

## Appendix A

### **Township of Greater Madawaska Municipal Performance Measurement Program For the year ending December 31, 2012**

The Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing, pursuant to Section 299 of *The Municipal Act, 2001* requires all Ontario municipalities to provide information to their taxpayers on specific performance-related measures each year based on the previous year's activities.

The 2012 results for the Township of Greater Madawaska are provided herein. Where appropriate, the previous year's results have been adjusted for comparison purposes. While it is the Township of Greater Madawaska's goal to improve upon the measures and to provide the highest quality of services in the most efficient and effective manner, some may have changed negatively compared to a year ago. Readers are cautioned that financial measures alone may not provide sufficient information to make an accurate assessment or comparison to either prior year results or other municipalities.

Questions concerning the Township of Greater Madawaska reported measures should be directed to the Deputy Treasurer as follows:

Mail:	Adam Murphy Deputy Treasurer Township of Greater Madawaska 19 Parnell Street Calabogie, Ontario K0J 1H0	Phone: 613-752-2222 Extension: 203
E-mail:	<a href="mailto:amurphy@greamtermadawaska.com">amurphy@greamtermadawaska.com</a>	Fax: 613-752-2617

<b>GENERAL GOVERNMENT</b>	
<b>1.1a OPERATING COSTS</b> Governance and political support, and corporate management support	<b>1.1b TOTAL COSTS</b> Governance and political support, and corporate management support
Operating costs for Governance and Corporate Management Total Municipal Operating Costs	Total costs for Governance and Corporate Management Total Municipal Operating Costs
<b>20.7% of total municipal operating costs</b>	<b>17.8% of total municipal total costs</b>
<p><i><b>Efficiency Measure</b></i> Governance and corporate management operating costs as a percentage of total municipal operating costs.</p> <p><i><b>Objective</b></i> Efficient municipal administration.</p>	<p><i><b>Efficiency Measure</b></i> Governance and corporate management total costs as a percentage of total municipal operating costs.</p> <p><i><b>Objective</b></i> Efficient municipal administration.</p>
<p><b>Notes</b></p> <p>The 2011 comparative result for this measure was 19.8%.</p>	<p><b>Notes</b></p> <p>The 2011 comparative result for this measure was 15.9%.</p>

<b>Fire Services</b>	
<b>2.1a OPERATING COSTS FOR FIRE SERVICES</b>	<b>2.1b TOTAL COSTS FOR FIRE SERVICES</b>
<u>Operating Costs for Fire Services</u> (Total Assessment / 1,000)	<u>Total Costs for Fire Services</u> (Total Assessment / 1,000)
<b>\$0.42 per \$1,000 of property assessment</b>	<b>\$0.52 per \$1,000 of property assessment</b>
<p><b>Efficiency Measure</b> Operating costs for fire services per \$1,000 of assessment.</p> <p><b>Objective</b> Efficient municipal management.</p>	<p><b>Efficiency Measure</b> Total costs for fire services per \$1,000 of assessment.</p> <p><b>Objective</b> Efficient municipal management.</p>
<p><b>Notes</b> The 2011 comparative result for this measure was \$0.43 per \$1,000 of property assessment.</p>	<p><b>Notes</b> The 2011 comparative result for this measure was \$0.55 per \$1,000 of property assessment.</p>
<b>2.2 FIRE RELATED INJURIES</b>	<b>2.3 FIRE RELATED INJURIES OVER 5 YEARS</b>
<u>Total number of residential fire related civilian injuries</u> (Total Population / 1,000)	(Total Number of residential fire related civilian injuries for <u>2008 + 2009 + 2010 + 2011 + 2012</u> ) / 5 (Total Population / 1,000)
<b>0 per 1,000 persons</b>	<b>0.404 per 1,000 persons</b>
<p><b>Effectiveness Measure</b> Number of residential fire related injuries per 1,000 persons.</p> <p><b>Objective</b> Effective municipal management.</p>	<p><b>Effectiveness Measure</b> Number of residential fire related injuries averaged over per 1,000 persons.</p> <p><b>Objective</b> Effective municipal management.</p>
<p><b>Notes</b> The 2011 comparative result for this measure was \$0.458 per 1,000 persons</p>	<p><b>Notes</b> The 2011 comparative result for this measure was \$0.458 per 1,000 persons.</p>

**Fire Services – Continued**

<b>2.4 FIRE RELATED FATALITIES</b>		<b>2.5 FIRE RELATED FATALITIES OVER 5 YEARS</b>	
<u>Total number of residential fire related civilian fatalities</u> (Total Population / 1,000)		<u>(Total Number of residential fire related civilian injuries for 2008+2009+2010+ 2011+2012) / 5</u> (Total Population / 1,000)	
<b>0 per 1,000 persons</b>		<b>0 per 1,000 persons</b>	
<p><i><b>Effectiveness Measure</b></i> Number of residential fire related fatalities per 1,000 persons.</p> <p><i><b>Objective</b></i> Effective municipal management.</p>		<p><i><b>Effectiveness Measure</b></i> Number of residential fire related fatalities averaged over 5 years per 1,000 persons.</p> <p><i><b>Objective</b></i> Effective municipal management.</p>	
<p><b>Notes</b> The 2011 comparative result for this measure was 0.</p>		<p><b>Notes</b> The 2011 comparative result for this measure was 0.</p>	
<b>2.6 RESIDENTIAL STRUCTURAL FIRES</b>			
<u>Total number of residential structural fires</u> (Total households / 1,000)			
<b>0.405 per 1,000 households</b>			
<p><i><b>Effectiveness Measure</b></i> Number of residential structural fires per 1,000 persons.</p> <p><i><b>Objective</b></i> Effective municipal management.</p>			
<p><b>Notes</b> The 2011 revised comparative result for this measure was 0.368. There was one residential fire in 2012 compared to one residential fire in 2011.</p>			

<b>Police Services</b>	
<b>3.1a OPERATING COSTS FOR POLICE SERVICES</b>	<b>3.1b TOTAL COSTS FOR POLICE SERVICES</b>
<u>Operating costs for Police Services</u> Total population	<u>Total costs for Police Services</u> Total population
<b>\$126.10 per person</b>	<b>\$126.10 per person</b>
<i>Efficiency Measure</i> Operating costs for police services per person. <i>Objective</i> Efficient municipal police services.	<i>Efficiency Measure</i> Total costs for police services per person. <i>Objective</i> Efficient municipal police services.
<b>Notes</b> The 2011 comparative result for this measure was \$118.45 per person.	<b>Notes</b> The 2011 comparative result for this measure was \$118.45 per person.
<b>3.2 VIOLENT CRIME RATE</b>	<b>3.3 PROPERTY CRIME RATE / 1,000</b>
<u>Total # of actual incidents of violent crime</u> Population / 1,000	<u>Total # of actual incidents of property crime</u> Population / 1,000
<b>5.657 violent crimes per 1,000 persons</b>	<b>15.354 property crimes per 1,000 persons</b>
<i>Efficiency Measure</i> Violent crime rate per 1,000 persons. <i>Objective</i> Safe communities.	<i>Efficiency Measure</i> Property crime rate per 1,000 persons. <i>Objective</i> Safe communities.
<b>Notes</b> The 2011 comparative result for this measure was 5.039 violent crimes per 1,000 persons. In 2012 there were a total of 14 incidents of violent crime compared to 11 in 2011.	<b>Notes</b> The 2011 comparative result for this measure was 15.117 property crimes per 1,000 persons. In 2012 there were a total of 38 incidents of property crime compared to 33 in 2011.

<b>Police Services – Continued</b>	
<b>3.4 TOTAL CRIME RATE / 1,000</b>	<b>3.5 YOUTH CRIME RATE / 1,000</b>
<p>Total # of actual incidents of violent crime, <u>property crime and other Criminal Code offences</u> Population / 1,000</p>	<p><u>Total # of youths cleared by charge or cleared otherwise</u> Youth Population / 1,000</p>
<b>22,222 crimes per 1,000 persons</b>	<b>0 youth crimes per 1,000 youths</b>
<p><i><b>Efficiency Measure</b></i> Total crime rate per 1,000 persons (Criminal Code, excluding traffic.) Note that the definition used refers to Criminal Code crimes, excluding traffic. <i><b>Objective</b></i> Safe communities</p>	<p><i><b>Efficiency Measure</b></i> Youth crime rate per 1,000 youths. <i><b>Objective</b></i> Safe communities</p>
<p><b>Notes</b> The 2011 comparative result for this measure was 21.072 crimes per 1,000 persons. In 2012 there were a total of 55 actual incidents of violent crime, property crime, and other Criminal Code offences, excluding traffic, compared to 81 in 2011.</p>	<p><b>Notes</b> In 2011 there were a total of 0 incidents of youth crimes per 1,000 youths compared to 0 in 2012.</p>

<b>Building Permits and Inspection Services</b>	
<b>4.1 OPERATING COSTS FOR CONSTRUCTION ACTIVITY</b>	<b>4.2 TOTAL COSTS FOR CONSTRUCTION ACTIVITY</b>
Operating costs for <u>Building Permits and Inspection Services</u> Total Value of Construction Activity (Based on Permits Issues) / \$1,000	Total costs for <u>Building Permits and Inspection Services</u> Total Value of Construction Activity (Based on Permits Issues) / \$1,000
<b>\$5.68 per \$1,000 of Construction Activity (Based on Permits Issued)</b>	<b>\$5.68 per \$1,000 of Construction Activity (Based on Permits Issued)</b>
<p><i><b>Efficiency Measure</b></i>                      Operating costs for building permits and inspections services per \$1,000 of construction activity (based on permits issued)</p> <p><i><b>Objective</b></i>                      Efficient use of building permits and inspection services resources</p>	<p><i><b>Efficiency Measure</b></i>                      Total costs for building permits and inspections services per \$1,000 of construction activity (based on permits issued)</p> <p><i><b>Objective</b></i>                      Efficient use of building permits and inspection services resources</p>
<p><b>Notes</b>                      The 2011 calculated comparative result for this measure was \$5.65 per \$1,000 of Construction Activity (Based on Permits Issued).</p> <p>In 2012 the total value of construction activity (based on permits issued) was \$11,529,000 compared to \$10,973,000 in 2011.</p>	<p><b>Notes</b>                      The 2011 calculated comparative result for this measure was \$5.65 per \$1,000 of Construction Activity (Based on Permits Issued).</p>

## Building Permits and Inspection Services - Continued

<b>4.3 REVIEW OF COMPLETE BUILDING PERMIT APPLICATIONS - HOUSES</b>	<b>4.4 REVIEW OF COMPLETE BUILDING PERMIT APPLICATIONS – SMALL BUILDINGS</b>
Median number of days to review a complete building permit application for a house and issue a permit or not issue a permit.	Median number of days to review a complete building permit application for a small building (small commercial/industrial not exceeding 3 storeys/600 square metres) and issue a permit or not issue a permit.
<b>5 working days</b>	<b>n/a</b>
<p><i><b>Effectiveness Measure</b></i> Median number of days to review a complete building permit application and issue a permit or not issue a permit</p> <p><i><b>Objective</b></i> Effective turnaround time for Municipality to respond to permit.</p>	<p><i><b>Effectiveness Measure</b></i> Median number of days to review a complete building permit application and issue a permit or not issue a permit</p> <p><i><b>Objective</b></i> Effective turnaround time for Municipality to respond to permit.</p>
<p><b>Notes</b> The provincial standard is 10 working days.</p>	<p><b>Notes</b> The provincial standard is 15 working days. No such buildings were constructed in 2012 in the Municipality.</p>
<b>4.5 REVIEW OF COMPLETE BUILDING PERMIT APPLICATIONS – LARGE BUILDINGS</b>	<b>4.6 REVIEW OF COMPLETE BUILDING PERMIT APPLICATIONS – COMPLEX BUILDINGS</b>
Median number of days to review a complete building permit application for large buildings (large residential/commercial/industrial/institutional)	Median number of days to review a complete building permit application for complex buildings (post disaster buildings, including hospitals, power/water, fire/police/EMS, communications)
<b>n/a</b>	<b>n/a</b>
<p><i><b>Effectiveness Measure</b></i> Median number of days to review a complete building permit application and issue a permit or not issue a permit</p> <p><i><b>Objective</b></i> Effective turnaround time for Municipality to respond to permit.</p>	<p><i><b>Effectiveness Measure</b></i> Median number of days to review a complete building permit application and issue a permit or not issue a permit</p> <p><i><b>Objective</b></i> Effective turnaround time for Municipality to respond to permit.</p>
<p><b>Notes</b> The provincial standard is 20 working days. No such buildings were constructed in 2012 in the Municipality.</p>	<p><b>Notes</b> The provincial standard is 30 working days. No such buildings were constructed in 2012 in the Municipality.</p>



<b>Road Services</b>	
<b>5.1a OPERATING COSTS FOR PAVED ROADS</b>	<b>5.1b TOTAL COSTS FOR PAVED ROADS</b>
<u>Operating costs for paved roads</u> Total paved lane kilometres	<u>Total costs for paved roads</u> Total paved lane kilometers
<b>\$2014.80 per paved lane kilometre</b>	<b>\$4085.21 per paved lane kilometre</b>
<i><b>Efficiency Measure</b></i> Operating costs of paved (hard top) roads per lane kilometre. <i><b>Objective</b></i> Efficient maintenance of paved roads.	<i><b>Efficiency Measure</b></i> Total costs of paved (hard top) roads per lane kilometre. <i><b>Objective</b></i> Efficient maintenance of paved roads
<b>Notes</b> The 2011 revised comparative result for this measure was \$1,657.62 per paved lane kilometre. There was 185km of paved roads in 2012 and 200km in 2011.	<b>Notes</b> The 2011 revised comparative result for this measure was \$3,800.34 per paved lane kilometre.
<b>5.2a OPERATING COSTS FOR UNPAVED ROADS</b>	<b>5.2b TOTAL COSTS FOR UNPAVED ROADS</b>
<u>Operating costs for unpaved roads</u> Total unpaved lane kilometres	<u>Total costs for unpaved roads</u> Total unpaved lane kilometres
<b>\$2,079.29 per paved lane kilometre</b>	<b>\$2,103.77 per paved lane kilometre</b>
<i><b>Efficiency Measure</b></i> Operating costs for unpaved (loose top) roads per lane kilometre. <i><b>Objective</b></i> Efficient maintenance of unpaved roads.	<i><b>Efficiency Measure</b></i> Total costs for unpaved (loose top) roads per lane kilometre. <i><b>Objective</b></i> Efficient maintenance of unpaved roads.
<b>Notes</b> The 2011 revised comparative result for this measure was \$1,973.55 per unpaved lane kilometre. There was 272km unpaved roads in 2012 and 257km in 2011	<b>Notes</b> The 2011 revised comparative result for this measure was \$2,009.08 per unpaved lane kilometre.

<b>Road Services – Continued</b>	
<b>5.3a OPERATING COSTS FOR BRIDGES AND CULVERTS</b>	<b>5.3b TOTAL COSTS FOR BRIDGES AND CULVERTS</b>
<u>Operating costs for Bridges and Culverts</u> Total square metres of surface area on bridges and culverts	<u>Total costs for Bridges and Culverts</u> Total square metres of surface area on bridges and culverts
<b>Not applicable</b>	<b>Not applicable</b>
<p><b><i>Efficiency Measure</i></b>                      Operating costs for bridges and culverts per square metre of surface area.</p> <p><b><i>Objective</i></b>                      Efficient maintenance of bridges and culverts.</p>	<p><b><i>Efficiency Measure</i></b>                      Total costs for bridges and culverts per square metre of surface area.</p> <p><b><i>Objective</i></b>                      Efficient maintenance of bridges and culverts</p>
<p><b>Notes</b>                      Operating costs in 2012 and 2011 were not separated from road expenses and therefore we are not able to calculate this measure.</p>	<p><b>Notes</b>                      Total costs in 2012 and 2011 were not separated from road expenses and therefore we are not able to calculate this measure.</p>
<b>5.4a OPERATING COSTS FOR WINTER CONTROL</b>	<b>5.4b TOTAL COSTS FOR WINTER CONTROL</b>
<u>Operating costs for winter control maintenance of roadways</u> Total lane kilometres maintained in winter	<u>Total costs for winter control maintenance of roadways</u> Total lane kilometres maintained in winter
<b>\$382.54 per lane kilometre</b>	<b>\$382.54 per lane kilometre</b>
<p><b><i>Efficiency Measure</i></b>                      Operating costs for winter control maintenance of roadways per lane kilometre maintained in winter.</p> <p><b><i>Objective</i></b>                      Efficient winter control operation.</p>	<p><b><i>Efficiency Measure</i></b>                      Total costs for winter control maintenance of roadways per lane kilometre maintained in winter.</p> <p><b><i>Objective</i></b>                      Efficient winter control operation</p>
<p><b>Notes</b>                      The 2011 comparative result for this measure was \$485.33 per lane kilometre.</p>	<p><b>Notes</b>                      The 2011 comparative result for this measure was \$485.33 per lane kilometre.</p>

<b>Road Services – Continued</b>	
<b>5.5 CONDITION OF ROADS</b>	<b>5.6 TOTAL COSTS FOR BRIDGES AND CULVERTS</b>
Number of paved lane kilometres rated as <u>good to very good</u> Total number of paved lane kilometres	Number of bridges and culverts rated as <u>good to very good</u> Total number of paved lane kilometres
<b>43.00% of lane kilometres</b>	<b>Not applicable</b>
<p><b>Efficiency Measure</b>                      Percentage of paved lane kilometres where condition is rated as good to very good.</p> <p><b>Objective</b>                      Provide a paved lane system that has a pavement condition that meets municipal standards.</p>	<p><b>Efficiency Measure</b>                      Percentage of bridges and culverts where condition is rated as good to very good.</p> <p><b>Objective</b>                      Provide a bridge and culvert system that has a pavement condition that meets municipal standards.</p>
<p><b>Notes</b>                      The 2011 comparative result for this measure was estimated at 43% of paved lane kilometres where condition was rated as good to very good.</p>	<p><b>Notes</b>                      This measure is not calculated due to how information is collected and recorded.</p>
<b>5.7 WINTER EVENT RESPONSES</b>	
Number of winter event responses <u>that met or exceeded municipal road maintenance standards x 100</u> Total number of winter events	
<b>95.7% of winter event responses met or exceeded municipal standards</b>	
<p><b>Efficiency Measure</b>                      Percentage of winter event responses that met or exceeded municipal road maintenance standards.</p> <p><b>Objective</b>                      Provide appropriate winter response.</p>	
<p><b>Notes</b>                      A winter event is a weather condition affecting roads such as snow fall, windblown snow, sleet, freezing rain, frost, black ice, etc. A response to a winter event is a series of winter control activities related to one winter event. In 2012, there were 23 winter events, compared to 27 in 2011.                      The 2011 comparative result for this measure was also 100%.</p>	

**Environmental Protection/Wastewater**

**6  
COLLECTION OF WASTEWATER**

The township does not collect, treat or dispose wastewater

**Storm Water**

**7  
STORM WATER**

The township does not maintain storm water

**Water Services**

**8  
Water Services**

The township does not treat drinking water.

<b>Solid Waste</b>	
<b>9.1a OPERATING COSTS FOR SOLID WASTE COLLECTION</b>	<b>9.1b TOTAL COSTS FOR SOLID WASTE COLLECTION</b>
<u>Operating costs for solid waste collection</u> Total tonnes received from all property classes	<u>Total costs for solid waste collection</u> Total tonnes received from all property classes
<b>Not Applicable</b>	<b>Not Applicable</b>
<b>Efficiency Measure</b> <i>Operating costs for solid waste collection per tonne</i>	<b>Efficiency Measure</b> <i>Total costs for solid waste collection per tonne</i>
<b>Objective</b> <i>Efficient solid waste collection programs.</i>	<b>Objective</b> <i>Efficient solid waste collection programs.</i>
<b>Notes</b> The township does not offer garbage collection.	<b>Notes</b> The township does not offer garbage collection.
<b>9.2a OPERATING COSTS FOR SOLID WASTE DISPOSAL</b>	<b>9.2b TOTAL COSTS FOR SOLID WASTE DISPOSAL</b>
<u>Operating costs of solid waste disposal</u> Total Households	<u>Total costs of solid waste disposal</u> Total Households
<b>\$118.39 per tonne</b>	<b>\$160.32 per tonne</b>
<b>Efficiency Measure</b> <i>Operating costs (revenue) for solid waste disposal per tonne</i>	<b>Efficiency Measure</b> <i>Total costs (revenue) for solid waste disposal per tonne</i>
<b>Objective</b> <i>Efficient solid waste disposal programs.</i>	<b>Objective</b> <i>Efficient solid waste disposal programs.</i>
<b>Notes</b> During 2012, 234 (2011 – 241) tonnes of solid waste was disposed of at the Township’s landfill facility. The comparable result for this measure was \$66.97 per tonne of solid waste disposal in 2011	<b>Notes</b> The comparable result for this measure was \$103.31 per tonne of solid waste disposal in 2011

<b>Solid Waste – Continued</b>	
<b>9.3a OPERATING COSTS FOR SOLID WASTE DIVERSION (RECYCLING)</b>	<b>9.3b TOTAL COSTS FOR SOLID WASTE DIVERSION (RECYCLING)</b>
<u>Operating costs for solid waste diversion (recycling)</u> Total tonnes diverted	<u>Total costs for solid waste diversion (recycling)</u> Total tonnes diverted
<b>\$41.17 per tonne</b>	<b>\$41.17 per tonne</b>
<b>Efficiency Measure</b> <i>Operating costs for solid waste diversion (recycling) per tonne</i>	<b>Efficiency Measure</b> <i>Total costs for solid waste diversion (recycling) per tonne</i>
<b>Objective</b> <i>Effective solid waste diversion.</i>	<b>Objective</b> <i>Effective solid waste diversion.</i>
<b>Notes</b> The 2011 comparative result for this measure was \$44.60 per tonne.	<b>Notes</b> The 2011 comparative result for this measure was \$44.60 per tonne.
<b>9.3a OPERATING COSTS FOR SOLID WASTE DIVERSION (RECYCLING)</b>	<b>9.3b TOTAL COSTS FOR SOLID WASTE DIVERSION (RECYCLING)</b>
<u>Operating costs for solid waste management</u> Total tonnes disposed of, and total tonnes diverted	<u>Total costs for solid waste management</u> Total tonnes disposed of, and total tonnes diverted
<b>Not Applicable</b>	<b>Not Applicable</b>
<b>Efficiency Measure</b> <i>Average operating costs for solid waste management (collection, disposal and diversion) per tonne</i>	<b>Efficiency Measure</b> <i>Average total costs for solid waste management (collection, disposal and diversion) per tonne</i>
<b>Objective</b> <i>Effective solid waste management.</i>	<b>Objective</b> <i>Effective solid waste management</i>
<b>Notes</b> Currently costs associated with waste management are not segregated in our system therefore no result for this measure.	<b>Notes</b> Currently costs associated with waste management are not segregated in our system therefore no result for this measure.

<b>Solid Waste – Continued</b>	
<b>9.5 COMPLAINTS FOR SOLID WASTE AND RECYCLING COLLECTION</b>	<b>9.6 NUMBER OF SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT SITES</b>
Number of Complaints Total Households / 1,000	Total number of waste management sites
<b>0 complaints per 1,000 households</b>	<b>5 sites</b>
<p><b>Efficiency Measure</b> Number of complaints received in a year concerning the collection of solid waste and recycled materials per 1,000 households.</p> <p><b>Objective</b> Effective waste management services.</p>	<p><b>Efficiency Measure</b> Total number of solid waste management facilities owned by Municipal with a Ministry of Environment (MOE) Certificate of Approval</p> <p><b>Objective</b> Efficient MOE compliance.</p>
<p><b>Notes</b> No complaints were received in 2012 or 2011</p>	<p><b>Notes</b> The Township owns 5 facilities. They are: - Norway Lake - Black Donald - Mount St. Patrick - Matawatchan - Griffith</p>
<b>9.7 COMPLIANCE ORDER FOR REMEDIATION</b>	<b>9.8 DIVERSION OF RESIDENTIAL SOLID WASTE</b>
Days a year a MOE compliance order for remediation was in effect	Total tonnes of residential solid waste diverted Total tonnes of residential solid waste disposed of an total tonnes diverted
<b>2 days</b>	<b>Not Applicable</b>
<p><b>Efficiency Measure</b> Number of days a year a MOE compliance order for remediation was in effect.</p> <p><b>Objective</b> Effective compliance.</p>	<p><b>Efficiency Measure</b> Percentage of residential solid waste diverted for recycling.</p> <p><b>Objective</b> Efficient waste diversion for recycling.</p>
<p><b>Notes</b> There were no days in either 2011 when a compliance order for remediation was in effect.</p>	<p><b>Notes</b> Tonnes diverted are not tracked</p>

<b>Solid Waste – Continued</b>	
<b>9.9 DIVERSION OF RESIDENTIAL SOLID WASTE</b>	
<p><u>Total tonnes of solid waste diverted</u>                      Total tonnes of solid waste disposed of and total tonnes diverted from all property classes</p>	
<b>35.5% of residential solid waste diverted for recycling</b>	
<p><b>Efficiency Measure</b>                      Percentage of solid waste diverted for recycling.</p> <p><b>Objective</b>                      Efficient waste diversion for recycling</p>	
<p><b>Notes</b>                      During 2012, 234 (2011 – 241) tonnes of solid waste was diverted – all classes.                      During 2012, 659 (2011 – 937) tonnes of solid waste were disposed of and diverted – all classes.                      The 2011 comparative result for this measure was 25.7% of residential solid waste diverted for recycling.</p>	



<b>Parks and Recreation</b>	
<b>10.1a OPERATING COSTS FOR PARKS</b>	<b>10.1b TOTAL COSTS FOR PARKS</b>
<u>Operating costs for parks</u> Total population	<u>Total costs for parks</u> Total population
<b>Not Applicable</b>	<b>Not Applicable</b>
<b>Efficiency Measure</b> <i>Operating costs for parks per person</i>	<b>Efficiency Measure</b> <i>Operating costs for parks per person</i>
<b>Objective</b> <i>Efficient operation of parks.</i>	<b>Objective</b> <i>Efficient operation of parks.</i>
<b>Notes</b> No costs are associated with Parks.	<b>Notes</b> No costs are associated with Parks.
<b>10.2a OPERATING COSTS FOR RECREATION PROGRAMS</b>	<b>10.2b TOTAL COSTS FOR RECREATION PROGRAMS</b>
<u>Operating costs of recreation programs</u> Total population	<u>Total costs of recreation programs</u> Total population
<b>\$8.30 per person</b>	<b>\$8.30 per person</b>
<b>Efficiency Measure</b> <i>Operating costs for recreation programs per person</i>	<b>Efficiency Measure</b> <i>Operating costs for recreation programs per person</i>
<b>Objective</b> <i>Efficient operation of recreation programs.</i>	<b>Objective</b> <i>Efficient operation of recreation programs</i>
<b>Notes</b> Recreation programs include a broad range of programs, services and activities. They include both registered and unregistered drop-in programs and clubs. In 2011, the comparative result for this measure was \$8.81 per person.	<b>Notes</b> In 2011, the comparative result for this measure was \$8.81 per person.

<b>Parks and Recreation – Continued</b>	
<b>10.3a OPERATING COSTS FOR RECREATION FACILITIES</b>	<b>10.3b TOTAL COSTS FOR RECREATION FACILITIES</b>
<u>Operating costs for recreation facilities</u> Total population	<u>Total costs for recreation facilities</u> Total population
<b>\$47.60 per person</b>	<b>\$55.03 per person</b>
<b>Efficiency Measure</b> <i>Operating costs for recreation facilities per person</i>	<b>Efficiency Measure</b> <i>Total costs for recreation facilities per person</i>
<b>Objective</b> <i>Efficient operation of recreation facilities</i>	<b>Objective</b> <i>Efficient operation of recreation facilities.</i>
<b>Notes</b> Recreation facilities include built or enclosed structures used for the purposes of community recreation and leisure. In 2011, the comparative result for this measure was \$57.49 per person.	<b>Notes</b> In 2011, the comparative result for this measure was \$65.92 per person.
<b>10.4a OPERATING COSTS FOR RECREATION PROGRAMS AND FACILITIES</b>	<b>10.4b TOTAL COSTS FOR RECREATION PROGRAMS AND FACILITIES</b>
<u>Operating costs for recreation programs and recreation facilities</u> Total population	<u>Total costs for recreation programs and recreation facilities</u> Total population
<b>\$55.89 per person</b>	<b>\$63.33 per person</b>
<b>Efficiency Measure</b> <i>Operating costs for recreation programs and recreation facilities per person.</i>	<b>Efficiency Measure</b> <i>Total costs for recreation programs and recreation facilities per person.</i>
<b>Objective</b> <i>Efficient operation of recreation programs and recreation facilities.</i>	<b>Objective</b> <i>Efficient operation of recreation programs and recreation facilities.</i>
<b>Notes</b> This represents a subtotal for measures 10.2a and 10.3a. In 2011, the comparable result for this measure was \$66.31 per person.	<b>Notes</b> This represents a subtotal for measures 10.2b and 10.3b. In 2011, the comparable result for this measure was \$74.73 per person.

<b>Parks and Recreation – Continued</b>	
<b>10.5 TOTAL KILOMETRES OF TRAILS</b>	<b>10.6 HECTARES OF OPEN SPACE</b>
<u>Total kilometres of trails</u> Total population / 1,000	<u>Total hectares of open space</u> Total population / 1,000
<b>9,697 kilometres of trails per 1,000 persons</b>	<b>18,182 hectares of open space per 1,000 persons</b>
<b>Effectiveness Measure</b> <i>Kilometres of trails per 1,000 persons.</i> <b>Objective</b> <i>Trails provide recreation opportunities</i>	<b>Effectiveness Measure</b> <i>Hectares of open space per 1,000 persons.</i> <b>Objective</b> <i>Open space is adequate for population.</i>
<b>Notes</b> The 2011 comparative result for this measure was 10.994 km of trails per 1,000 persons. The Township has 24 kilometres (2011 – 24 km) of trails	<b>Notes</b> In 2011, the comparative result was 20.614 hectares of open space per 1,000 persons.
<b>10.7 PARTICIPANT HOURS FOR RECREATION PROGRAMS</b>	<b>10.8 INDOOR RECREATION FACILITY SPACE</b>
Total participant hours for recreation programs: <u>registered, drop-in and permitted programs</u> Total population / 1,000	<u>Square metres of indoor recreation facility space</u> Total population / 1,000
<b>Not applicable</b>	<b>463,838 square metres of indoor recreation facility space per 1,000 persons</b>
<b>Effectiveness Measure</b> <i>Total participant hours for recreation programs per 1,000 persons.</i> <b>Objective</b> <i>Recreation programs serve needs of residents</i>	<b>Effectiveness Measure</b> <i>Square metres of indoor recreation facility space per 1,000 persons.</i> <b>Objective</b> <i>Indoor recreation facility space is adequate for population.</i>
<b>Notes</b> The Township did not track participant hours for recreation programs in 2012 or 2011	<b>Notes</b> In 2011, the comparative result for this measure was also 525.882 square metres of indoor recreation facility space per 1,000 persons. The Township has a total of 1,148 square metres of indoor recreation facility space.

<b>Parks and Recreation – Continued</b>
<b>10.9 Outdoor Recreation Facility Space</b>
Square metres of outdoor recreation facility space with controlled access and electrical or mechanical functions Total population / 1,000
<b>1,169,293 square metres of outdoor recreation facility space per 1,000 persons</b>
<p><b>Efficiency Measure</b>  <i>Square metres of outdoor recreation facility space per 1,000 persons.</i></p> <p><b>Objective</b>  <i>Outdoor recreation space is adequate for the population</i></p>
<p><b>Notes</b>                  In 2011, the comparative result for this measure was also 1,325.699 square metres of outdoor recreation facility space per 1,000 persons.</p>

**Library**

<b>11.1a OPERATING COST PER PERSON</b>		<b>10.6 HECTARES OF OPEN SPACE</b>	
<p><u>Operating costs for library services</u> Total population <b>\$20.73 per person</b></p>		<p><u>Total costs for library services</u> Total population <b>\$20.73 per person</b></p>	
<p><b>Efficiency Measure</b> <i>Operating costs for library services per person</i> <b>Objective</b> <i>Efficient library services</i></p>		<p><b>Efficiency Measure</b> <i>Total costs for library services per person</i> <b>Objective</b> <i>Efficient library services.</i></p>	
<p><b>Notes</b> The revised comparable result for this measure was \$21.99 per person in 2011.</p>		<p><b>Notes</b> The comparable result for this measure was \$21.99 per person in 2011.</p>	
<b>11.2a OPERATING COST PER USE</b>		<b>11.2b TOTAL COST PER USE</b>	
<p><u>Operating costs for library services</u> Total uses <b>\$11.10 per use</b></p>		<p><u>Operating costs for library services</u> Total uses <b>\$11.10 per use</b></p>	
<p><b>Efficiency Measure</b> <i>Operating costs for library services per use</i> <b>Objective</b> <i>Efficient library services.</i></p>		<p><b>Efficiency Measure</b> <i>Operating costs for library services per use</i> <b>Objective</b> <i>Efficient library services</i></p>	
<p><b>Notes</b> Library uses include: visits to the library, circulation of materials, program attendance, reference questions, use of electronic workstations and databases as well as accessing the library’s website. During 2012 there were a total of 4,623 (2011 – 4,246) uses of library services. The comparable result for this measure was \$17.48 per use in 2011.</p>		<p><b>Notes</b> The comparable result for this measure was \$17.48 per use in 2011</p>	

**Library – Continued**

<b>11.3 LIBRARY USES PER PERSON</b>		<b>11.4 ELECTRONIC LIBRARY USES</b>	
$\frac{\text{Total library uses}}{\text{Total population}}$		$\frac{\text{Electronic library uses}}{\text{Total library uses}}$	
<b>1,868 per person</b>		<b>14% of total library uses were electronic</b>	
<p><b>Effectiveness Measure</b> Library uses per person <b>Objective</b> Increased use of library services</p>		<p><b>Effectiveness Measure</b> Electronic library uses as a percentage of total library uses. <b>Objective</b> Better information on library usage.</p>	
<p><b>Notes</b> The comparable result for this measure was 1.953 library uses per person in 2011.</p>		<p><b>Notes</b> In 2011, the comparable result for this measure was 30% of total library uses were electronic.</p>	
<b>11.5 NON-ELECTRONIC LIBRARY USES</b>			
$\frac{\text{Non-electronic library uses}}{\text{Total library uses}}$			
<b>86% of total library uses were non-electronic</b>			
<p><b>Effectiveness Measure</b> Non-electronic library uses as a percentage of total library uses. <b>Objective</b> Better information on library usage.</p>			
<p><b>Notes</b> In 2011, the comparable result for this measure was 70% of total library uses were non-electronic</p>			

**Land Use Planning**

**7**

**Land Use Planning**

The township did not complete information on the FIR and MPMP