

**MUNICIPALITY**  
**Municipal Performance Measurement Program (MPMP) • 2011 RESULTS**

<b>3.4 TOTAL CRIME RATE – EFFECTIVENESS</b>					
	2011	2010	2009	2008	2007
3.4 Total crime rate per 1,000 persons ( <i>Criminal Code</i> offences, excluding traffic).	18.7	24.2	22.3	19.6	28.4
<b>OBJECTIVE:</b> Safe communities.					
<b>NOTES &amp; KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:</b>					
<b>REFERENCE:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Financial Information Return: 92 1263 07.</li> </ul>					

<b>3.5 YOUTH CRIME RATE – EFFECTIVENESS</b>					
	2011	2010	2009	2008	2007
3.5 Youth crime rate per 1,000 youths.	3.1	11.0	11.0	18.9	11.0
<b>OBJECTIVE:</b> Safe communities.					
<b>NOTES &amp; KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:</b>					
<b>REFERENCE:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Financial Information Return: 92 1265 07.</li> </ul>					

**MUNICIPALITY**  
**Municipal Performance Measurement Program (MPMP) • 2011 RESULTS**

**Building Permits & Inspection Services**

<b>4.1 BUILDING PERMITS &amp; INSPECTION SERVICES – EFFICIENCY</b>		
	2011	
4.1 a) Operating costs for building permits and inspection services per \$1,000 of construction activity (based on permits issued).	\$ 8.77	
4.1 b) Total costs for building permits and inspection services per \$1,000 of construction activity (based on permits issued).	\$ 8.96	
<b>OBJECTIVE:</b> Efficient building permits and inspection services.		
<b>NOTES &amp; KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:</b>		
<b>REFERENCE:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• MPMP measures for building permits and inspection services were introduced in 2011.</li> <li>• Financial Information Return: 91 1301 35 (Operating costs measure) and 91 1301 45 (Total costs measure).</li> </ul>		

**MUNICIPALITY**  
**Municipal Performance Measurement Program (MPMP) • 2011 RESULTS**

<b>4.2 REVIEW OF COMPLETE BUILDING PERMIT APPLICATIONS – EFFECTIVENESS</b>	
	2011
4.2 Median number of days to review a complete building permit application and issue a permit or not issue a permit, and provide all reasons for refusal:	
a) Category 1: Houses (houses not exceeding 3 storeys/600 square metres) Reference: provincial standard is 10 working days.	7
b) Category 2: Small Buildings (small commercial/industrial not exceeding 3 storeys/600 square metres) Reference: provincial standard is 15 working days.	7
c) Category 3: Large Buildings (large residential/commercial/ industrial/ institutional) Reference: provincial standard is 20 working days.	14
d) Category 4: Complex buildings (post disaster buildings, including hospitals, power/water, fire/police/EMS, communications) Reference: provincial standard is 30 working days.	0
<b>OBJECTIVE:</b> Complete building permit applications are processed quickly and accurately.	
<b>NOTES &amp; KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:</b> The figure is 0 for Category 4 because this Township does not process Category 4 Building Permits.	
<b>REFERENCE:</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• MPMP measures for building permits and inspection services were introduced in 2011.</li> <li>• Financial Information Return: (a) 91 1351 07, (b) 91 1352 07, (c) 91 1353 07, (d) 91 1354 07.</li> </ul>	



**MUNICIPALITY**  
**Municipal Performance Measurement Program (MPMP) • 2011 RESULTS**

Roads

<b>5.1 PAVED ROADS – EFFICIENCY</b>			
	2011	2010	
5.1 a) Operating costs for paved (hard top) roads per lane kilometre. <sup>1</sup>	164..30	\$ 169.01	
5.1 b) Total costs for paved (hard top) roads per lane kilometre.	\$ 2,744.37	\$ 3,365.66	
<b>OBJECTIVE:</b> Efficient maintenance of paved roads.			
<b>NOTES &amp; KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:</b>			
<b>REFERENCE:</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <sup>1</sup> The formulas for efficiency measures for paved roads were revised in 2010 to net out revenue received from utilities for utility cut repairs.</li> <li>• The Total cost measure was also revised in 2010. Total costs mean operating costs as defined in MPMP, plus amortization and interest on long-term debt, less revenue received from other municipalities for tangible capital assets.</li> <li>• Financial Information Return: 91 2111 35 (Operating costs measure) and 91 2111 45 (Total costs measure).</li> </ul>			

<b>5.2 UNPAVED ROADS – EFFICIENCY</b>				
	2011	2010	2009	
5.2 a) Operating costs for unpaved (loose top) roads per lane	\$ 1,052.35	\$ 1,243.61	\$ 1,243.27	
5.2 b) Total costs for unpaved (loose top) roads per lane kilometre.	\$ 1,164.96	\$ 1,363.85		
<b>OBJECTIVE:</b> Efficient maintenance of unpaved roads.				
<b>NOTES &amp; KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:</b>				
<b>REFERENCE:</b>				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The formulas for efficiency measures were revised in 2009 to reflect changes in the reporting of expenses consistent with accrual accounting concepts. New total cost measures were introduced and revised in 2010. Total costs mean operating costs as defined in MPMP, plus amortization and interest on long-term debt, less revenue received from other municipalities for tangible capital assets.</li> <li>• Financial Information Return: 91 2110 35 (Operating costs measure) and 91 2110 45 (Total costs measure).</li> </ul>				

**MUNICIPALITY**  
**Municipal Performance Measurement Program (MPMP) • 2011 RESULTS**

<b>5.3 BRIDGES AND CULVERTS – EFFICIENCY</b>				
	2011	2010	2009	
5.3 a) Operating costs for bridges and culverts per square metre of surface area.	\$ 0.23	\$ 1.36	\$ 0.67	
5.3 b) Total costs for bridges and culverts per square metre of surface area.	\$ 0.80	\$ 1.92	\$ 1.24	
<b>OBJECTIVE:</b> Efficient maintenance of bridges and culverts.				
<b>NOTES &amp; KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:</b>				
<b>REFERENCE:</b>				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The formulas for efficiency measures were revised in 2009 to reflect changes in the reporting of expenses consistent with accrual accounting concepts. New total cost measures were introduced and revised in 2010. Total costs mean operating costs as defined in MPMP, plus amortization and interest on long-term debt, less revenue received from other municipalities for tangible capital assets.</li> </ul>				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Financial Information Return: 91 2130 35 (Operating costs measure) and 91 2130 45 (Total costs measure).</li> </ul>				

<b>5.4 WINTER MAINTENANCE OF ROADS – EFFICIENCY</b>				
	2011	2010	2009	
5.4 a) Operating costs for winter maintenance of roadways per lane kilometre maintained in winter.	\$ 469.16	\$ 401.04	\$ 404.27	
5.4 b) Total costs for winter maintenance of roadways per lane kilometre maintained in winter.	\$ 518.36	\$ 439.82	\$ 442.27	
<b>OBJECTIVE:</b> Efficient winter maintenance of roads.				
<b>NOTES &amp; KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:</b>				
<b>REFERENCE:</b>				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The formulas for efficiency measures were revised in 2009 to reflect changes in the reporting of expenses consistent with accrual accounting concepts. New total cost measures were introduced and revised in 2010. Total costs mean operating costs as defined in MPMP, plus amortization and interest on long-term debt, less revenue received from other municipalities for tangible capital assets.</li> </ul>				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Financial Information Return: 91 2205 35 (Operating costs measure) and 91 2205 45 (Total costs measure).</li> </ul>				

**MUNICIPALITY**  
**Municipal Performance Measurement Program (MPMP) • 2011 RESULTS**

<b>5.5 ADEQUACY OF PAVED ROADS – EFFECTIVENESS</b>					
	2011	2010	2009	2008	2007
5.5 Percentage of paved lane kilometres where the condition is rated as good to very good. <sup>1</sup>	90%	92%	84%	79%	75%
<b>OBJECTIVE:</b> Pavement condition meets municipal objectives.					
<b>NOTES &amp; KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:</b>					
<b>REFERENCE:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <sup>1</sup> Pavement 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).</li> <li>• Financial Information Return: 92 2152 07.</li> </ul>					

<b>5.6 ADEQUACY OF BRIDGES AND CULVERTS – EFFECTIVENESS</b>				
	2011	2010	2009	
5.6 Percentage of bridges and culverts where the condition is rated as good to very good. <sup>1</sup>	94%	94%	94%	
<b>1</b>				
<b>NOTES &amp; KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:</b>				
<b>REFERENCE:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The effectiveness measure for bridges and culverts was introduced in 2009.</li> <li>• <sup>1</sup> A 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.</li> <li>• Financial Information Return: 92 2165 07.</li> </ul>				

<b>5.7 WINTER EVENT RESPONSES – EFFECTIVENESS</b>					
	2011	2010	2009	2008	2007
5.7 Percentage of winter events where the response met or exceeded locally determined municipal service levels for road	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
<b>OBJECTIVE:</b> Response to winter storm events meets locally determined service levels for winter road maintenance.					
<b>NOTES &amp; KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:</b>					
<b>REFERENCE:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Financial Information Return: 92 2251 07.</li> </ul>					

**MUNICIPALITY**  
**Municipal Performance Measurement Program (MPMP) • 2011 RESULTS**

**Solid Waste Management (Garbage)**

<b>10.1 GARBAGE COLLECTION – EFFICIENCY</b>			
	2011	2010	2009
10.1 a) Operating costs for garbage collection per tonne	\$ 127.43	\$ 151.19	
10.1 b) Total costs for garbage collection per tonne or per household. <b>(Specify)</b>	\$ 127.43	\$ 151.19	
<b>OBJECTIVE:</b> Efficient municipal garbage collection services.			
<b>NOTES &amp; KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:</b> The information for 2009 is not comparable because it was per household and not per tonne.			
<b>REFERENCE:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The formulas for efficiency measures were revised in 2009 to reflect changes in the reporting of expenses consistent with accrual accounting concepts. New total cost measures were introduced and revised in 2010. Total costs mean operating costs as defined in MPMP, plus amortization and interest on long-term debt, less revenue received from other municipalities for tangible capital assets.</li> <li>• Financial Information Return: 91 3404 35 (Operating costs measure) and 91 3404 45 (Total costs)</li> </ul>			

<b>10.2 GARBAGE DISPOSAL – EFFICIENCY</b>			
	2011	2010	2009
10.2 a) Operating costs for garbage disposal per tonne or per household. <b>(Specify)</b>	\$ 139.55	\$ 93.56	
10.2 b) Total costs for garbage disposal per tonne or per household. <b>(Specify)</b>	\$ 142.61	\$ 97.05	
<b>OBJECTIVE:</b> Efficient municipal garbage disposal services.			
<b>NOTES &amp; KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:</b> The information for 2009 is not comparable because it was per household and not per tonne.			
<b>REFERENCE:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The formulas for efficiency measures were revised in 2009 to reflect changes in the reporting of expenses consistent with accrual accounting concepts. New total cost measures were introduced and revised in 2010. Total costs mean operating costs as defined in MPMP, plus amortization and interest on long-term debt, less revenue received from other municipalities for tangible capital assets.</li> <li>• Financial Information Return: 91 3504 35 (Operating costs measure) and 91 3504 45 (Total costs)</li> </ul>			

**MUNICIPALITY**  
**Municipal Performance Measurement Program (MPMP) • 2011 RESULTS**

<b>10.3 SOLID WASTE DIVERSION (RECYCLING) – EFFICIENCY</b>			
	2011	2010	2009
10.3 a) Operating costs for solid waste diversion per tonne or per household.	\$ 213.65	\$ 156.39	
10.3 b) Total costs for solid waste diversion per tonne or per household. <b>(Specify)</b>	\$ 213.65	\$ 156.39	
<b>OBJECTIVE:</b> Efficient solid waste diversion (recycling) services.			
<b>NOTES &amp; KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:</b> The information for 2009 is not comparable because it was per household and not per tonne.			
<b>REFERENCE:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The formulas for efficiency measures were revised in 2009 to reflect changes in the reporting of expenses consistent with accrual accounting concepts. New total cost measures were introduced and revised in 2010. Total costs mean operating costs as defined in MPMP, plus amortization and interest on long-term debt, less revenue received from other municipalities for tangible capital assets.</li> <li>• Financial Information Return: 91 3606 35 (Operating costs measure) and 91 3606 45 (Total costs)</li> </ul>			

<b>10.4 SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT (INTEGRATED SYSTEM) – EFFICIENCY</b>			
	2011	2010	2009
10.4 a) Average operating costs for solid waste management (collection, disposal and diversion) per tonne or per household. <b>(Specify)</b>	\$ 224.46	\$ 180.02	
10.4 b) Average total costs for solid waste management (collection, disposal and diversion) per tonne or per household. <b>(Specify)</b>	\$ 226.83	\$ 182.56	
<b>OBJECTIVE:</b> Efficient solid waste management (integrated system).			
<b>NOTES &amp; KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:</b> The information for 2009 is not comparable because it was per household and not per tonne.			
<b>REFERENCE:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The formulas for efficiency measures were revised in 2009 to reflect changes in the reporting of expenses consistent with accrual accounting concepts. New total cost measures were introduced and revised in 2010. Total costs mean operating costs as defined in MPMP, plus amortization and interest on long-term debt, less revenue received from other municipalities for tangible capital assets.</li> <li>• Financial Information Return: 91 3607 35 (Operating costs measure) and 91 3607 45 (Total costs)</li> </ul>			

**MUNICIPALITY**  
**Municipal Performance Measurement Program (MPMP) • 2011 RESULTS**

<b>10.5 COMPLAINTS – COLLECTION OF GARBAGE AND RECYCLED MATERIALS EFFECTIVENESS</b>					
	2011	2010	2009	2008	2007
10.5 Number of complaints received in a year concerning the collection of garbage and recycled materials per 1,000 households.	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
<b>OBJECTIVE:</b> Improved collection of garbage and recycled materials.					
<b>NOTES &amp; KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:</b>					
<b>REFERENCE:</b> • Financial Information Return: 92 3452 07.					

<b>10.6 NUMBER OF MUNICIPAL SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT FACILITIES EFFECTIVENESS</b>					
	2011	2010	2009	2008	2007
10.6 Total number of solid waste management facilities owned by the municipality with a Ministry of Environment certificate of	1	1	1	4	4
<b>OBJECTIVE:</b> Context for solid waste management facility compliance measure.					
<b>NOTES &amp; KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:</b>					
<b>REFERENCE:</b> • Financial Information Return: 92 3552 07.					

**MUNICIPALITY**  
**Municipal Performance Measurement Program (MPMP) • 2011 RESULTS**

10.7 FACILITY COMPLIANCE – EFFECTIVENESS						
10.7	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 2011	Days 2010	Days 2009	Days 2008	Days 2007
3553	Code Road Site (Drummond)	0	0	0	0	0
3554						
3555						
3556						
3557						
3558						
3559						
3560						
3561						
3562	Please delete unused rows.					
List facilities in the order they appear in the 2011 Financial Information Return (FIR).						
<b>OBJECTIVE:</b> Municipal solid waste services do not have an adverse impact on environment.						
<b>REFERENCE:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Facility Name: 92 3553 03 to 92 3562 03 in Financial Information Return.</li> <li>• Days: 92 3553 07 to 92 3562 07.</li> </ul>						

10.9 DIVERSION OF RESIDENTIAL SOLID WASTE (Based on Combined Residential and Industrial/Commercial/Institutional Tonnage) EFFECTIVENESS					
	2011	2010	2009	2008	2007
10.9 Percentage of residential solid waste diverted for recycling (based on combined residential and ICI tonnage).	22%	30%	17%	19%	18%
<b>OBJECTIVE:</b> Municipal solid waste reduction programs divert waste from landfills and/or incinerators.					
<b>NOTES &amp; KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:</b>					
<b>REFERENCE:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ICI means Industrial/Commercial/Institutional.</li> <li>• Financial Information Return: 92 3656 07.</li> </ul>					

**MUNICIPALITY**  
**Municipal Performance Measurement Program (MPMP) • 2011 RESULTS**

**Parks and Recreation**

<b>11.3 RECREATION FACILITIES – EFFICIENCY</b>			
	2011	2010	2009
11.3 a) Operating costs for recreation facilities per person.	\$ 32.10	\$ 34.40	\$ 30.04
11.3 b) Total costs for recreation facilities per person.	\$ 33.08	\$ 35.47	
<b>OBJECTIVE:</b> Efficient operation of recreation facilities.			
<b>NOTES &amp; KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:</b>			
<b>REFERENCE:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The formulas for efficiency measures were revised in 2009 to reflect changes in the reporting of expenses consistent with accrual accounting concepts. New total cost measures were introduced and revised in 2010. Total costs mean operating costs as defined in MPMP, plus amortization and interest on long-term debt, less revenue received from other municipalities for tangible capital assets.</li> <li>• Financial Information Return: 91 7306 35 (Operating costs measure) and 91 7306 45 (Total costs</li> </ul>			

<b>11.4 RECREATION PROGRAMS AND RECREATION FACILITIES (SUBTOTAL) EFFICIENCY</b>			
	2011	2010	2009
11.4 a) Operating costs for recreation programs and recreation facilities per person (Subtotal)	\$ 32.10	\$ 34.40	\$ 30.04
11.4 b) Total costs for recreation programs and recreation facilities per person (Subtotal)	\$ 33.08	\$ 35.47	
<b>OBJECTIVE:</b> Efficient operation of recreation programs and facilities.			
<b>NOTES &amp; KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:</b>			
<b>REFERENCE:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The formulas for efficiency measures were revised in 2009 to reflect changes in the reporting of expenses consistent with accrual accounting concepts. New total cost measures were introduced and revised in 2010. Total costs mean operating costs as defined in MPMP, plus amortization and interest on long-term debt, less revenue received from other municipalities for tangible capital assets.</li> <li>• Financial Information Return: 91 7320 35 (Operating costs measure) and 91 7320 45 (Total costs measure).</li> </ul>			



**MUNICIPALITY**  
**Municipal Performance Measurement Program (MPMP) • 2011 RESULTS**

<b>11.6 OPEN SPACE – EFFECTIVENESS</b>					
	2011	2010	2009	2008	2007
11.6 Hectares of open space (municipally owned)	1	1	1	1	1
11.6 Hectares of open space per 1,000 persons (municipally owned)	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1
<b>OBJECTIVE:</b> Open space is adequate for population.					
<b>NOTES &amp; KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:</b>					
<b>REFERENCE:</b> • Financial Information Return: 92 7155 05 and 92 7155 07.					

<b>11.8 INDOOR RECREATION FACILITY SPACE – EFFECTIVENESS</b>					
	2011	2010	2009	2008	2007
11.8 Square metres of indoor recreation facilities (municipally)	436	436	436	436	436
11.8 Square metres of indoor recreation facilities per 1,000 persons (municipally owned).	58.2	63.8	63.8	65.4	65.5
<b>OBJECTIVE:</b> Indoor recreation facility space is adequate for population.					
<b>NOTES &amp; KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:</b>					
<b>REFERENCE:</b> • Financial Information Return: 92 7356 05 and 92 7356 07.					

**MUNICIPALITY**  
**Municipal Performance Measurement Program (MPMP) • 2011 RESULTS**

**Libraries**

<b>12.1 LIBRARY COSTS PER PERSON – EFFICIENCY</b>			
	2011	2010	2009
12.1 a) Operating costs for library services per person.	\$ 19.52	\$ 21.02	\$ 18.61
12.1 b) Total costs for library services per person.	\$ 22.79	\$ 24.57	
<b>OBJECTIVE:</b> Efficient library services.			
<b>NOTES &amp; KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:</b>			
<b>REFERENCE:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The formulas for efficiency measures were revised in 2009 to reflect changes in the reporting of expenses consistent with accrual accounting concepts. New total cost measures were introduced and revised in 2010. Total costs mean operating costs as defined in MPMP, plus amortization and interest on long-term debt, less revenue received from other municipalities for tangible capital assets.</li> <li>• Financial Information Return: 91 7405 35 (Operating costs measure) and 91 7405 45 (Total costs measure).</li> </ul>			

<b>12.2 LIBRARY COSTS PER USE – EFFICIENCY</b>			
	2011	2010	2009
12.2 a) Operating costs for library services per use. <sup>1</sup>	\$ 0.84	\$ 0.94	\$ 1.09
12.2 b) Total costs for library services per use.	\$ 0.99	\$ 1.10	
<b>NOTES &amp; KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:</b>			
<b>REFERENCE:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The formulas for efficiency measures were revised in 2009 to reflect changes in the reporting of expenses consistent with accrual accounting concepts. New total cost measures were introduced and revised in 2010. Total costs mean operating costs as defined in MPMP, plus amortization and interest on long-term debt, less revenue received from other municipalities for tangible capital assets.</li> <li>• <sup>1</sup> The calculation of electronic library uses was updated in 2009 to include the number of people using the public library wireless connection. In 2011 three additional categories of reference transactions were added to the definition of library uses. This may affect the comparability of 2011 results with earlier years.</li> </ul>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Financial Information Return: 91 7406 35 (Operating costs measure) and 91 7406 45 (Total costs measure).</li> </ul>			

**MUNICIPALITY**  
**Municipal Performance Measurement Program (MPMP) • 2011 RESULTS**

12.3 LIBRARY USES – EFFECTIVENESS				
	2011	2010	2009	
12.3 Library uses per person. <sup>1</sup>	31.98	27.75	23.58	
<b>OBJECTIVE:</b> Increased use of library services.				
<b>NOTES &amp; KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:</b>				
<b>REFERENCE:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <sup>1</sup> The calculation of electronic library uses was updated in 2009 to include the number of people using the public library wireless connection. In 2011 three additional categories of reference transactions were added to the definition of library uses. This may affect the comparability of 2011 results with earlier years.</li> <li>• Financial Information Return: 92 7460 07.</li> </ul>				
<b>Line numbers for prior years:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The FIR reference for the measure, library uses per person, did not change in 2009.</li> </ul>				

12.4 ELECTRONIC LIBRARY USES – EFFECTIVENESS				
	2011	2010	2009	
12.4 Electronic library uses as a percentage of total library uses. <sup>1</sup>	53%	24%	10%	
<b>OBJECTIVE:</b> Better information on library usage.				
<b>NOTES &amp; KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:</b>				
<b>REFERENCE:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <sup>1</sup> The calculation of electronic library uses was updated in 2009 to include the number of people using the public library wireless connection. In 2011 three additional categories of reference transactions were added to the definition of library uses. This may affect the comparability of 2011 results with earlier years.</li> <li>• Financial Information Return: 92 7463 07.</li> </ul>				

12.5 NON - ELECTRONIC LIBRARY USES – EFFECTIVENESS				
	2011	2010	2009	
12.5 Non-electronic library uses as a percentage of total library uses. <sup>1</sup>	47%	76%	90%	
<b>OBJECTIVE:</b> Better information on library usage.				
<b>NOTES &amp; KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:</b>				
<b>REFERENCE:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <sup>1</sup> The calculation of electronic library uses was updated in 2009 to include the number of people using the public library wireless connection. In 2011 three additional categories of reference transactions were added to the definition of library uses. This may affect the comparability of 2011 results with earlier years.</li> <li>• Financial Information Return: 92 7462 07.</li> </ul>				

**MUNICIPALITY**  
**Municipal Performance Measurement Program (MPMP) • 2011 RESULTS**

Land Use Planning

<b>13.1 LOCATION OF NEW RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT – EFFECTIVENESS</b>					
	2011	2010	2009	2008	2007
13.1 Percentage of new residential units located within settlement areas	27%	13%	3%	5%	2100%
<b>OBJECTIVE:</b> New residential development is occurring within settlement areas.					
<b>NOTES &amp; KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:</b>					
<b>REFERENCE:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Financial Information Return: 92 8170 07.</li> </ul>					

<b>13.2 PRESERVATION OF AGRICULTURAL LAND DURING REPORTING YEAR EFFECTIVENESS</b>					
	2011	2010	2009	2008	2007
13.2 Percentage of land designated for agricultural purposes which was not re-designated for other uses	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
<b>OBJECTIVE:</b> Preservation of agricultural land.					
<b>NOTES &amp; KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:</b>					
<b>REFERENCE:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Financial Information Return: 92 8163 07.</li> </ul>					

**MUNICIPALITY**  
**Municipal Performance Measurement Program (MPMP) • 2011 RESULTS**

<b>13.3 PRESERVATION OF AGRICULTURAL LAND RELATIVE TO 2000 EFFECTIVENESS</b>					
	2011	2010	2009	2008	2007
13.3 Percentage of land designated for agricultural purposes which was not re-designated for other uses	63%	63%	63%	63%	63%
<b>OBJECTIVE:</b> Preservation of agricultural land.					
<b>NOTES &amp; KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:</b>					
<b>REFERENCE:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Financial Information Return: 92 8164 07.</li> </ul>					

<b>13.4 CHANGE IN NUMBER OF AGRICULTURAL HECTARES DURING REPORTING YEAR EFFECTIVENESS</b>					
	2011	2010	2009	2008	2007
13.4 Number of hectares of land originally designated for agricultural purposes which was re-designated for other uses	0	0	0	0	0
<b>OBJECTIVE:</b> Preservation of agricultural land.					
<b>NOTES &amp; KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:</b>					
<b>REFERENCE:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Financial Information Return: 92 8165 07.</li> </ul>					

<b>13.5 CHANGE IN NUMBER OF AGRICULTURAL HECTARES SINCE 2000 EFFECTIVENESS</b>					
	2011	2010	2009	2008	2007
13.5 Number of hectares of land originally designated for agricultural purposes which was re-designated for other uses since	668	668	668	668	668
<b>OBJECTIVE:</b> Preservation of agricultural land.					
<b>NOTES &amp; KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:</b>					
<b>REFERENCE:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Financial Information Return: 92 8166 07.</li> </ul>					