

Local Government

1.1 OPERATING COSTS FOR LOCAL GOVERNMENT
2002
3.55%
<p>Efficiency Measure <i>Operating costs for governance and corporate management as a percentage of total municipal operating costs.</i></p> <p>Objective <i>Efficient municipal government.</i></p>
<p>Notes <i>2002 is the first year as mandated by the Ministry where program support costs which were previously included in General Government Support have been allocated to the various functional expense categories.</i></p>

Fire Services

2.1 OPERATING COSTS FOR FIRE SERVICES
2002
\$2.32
<p>Efficiency Measure <i>Operating costs for fire services per \$1,000 of assessment.</i></p> <p>Objective <i>Efficient municipal fire services.</i></p>

Police Services

3.1 OPERATING COSTS FOR POLICE SERVICES	3.2 VIOLENT CRIME RATE
2002	2002
\$620.62	11.97
<p>Efficiency Measure Operating costs for police services per household.</p> <p>Objective Efficient municipal police services.</p>	<p>Effectiveness Measure Violent crime rate per 1,000 persons.</p> <p>Objective Safe communities.</p>

Police Services

3.3 PROPERTY CRIME RATE	3.4 TOTAL CRIME RATE
2002	2002
65.12	98.57
<p>Effectiveness Measure Property crime rate per 1,000 persons.</p> <p>Objective Safe communities.</p>	<p>Effectiveness Measure Total crime rate per 1,000 persons.</p> <p>Note that the definition used refers to Criminal Code offences, excluding traffic.</p> <p>Objective Safe communities.</p>

Road Services

4.1 OPERATING COSTS FOR PAVED ROADS	4.2 OPERATING COSTS FOR UNPAVED ROADS
2002	2002
\$865.76	\$259.26
<p>Efficiency Measure <i>Operating costs for paved (hard top) roads per lane kilometre.</i></p> <p>Objective <i>Efficient maintenance of paved roads.</i></p>	<p>Efficiency Measure <i>Operating costs for unpaved (loose top) roads per lane kilometre.</i></p> <p>Objective <i>Efficient maintenance of unpaved roads.</i></p>
<p>Notes <i>Both direct and indirect costs have been included. Employee, operational, and facility overheads are included. Direct costs excluded are Traffic Signs & Signals, Pavement Markings, Sidewalks (including integral), Curb & Gutters, Wheelchair Ramps, Walkways, Alleys, Recoverable Work, Roadside Maint. (inc. guide posts, guide rails), and Structures (bridges). In 2000 and 2001 submissions costs for roadside maintenance (inc. guide posts and guide rails), integral sidewalks, curb and gutter, wheelchair ramps and structures were included. These costs are excluded starting in 2002 to conform to OGRA schedule definitions. Indirect costs include operational overheads such as supervision, technical support, building/stock maintenance, utilities, training, and general expenses supporting hard top maintenance. The majority of revenue fund revenues are from internal sources with the exception of Recoverable Work which has been excluded from both costs and revenues in this calculation.</i></p>	<p>Notes <i>Both direct and indirect costs have been included. Employee, operational, and facility overheads are included. Direct costs excluded are Alleys. Indirect costs include overheads such as supervision, technical support, building/stock maintenance, utilities, training, and general expenses supporting loosetop maintenance activities. There are no revenue fund revenues from external sources.</i></p>

Road Services

4.3 OPERATING COSTS FOR WINTER MAINTENANCE OF ROADS	4.4 CONDITION OF PAVED ROADS
2002	2002
\$1,013.06	36.47%
<p>Efficiency Measure <i>Operating costs for winter maintenance of roadways per lane kilometre maintained in winter.</i></p> <p>Objective <i>Efficient winter control operation.</i></p>	<p>Effectiveness Measure <i>Percentage of paved lane kilometres where the condition is rated as good to very good.</i></p> <p>Objective <i>Provide a paved lane system that has a pavement condition that meets municipal standards.</i></p>
<p>Notes <i>Lane km lengths include the "In-Service" and "In Maintenance Period" roadways.</i></p>	<p>Notes <i>Rating method is RIMS for pavement deficiencies only. "Good to very good" deemed to be roads without pavement deficiencies. Approximations required to convert data from centreline kms to lane kms.</i></p>

Road Services

4.5 WINTER EVENT RESPONSES
2002
100.0%
<p>Effectiveness <i>Percentage of winter events where the response met or exceeded locally determined road maintenance standards.</i></p> <p>Objective <i>Provide an appropriate response to winter events.</i></p>

Conventional Transit

5.1 OPERATING COSTS	5.2 PUBLIC TRANSIT USE
2002	2002
\$3.01	25.63
<p>Efficiency Measure <i>Operating costs for conventional transit per regular service passenger trip.</i></p> <p>Objective <i>Efficient conventional transit services.</i></p>	<p>Effectiveness Measure <i>Number of conventional transit passenger trips per person in the service area in a year.</i></p> <p>Objective <i>Maximum utilization of municipal transit services.</i></p>

Wastewater

6.1 OPERATING COSTS FOR WASTEWATER COLLECTION	6.2 OPERATING COST FOR WASTEWATER COLLECTION AND TREATMENT
2002	2002
\$4,213.07	\$150.34
<p>Efficiency Measure Operating costs for the collection of wastewater per kilometre of wastewater main.</p> <p>Objective Efficient wastewater collection services.</p>	<p>Efficiency Measure Operating costs for the treatment and disposal of wastewater per megalitre.</p> <p>A megalitre equals 1,000,000 litres or 1,000 cubic metres.</p> <p>Objective Efficient water treatment and disposal services.</p>

Wastewater

6.3 OPERATING COSTS FOR WASTEWATER SYSTEM	6.4 WASTEWATER MAIN BACKUPS
2002	2002
\$198.28	1.2255
<p>Efficiency Measure Operating costs for collection, treatment, and disposal of wastewater per megalitre (Integrated system).</p> <p>A megalitre equals 1,000,000 litres or 1,000 cubic metres.</p> <p>Objective Efficient wastewater system.</p>	<p>Effectiveness Measure Number of wastewater main backups per 100 kilometres of wastewater main in a year.</p> <p>Objective Prevention of human and environmental health hazards.</p>
	<p>Notes The number of wastewater main backups is not currently tracked. The estimate of wastewater main backups provided above is an estimate of the number of wastewater main obstructions that required the use of a flusher or rodder in order to remove. Wastewater main lengths include sanitary, storm, and combined wastewater lengths.</p>

Wastewater

6.5 WASTEWATER TREATMENT BYPASS
2002
1.90%
<i>Effectiveness Measure</i> <i>Percentage of wastewater estimated to have by-passed treatment.</i>
<i>Objective</i> <i>Effective wastewater and treatment and disposal services.</i>

Drinking Water Services

8.1 OPERATING COSTS FOR DRINKING WATER TREATMENT	8.2 OPERATING COSTS FOR DRINKING WATER DISTRIBUTION
2002	2002
\$64.09	\$6,659.80
<p>Efficiency Measure <i>Operating costs for the treatment of drinking water per megalitre.</i></p> <p><i>A megalitre equals 1,000,000 litres, or 1,000 cubic metres.</i></p> <p>Objective <i>Efficient production of drinking water.</i></p>	<p>Efficiency Measure <i>Operating costs for the distribution of drinking water per kilometre of water distribution pipe.</i></p> <p>Objective <i>Efficient distribution of drinking water.</i></p>

Drinking Water Services

8.3 OPERATING COSTS FOR TREATMENT AND DISTRIBUTION	8.4 BOIL WATER ADVISORIES
2002	2002
\$173.38	0.0
<p>Efficiency Measure <i>Operating costs for the treatment and distribution of drinking water per megalitre (Integrated System).</i></p> <p><i>A megalitre equals 1,000,000 litres, or 1,000 cubic metres.</i></p> <p>Objective <i>Efficient treatment and distribution of water.</i></p>	<p>Effectiveness Measure <i>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.</i></p> <p>Objective <i>Water is safe and meets local needs.</i></p>

Drinking Water Services

8.5 DRINKING WATER MAIN BREAKS
2002
36.9756
<p>Effectiveness Measure <i>Number of water main breaks per 100 kilometres of water distribution pipe in a year.</i></p> <p>Objective <i>Improve system reliability.</i></p>

Solid Waste

9.1 OPERATING COSTS FOR GARBAGE COLLECTION	9.2 OPERATING COSTS FOR GARBAGE DISPOSAL
2002	2002
\$65.86	\$56.00
<p>Efficiency Measure <i>Operating costs for garbage collection per tonne.</i></p> <p>Objective <i>Efficient garbage collection services..</i></p>	<p>Efficiency Measure <i>Operating costs for garbage disposal per tonne.</i></p> <p>Objective <i>Efficient garbage disposal.</i></p>

Solid Waste

9.3 OPERATING COSTS FOR SOLID WASTE DIVERSION (RECYCLING)	9.4 OPERATING COSTS FOR SOLID WASTE (INTEGRATED SYSTEM)
2002	2002
\$123.02	\$122.22
<p>Efficiency Measure <i>Operating costs for solid waste diversion (recycling) per tonne.</i></p> <p>Objective <i>Efficient solid waste diversion (recycling) services.</i></p>	<p>Efficiency Measure <i>Average operating costs for solid waste management (collection, disposal and diversion) per tonne.</i></p> <p>Objective <i>Efficient solid waste management.</i></p>

Solid Waste

9.5 COMPLAINTS FOR SOLID WASTE AND RECYCLING COLLECTION	9.6 NUMBER OF SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT SITES
2002	2002
58.4125	2
<p>Effectiveness Measure <i>Number of complaints received in a year concerning the collection of garbage and recycled materials per 1,000 households.</i></p> <p>Objective <i>Improved garbage collection services.</i></p>	<p>Effectiveness Measure <i>Total number of solid waste management sites owned by the municipality with a Ministry of Environment Certificate of Approval.</i></p> <p>Objective <i>Context for solid waste management facility compliance measure.</i></p>

Solid Waste

9.8 DIVERSION OF SOLID WASTE
2002
31.11 %
<p>Effectiveness Measure <i>Percentage of residential solid waste diverted for recycling.</i></p> <p>Objective <i>Municipal waste programs divert garbage from landfills and incinerators.</i></p>

Land Use Planning

10.1 GROWTH AND SETTLEMENT PATTERN	10.2 PRESERVATION OF AGRICULTURAL LAND IN REPORTING YEAR
2002	2002
100.00%	0.0%
<p>Effectiveness Measure <i>Percentage of new lots, blocks and/or units with final approval which are located within settlement areas.</i></p> <p>Objective <i>New lot creation is occurring in settlement areas.</i></p>	<p>Effectiveness Measure <i>Percentage of land designated for agricultural purposes which was not re-designated for other uses during 2002.</i></p> <p>Objective <i>Preserve agricultural land.</i></p>

Land Use Planning

10.3 PRESERVATION OF AGRICULTURAL LAND (RELATIVE TO 2000)	10.4 CHANGE IN HECTARES AGRICULTURAL LAND (DURING REPORTING YEAR)
2002	2002
0.0 %	0
<p>Effectiveness Measure <i>Percentage of land designated for agricultural purposes which was not re-designated for other uses relative to the base year of 2000.</i></p> <p>Objective <i>Preserve agricultural land.</i></p>	<p>Effectiveness Measure <i>Number of hectares of land originally designated for agricultural purposes which was re-designated for other uses during 2002.</i></p> <p>Objective <i>Preserve agricultural land.</i></p>

Land Use Planning

10.5 CHANGE IN AGRICULTURAL LAND (SINCE 2000)
2002
0
<p>Effectiveness Measure <i>Number of hectares of land originally designated for agricultural purposes which was re-designated for other uses since January 1, 2000.</i></p> <p>Objective <i>Preserve agricultural land.</i></p>