City of Orillia

2002 MUNICIPAL PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT PROGRAM

Beginning with the reporting year of 2000, all municipalities in Ontario are required to release information on the efficiency and effectiveness of operations in a variety of areas. For the 2002 reporting year, the areas are:

Area	Measurement numbers
General Government	1.1
Fire	2.1
Police	3.1 – 3.5
Roads	4.1 – 4.5
Transit	5.1 – 5.2
Wastewater	6.1 – 6.5
Storm Water	7.1 – 7.2
Drinking Water	8.1 – 8.5
Solid Waste	9.1 – 9.9
Land Use Planning	10.1 – 10.5

For 2002, the Province introduced new measures and several changes to how the existing measures are calculated. These changes will improve the quality and meaning of the measure in the future. However, this means several measures cannot be compared with the results from previous years. Comparison information is provided only where the data is similar. Further explanation has been provided in the notes section of the measure.

Although comparisons may be made between municipalities, the measures are affected by a number of factors. These factors will make it difficult to directly compare results. The factors include: population, geographic size, location of municipality, weather conditions, economic conditions, assessment values, mix of assessment type between classes, wage levels, and range and level of services provided. These factors, and others associated with the individual measures, must be considered if comparisons are attempted.

The City of Orillia has used the Province's standard report form to release the Performance Measure information. Some measures (Water, Wastewater, Solid Waste) report both separate and combined results.

Further information on the Province's Municipal Performance Measurement Program may be obtained from the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing. Their website is http://www.mah.gov.on.ca.

Local Government

1.1 OPERATING COSTS FOR LOCAL GOVERNMENT

2002	2001
5.06%	Not available

Efficiency Measure

Operating costs for governance and corporate management as a percentage of total municipal operating costs.

Objective

Efficient municipal government.

Notes

Provincial formula change for local government means the measure for 2002 cannot be compared to the measure for 2001. The measure in 2001 included all General Government costs. The 2002 measure reports Governance and Corporate Management costs only.

This measure includes expenses for Mayor and Council, Council Support, City Manager, Corporate Accounting, Real Estate, Taxation, Financial Reporting, and other Corporate Management costs.

Calculation

$$\frac{\text{Operating Costs for governance and corporate management}}{\text{Total Municipal Operating Costs}} = \frac{\$1,142,780}{22,589,358} \times 100$$

Note: Total municipal operating costs exclude transfer costs such as Public Health, Ambulance, Welfare, Homes for the Aged, Child Care and Social Housing.

Fire Services

2.1 OPERATING COSTS FOR FIRE SERVICES	
2002	**2001**
$1.32	**$1.36**

Efficiency Measure

Operating costs for fire services per $1,000 of assessment.

Objective

Efficient municipal fire services.

Notes

Costs include combined 911/dispatch service expenses.

Cost include an interdepartmental water charge for contribution to over-sizing, water usage and hydrant protection. With these costs excluded, the measure would be: 2002 - $1.25, 2001 - $1.28.

Operating Costs include a $189,264 charge for program support overhead. This is lower than in 2001 due to changes in how overhead costs are allocated. Excluding overhead costs, the measure would be: 2002-$1.22, 2001 - $1.21.

Calculation

$$\frac{\text{Operating Costs for Fire Services}}{\text{Total Property Assessment/1,000}} = \frac{\$2,412,641}{1,824,598}$$

The total Property Assessment for the City increased by 1.5% due to a province-wide reassessment.

Police Services

3.1 OPERATING COSTS FOR POLICE SERVICES		3.2 VIOLENT CRIME RATE	
2002	**2001**	**2002**	**2001**
$322.91	**$331.65**	**17.19**	**N/A**

Efficiency Measure
Operating costs for police services per household.

Objective
Efficient municipal police services.

Notes

The City's police services are provided through a contract with the OPP.

The OPP contract is reconciled on a yearly basis in April, after the Province's year-end. Adjustments to the previous year's contract are included in the performance measure results in the next year.

Operating Costs include a $50,058 charge for program support overhead. This is lower than in 2001 due to changes in how overhead costs are allocated. Excluding overhead costs, the measure would be: 2002-$318.83, 2001 - $305.16.

Calculation

$$\frac{\text{Operating Costs for Police Services}}{\text{Total Households}} = \frac{\$3,968,195}{12,289}$$

Effectiveness Measure
Violent crime rate per 1,000 persons.

Objective
Safe communities.

Notes

Due to changes in the definition of categories, and the transition to a new provincial reporting system, the statistics are not comparable between 2001 and 2002.

Calculation

$$\frac{\text{Total number of actual incidents of violent crime}}{\text{Total Population / 1,000}} = \frac{488}{28,388 / 100}$$

Police Services

3.3 PROPERTY CRIME RATE		3.4 TOTAL CRIME RATE
2002	**2001**	**2002**
59.78	**Not available**	**116.88**
Effectiveness Measure *Property crime rate per 1,000 persons.* ***Objective*** *Safe communities.*		***Effectiveness Measure*** *Total crime rate per 1,000 persons.* *Note that the definition used refers to Criminal Code offences, excluding traffic.* ***Objective*** *Safe communities.*
Notes Due to changes in the definition of categories, and the transition to a new provincial reporting system, the statistics are not comparable between 2001 and 2002. **Calculation** $\frac{\text{Total number of actual incidents of property crime}}{\text{Total Population / 1,000}} = \frac{1,697}{28,388 / 100}$		**Notes** Provincial formula change for total crime means measure for 2002 cannot be compared to measure for 2001. **Calculation** $\frac{\text{Total number of actual incidents}}{\text{Total Population / 1,000}} = \frac{3,318}{28,388 / 100}$

Police Services

3.5 YOUTHS CHARGED
2002
86.27
Effectiveness Measure *Number of youths charged per 1,000 youths.* ***Objective*** *Safe communities.*
Notes Provincial formula change for youths charged means measure for 2002 cannot be compared to measure for 2001. **Calculation** $\frac{\text{Total number of youths charged}}{\text{Youth Population / 1,000}} = \frac{201}{2,330 / 1,000}$

Road Services

4.1 OPERATING COSTS FOR PAVED ROADS	4.2 OPERATING COSTS FOR UNPAVED ROADS
2002	**2002**
$761.22	**Not applicable**
Efficiency Measure *Operating costs for paved (hard top) roads per lane kilometre.* ***Objective*** *Efficient maintenance of paved roads.*	***Efficiency Measure*** *Operating costs for unpaved (loose top) roads per lane kilometre.* ***Objective*** *Efficient maintenance of unpaved roads.*
Notes Provincial formula change for paved roads means measure for 2002 cannot be compared to measure for 2001. The following costs are included in this measure: Patching & crack filling, road restoration, leaf pickup, summer sweep & flush, and shoulder maintenance. Some municipalities may report leaf pickup as a solid waste expense. Operating Costs include a $21,029 charge for program support overhead. **Calculation** $\frac{\text{Operating costs for paved roads}}{\text{Total paved lane kilometres}} = \frac{\$264,903}{348}$	**Notes** Provincial formula change for unpaved roads means measure for 2002 cannot be compared to measure for 2001. There are no unpaved roads maintained by the City.

Road Services

4.3 OPERATING COSTS FOR WINTER MAINTENANCE OF ROADS

2002
$2,128.83

Efficiency Measure

Operating costs for winter maintenance of roadways per lane kilometre maintained in winter.

Objective

Efficient winter control operation.

Notes

Provincial formula change for winter maintenance means measure for 2002 cannot be compared to measure for 2001.

Costs include a portion of administration and centralized expenses for the Engineering and Operations department.

The cost of winter control maintenance is related to the weather conditions. Any comparisons must take into account the unique weather conditions of a particular season.

Operating Costs include a $55,863 charge for program support overhead.

Operating Costs include sand clean up and removal.

Calculation

$$\frac{\text{Operating costs for winter control maintenance}}{\text{Total lane kilometres maintained in winter}} = \frac{\$740,832}{348}$$

4.4 CONDITION OF PAVED ROADS

2002	2001
33.05%	**34.6%**

Effectiveness Measure

Percentage of paved lane kilometres where the condition is rated as good to very good.

Objective

Provide a paved lane system that has a pavement condition that meets municipal standards.

Notes

Calculation

$$\frac{\text{Number of paved lane kilometres rated as good to very good}}{\text{Total number of paved lane kilometres tested}} \times 100 = \frac{115}{348} \times 100$$

Road Services

4.5 WINTER EVENT RESPONSES	
2002	**2001**
91.18%	**96.15%**

Effectiveness

Percentage of winter events where the response met or exceeded locally determined road maintenance standards.

Objective

Provide an appropriate response to winter events.

Notes

Calculation

$$\frac{\text{Number of winter events where the response met or exceeded locally determined road maintenance standards}}{\text{Total number of winter events}} \times 100$$

$$= \frac{62}{68} \times 100$$

Conventional Transit

5.1 OPERATING COSTS		5.2 PUBLIC TRANSIT USE	
2002	**2001**	**2002**	**2001**
$3.33	**$3.43**	**7.82**	**7.83**

Efficiency Measure
Operating costs for conventional transit per regular service passenger trip.

Objective
Efficient conventional transit services.

Notes

The City's Transit service is provided through a contract. Higher contract costs were offset by lower overhead costs.

Operating costs include a $5,203 charge for program support overhead. This is lower than in 2001 due to changes in how overhead is allocated. Excluding overhead charges, the measure would be: 2002-3.31, 2001 - $3.09.

Calculation

$$\frac{\text{Operating costs for conventional transit}}{\text{Total number of regular service passenger trips}} = \frac{\$739,699}{222,000}$$

The number of passenger trips is an estimate.

Effectiveness Measure
Number of conventional transit passenger trips per person in the service area in a year.

Objective
Maximum utilization of municipal transit services.

Notes

Calculation

$$\frac{\text{Total number of conventional transit passenger trips in service area in a year}}{\text{Population of service area}} = \frac{222,000}{28,388}$$

The number of passenger trips is an estimate.

Wastewater

6.1 OPERATING COSTS FOR WASTEWATER COLLECTION		6.2 OPERATING COST FOR WASTEWATER TREATMENT AND DISPOSAL	
2002	**2001**	**2002**	**2001**
$3,272.62	**$3,751.39**	**$255.53**	**$235.26**

Efficiency Measure

Operating costs for the collection of wastewater per kilometre of wastewater main.

Objective

Efficient wastewater collection services.

Notes

The results for 2001 have been restated to correct the number of kms of pipe used in the calculation. The 2001 measure included storm pipes as well as sanitary sewer pipes.

Costs include a portion of administration and centralized expenses for Engineering and Operations department.

Operating Costs include a $38,710 charge for program support overhead. This is lower than in 2001 due to changes in how overhead is allocated. Excluding overhead, the measure would be: 2002-$3,011.07, 2001 – $3,121.29.

Calculation

$$\frac{\text{Operating costs for wastewater collection}}{\text{Total kilometres of wastewater mains}} = \frac{\$484,348}{148}$$

Efficiency Measure

Operating costs for the treatment and disposal of wastewater per megalitre.

A megalitre equals 1,000,000 litres or 1,000 cubic metres.

Objective

Efficient water treatment and disposal services.

Notes

Costs include a portion of administration and centralized expenses for Engineering and Operations department.

The reported volume of water treated is lower by 6.9% from 2001. This results in a higher measure, because most costs remain constant.

Operating Costs include a $123,104 charge for program support overhead. This is lower than in 2001 due to changes in how overhead is allocated. Excluding overhead, the measure would be: 2002 - $235.12, 2001 - $196.15.

Calculation

$$\frac{\text{Operating costs for wastewater treatment and disposal}}{\text{Total megalitres of wastewater treated}} = \frac{\$1,541,121}{6,031}$$

Wastewater

6.3 OPERATING COSTS FOR WASTEWATER SYSTEM		6.4 WASTEWATER MAIN BACKUPS	
2002	**2001**	**2002**	**2001**
$335.84	**$321.40**	**0.0000**	**.5076**

Efficiency Measure

Operating costs for collection, treatment, and disposal of wastewater per megalitre (Integrated system).

A megalitre equals 1,000,000 litres or 1,000 cubic metres.

Objective

Efficient wastewater system.

Notes

This measure reports the combined cost of measure 6.1 and 6.2.

Costs include a portion of administration and centralized expenses for Engineering and Operations department.

The reported volume of water treated is lower by 6.9% from 2001. This results in a higher measure, because most costs remain constant.

Operating Costs include a $161,814 charge for program support overhead. This is lower than in 2001 due to changes in how overhead is allocated. Excluding overhead, the measure would be: 2002 - $309.01, 2001 - $267.81.

Calculation

$$\frac{\text{Operating costs for wastewater collection, treatment and disposal}}{\text{Total megalitres of wastewater treated}} = \frac{\$2,025,469}{6,031}$$

Effectiveness Measure

Number of wastewater main backups per 100 kilometres of wastewater main in a year.

Objective

Prevention of human and environmental health hazards.

Notes

There were no backups reported in 2002.

Calculation

$$\frac{\text{Total number of backed up wastewater connections}}{\text{Total kilometres of wastewater mains /100}} = \frac{0}{148/100}$$

Wastewater

6.5 WASTEWATER TREATMENT BYPASS	
2002	**2001**
0.0%	**0.0%**

Effectiveness Measure
Percentage of wastewater estimated to have by-passed treatment.

Objective
Effective wastewater and treatment and disposal services.

Notes

No wastewater by-passed treatment.

Storm Water

7.1 OPERATING COSTS FOR URBAN STORM WATER MANAGEMENT	7.2 OPERATING COSTS FOR RURAL STORM WATER MANAGEMENT
2002	**2002**
$239.72	**Not applicable**
Efficiency Measure *Operating costs for urban storm water management (collection, treatment, and disposal) per kilometre of drainage system.* ***Objective*** *Efficient storm water management.*	***Efficiency Measure*** *Operating costs for rural storm water management (collection, treatment, and disposal) per kilometre of drainage system.* ***Objective*** *Efficient storm water management.*
Notes This is a new measure for 2002. Operating Costs include a $4,305 charge for program support overhead. **Calculation** $\frac{\text{Operating costs for storm water management}}{\text{Total km of urban drainage system}} = \frac{\$59,450}{248}$	**Notes**

Drinking Water Services

8.1 OPERATING COSTS FOR DRINKING WATER TREATMENT		8.2 OPERATING COSTS FOR DRINKING WATER DISTRIBUTION	
2002	**2001**	**2002**	**2001**
$230.78	**$212.60**	**$3,129.34**	**$3,254.99**

Efficiency Measure

Operating costs for the treatment of drinking water per megalitre.

A megalitre equals 1,000,000 litres, or 1,000 cubic metres.

Objective

Efficient production of drinking water.

Notes

Costs include billing, meter reading and overhead charges. Costs also include a portion of administration and centralized expenses for Engineering and Operations department.

Operating Costs include a $109,014 charge for program support overhead. This is lower than in 2001 due to changes in how overhead is allocated. Excluding overhead, the measure would be: 2002 - $207.39, 2001 - $171.96.

Calculation

$$\frac{\text{Operating costs for treatment of drinking water}}{\text{Total megalitres of drinking water treated}} = \frac{\$1,075,674}{4,661}$$

Efficiency Measure

Operating costs for the distribution of drinking water per kilometre of water distribution pipe.

Objective

Efficient distribution of drinking water.

Notes

Costs include billing, meter reading and overhead charges. Costs also include a portion of administration and centralized expenses for Engineering and Operations department.

Operating Costs include a $49,167 charge for program support overhead. This is lower than in 2001 due to changes in how overhead is allocated. Excluding overhead, the measure would be: 2002 - $2,812.20, 2001 - $2,632.76.

Calculation

$$\frac{\text{Operating costs for distribution of drinking water}}{\text{Total kilometres of water distribution pipe}} = \frac{\$485,048}{155.0}$$

Drinking Water Services

8.3 OPERATING COSTS FOR TREATMENT AND DISTIBUTION		8.4 BOIL WATER ADVISORIES	
2002	**2001**	**2002**	**2001**
$334.85	**$320.89**	**0.0**	**0.0**

Efficiency Measure

Operating costs for the treatment and distribution of drinking water per megalitre (Integrated System).

A megalitre equals 1,000,000 litres, or 1,000 cubic metres.

Objective

Efficient treatment and distribution of water.

Notes

This measure reports the combined cost of measure 8.1 and 8.2.

Costs include billing, meter reading and overhead charges. Costs also include a portion of administration and centralized expenses for Engineering and Operations department.

Operating Costs include a $158,181 charge for program support overhead. Excluding overhead, the measure would be: 2002 - $300.91, 2001 - $259.55.

Calculation

$$\frac{\text{Operating costs for treatment and distribution of drinking water}}{\text{Total megalitres of drinking water treated}} = \frac{\$1,560,722}{4,661}$$

Effectiveness Measure

Weighted number of days when a boil water advisory issued by the Medical Officer of Health, applicable to a municipal water supply, was in effect.

Objective

Water is safe and meets local needs.

Notes

There were no boil water advisories issued.

Drinking Water Services

8.5 DRINKING WATER MAIN BREAKS	
2002	**2001**
12.90	**12.90**

Effectiveness Measure

Number of water main breaks per 100 kilometres of water distribution pipe in a year.

Objective

Improve system reliability.

Notes

Calculation

$$\frac{\text{Number of water main breaks in a year}}{\text{Total kilometres of water main pipe / 100}} = \frac{20}{155 / 100}$$

Solid Waste

9.1 OPERATING COSTS FOR GARBAGE COLLECTION		9.2 OPERATING COSTS FOR GARBAGE DISPOSAL	
2002	**2001**	**2002**	**2001**
$53.43	**$56.35**	**$58.41**	**$69.29**

Efficiency Measure
Operating costs for garbage collection per tonne or per household.

Objective
Efficient garbage collection services.

Notes

The City uses a contracted garbage collection service.

Operating Costs include a $0 charge for program support overhead. This is lower than in 2001 due to changes in how overhead costs are allocated. Excluding overhead, the measure would be: 2002 - $53.43, 2001 - $52.17.

Calculation

$$\frac{\text{Operating costs for garbage collection}}{\text{Total tonnes received from all property classes}} = \frac{255{,}267}{4{,}778}$$

Efficiency Measure
Operating costs for garbage disposal per tonne or per household.

Objective
Efficient garbage disposal.

Notes

The results for 2001 have been restated to correct the tonnage of garbage disposed. The 2001 measure included waste collected by the garbage contractor only.

Operating Costs include a $36,906 charge for program support overhead. This is lower than in 2001 due to changes in how overhead costs are allocated. Excluding overhead, the measure would be: 2002-$53.93, 2001 - $61.97

Calculation

$$\frac{\text{Operating costs for garbage disposal}}{\text{Total tonnes disposed of from all property classes}} = \frac{481{,}962}{8{,}252}$$

Solid Waste

9.3 OPERATING COSTS FOR SOLID WASTE DIVERSION (RECYCLING)		9.4 OPERATING COSTS FOR SOLID WASTE (INTEGRATED SYSTEM)	
2002	**2001**	**2002**	**2001**
$62.87	**$64.67**	**$76.15**	**$83.91**

Efficiency Measure

Operating costs for solid waste diversion (recycling) per tonne or per household.

Objective

Efficient solid waste diversion (recycling) services.

Notes

The results for 2001 have been restated to correct the tonnage of garbage disposed. The 2001 measure included waste collected by the garbage contractor only.

The net cost of waste diversion is reduced by the amount of revenue from the sale of recycling materials. The value of materials depends on market factors not controlled by the municipality. Revenue increased from $199,000 in 2001 to $223,000 in 2002. The increase in revenue results in a lower measurement result.

Operating Costs include a $12,755 charge for program support overhead. This is lower than in 2001 due to changes in how overhead costs are allocated. Excluding overhead, the measure would be: 2002-$61.31, 2001-$57.68.

Calculation

$$\frac{\text{Operating costs for solid waste diversion}}{\text{Total tonnes Diverted}} = \frac{515{,}100}{8{,}193}$$

Efficiency Measure

Average operating costs for solid waste management (collection, disposal and diversion) per tonne or per household (Integrated system).

Objective

Efficient solid waste management.

Notes

This measure reports the combined cost of measure 9.1 and 9.2 and 9.3.

The results for 2001 have been restated to correct the tonnage of garbage disposed. The 2001 measure included waste collected by the garbage contractor only.

The net cost of waste diversion is reduced by the amount of revenue from the sale of recycling materials. The value of materials depends on market factors not controlled by the municipality. Revenue increased from $199,000 in 2001 to $223,000 in 2002. The increase in revenue results in a lower measurement result.

Operating Costs include a $49,661 charge for program support overhead. This is lower than in 2001 due to changes in how overhead costs are allocated. Excluding overhead, the measure would be: 2002 - $73.13, 2001 - $75.50.

Calculation

$$\frac{\text{Operating costs for solid waste management}}{\text{Total tonnes disposed of and total tones diverted}} = \frac{1{,}252{,}329}{16{,}445}$$

Solid Waste

9.5 COMPLAINTS FOR SOLID WASTE AND RECYCLING COLLECTION		9.6 NUMBER OF SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT SITES	
2002	**2001**	**2002**	**2001**
8.1	**8.2**	**1**	**1**

Effectiveness Measure
Number of complaints received in a year concerning the collection of garbage and recycled materials per 1,000 households.

Objective
Improved garbage collection services.

Notes

There were an estimated 100 complaints reported in 2002.

Calculation

$$\frac{\text{Number of Complaints}}{\text{Total Households / 1,000}} = \frac{100}{12{,}289 / 1{,}000}$$

Effectiveness Measure
Total number of solid waste management sites owned by the municipality with a Ministry of Environment Certificate of Approval.

Objective
Context for solid waste management facility compliance measure.

Notes

Solid Waste

9.7 FACILITY COMPLIANCE		
Facility Name	**Days 2002**	**Days 2001**
Kitchener Street Waste Diversion Site	**0.0**	**0.0**

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

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

Notes

There were no orders for remediation

Solid Waste

9.8 DIVERSION OF SOLID WASTE		9.9 DIVERSION OF SOLID WASTE (RESIDENTIAL AND OTHER)	
2002	**2001**	**2002**	**2001**
See measure 9.9	**See measure 9.9**	**49.8%**	**49.8%**
Effectiveness Measure *Percentage of residential solid waste diverted for recycling.* ***Objective*** *Municipal waste programs divert garbage from landfills and incinerators.*		***Effectiveness Measure*** *Percentage of residential solid waste diverted for recycling (based on combined residential, industrial, commercial and institutional tonnage).* ***Objective*** *Municipal waste programs divert garbage from landfills and incinerators.*	
Notes The City does not measure residential solid waste diversion separate from other types of diversion. See measure 9.9 for the combine solid waste diversion measure.		**Notes** The results for 2001 have been restated to correct the tonnage of garbage disposed. The 2001 measure included waste collected by the garbage contractor only. **Calculation** $\frac{\text{Total tonnes of solid waste diverted from all property classes}}{\text{Total tonnes of solid waste disposed of And total tonnes diverted from all property classes}} \times 100$ $= \frac{8,193}{16,445} \times 100$	

Land Use Planning

10.1 GROWTH AND SETTLEMENT PATTERN		10.2 PRESERVATION OF AGRICULTURAL LAND IN REPORTING YEAR	
2002	**2001**	**2002**	**2001**
100%	**100%**	**Not applicable**	**Not applicable**
Effectiveness Measure *Percentage of new lots, blocks and/or units with final approval which are located within settlement areas.* ***Objective*** *New lot creation is occurring in settlement areas.*		***Effectiveness Measure*** *Percentage of land designated for agricultural purposes which was not re-designated for other uses during 2002.* ***Objective*** *Preserve agricultural land.*	
Notes There were 217 new lots and units approved in 2002.		**Notes** There is no agricultural land indicated in the City's Official Plan. Therefore, the measure has not been calculated.	

Land Use Planning

10.3 PRESERVATION OF AGRICULTURAL LAND (RELATIVE TO 2000)		10.4 CHANGE IN HECTARES AGRICULTURAL LAND (DURING REPORTING YEAR)	
2002	**2001**	**2002**	**2001**
Not applicable	**Not applicable**	**Not applicable**	**Not applicable**
Effectiveness Measure *Percentage of land designated for agricultural purposes which was not re-designated for other uses relative to the base year of 2000.* ***Objective*** *Preserve agricultural land.*		***Effectiveness Measure*** *Number of hectares of land originally designated for agricultural purposes which was re-designated for other uses during 2002.* ***Objective*** *Preserve agricultural land.*	
Notes There is no agricultural land indicated in the City's Official Plan. Therefore, the measure has not been calculated.		**Notes** There is no agricultural land indicated in the City's Official Plan. Therefore, the measure has not been calculated.	

Land Use Planning

10.5 CHANGE IN AGRICULTURAL LAND (SINCE 2000)	
2002	**2001**
Not applicable	**Not applicable**
Effectiveness Measure *Number of hectares of land originally designated for agricultural purposes which was re-designated for other uses since January 1, 2000.* ***Objective*** *Preserve agricultural land.*	
Notes There is no agricultural land indicated in the City's Official Plan. Therefore, the measure has not been calculated.	