



2005 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 2005 reporting year, the areas are:

Local Government
Police
Transit
Storm Water
Solid Waste
Library

Fire
Roads
Wastewater
Drinking Water
Parks and Recreation
Land Use Planning

Comparison information is provided only where the data is similar. Since 2000, the Province has introduced new measures and made several changes to how the 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.

The measures are affected by a number of factors, making direct comparisons between municipalities difficult. 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.

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

Local Government

1.1 GENERAL GOVERNMENT – EFFICIENCY	
	2005
	4.5%
<p>Efficiency Measure Operating costs for governance and corporate management as a percentage of total municipal operating costs.</p> <p>Objective Efficient municipal government.</p>	
<p>Notes</p> <p>This measure includes expenses for Council, Council support, Office of the Mayor, City Manager, Corporate Accounting, Financial Policy, Legal, Real Estate, Property Taxation and other Corporate Management costs.</p> <p>The method for calculating this measure was changed in 2005. The 2005 measure is not comparable to previous years.</p>	
<p>Calculation</p> $\frac{\text{Operating costs for governance and corporate management}}{\text{Total municipal operating costs}} = \frac{\$1,648,529}{\$36,886,670} \times 100$	

Fire Services

2.1 FIRE SERVICES – EFFICIENCY	
	2005
	\$1.35
<p>Efficiency Measure Operating costs for fire services per \$1,000 of assessment.</p>	
<p>Objective Efficient fire services.</p>	
<p>Notes</p> <p>Costs include combined 911/dispatch expenses.</p> <p>Costs include an interdepartmental water charge for contribution to oversizing, water usage and hydrant protection. With these costs excluded, the measure would be \$1.31 for 2005.</p> <p>Operating costs include a \$265,463 charge for program support overhead.</p> <p>Total Property Assessment for the City increased by 12.1% in 2005, 4.2% in 2004 and 11.0% in 2003.</p> <p>The method for calculating this measure was changed in 2005. The 2005 measure is not comparable to previous years.</p>	
<p>Calculation</p> $ \begin{array}{r} \frac{\text{Operating costs for fire services}}{\text{Total property assessment / 1,000}} \\ = \\ \frac{\$3,185,725}{\$2,364,248} \end{array} $	

Police Services

3.1 POLICE SERVICES – EFFICIENCY	
	2005 \$152.53
<p>Efficiency Measure Operating costs for police services per household.</p> <p>Objective Efficient police services.</p>	
<p>Notes</p> <p>The City's police services are provided through a contract with the OPP.</p> <p>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. The amount of the adjustment can change significantly from year to year. If the adjustments were reported in the year they apply to, the measure for 2005 would be \$160.54.</p> <p>Operating costs include a \$60,321 charge for program support overhead.</p> <p>The method for calculating this measure was changed in 2005. The 2005 measure is not comparable to previous years.</p> <p>Calculation</p> <div style="text-align: center; margin-top: 20px;"> $\frac{\text{Operating costs for police services}}{\text{Total population}} = \frac{\\$4,640,704}{30,424}$ </div>	

3.2 VIOLENT CRIME RATE					
	2005	2004	2003	2002	2001
	16.11	14.66	15.08	17.19	Not available

Effectiveness Measure

Violent crime rate per 1,000 persons.

Objective

Safe communities.

Notes

There has been a further increase in violent crime in 2006. The increasing violent crime has a strong connection with increasing presence of cocaine and crack cocaine. In the 2006 business plan Police Services have increased their focus on highly addictive drugs, adding a member to the drug enforcement and additional training to uniform members. Orillia Detachment street crime members have also been asked to focus more of their time on street level drug enforcement. The Inspector has been reporting the drug enforcement to the Board on a monthly basis. There has been an exponential increase in cocaine related enforcement. Although there may be a lag, it is hoped these efforts will stabilize the level of violent crime.

Calculation

$$\frac{\text{Total number of actual incidents of violent crime}}{\text{Total population} / 1,000} = \frac{490}{30,424 / 1,000}$$

3.3 PROPERTY CRIME RATE					
	2005	2004	2003	2002	2001
	41.68	48.65	52.06	59.78	Not available

Effectiveness Measure

Property crime rate per 1,000 persons.

Objective

Safe communities.

Notes

Calculation

$$\frac{\text{Total number of actual incidents of property crime}}{\text{Total population} / 1,000} = \frac{1,268}{30,424 / 1,000}$$

3.4 TOTAL CRIME RATE					
	2005	2004	2003	2002	
	100.68	109.38	112.16	116.88	
<p>Effectiveness Measure Total crime rate per 1,000 persons (Criminal Code offences excluding traffic).</p> <p>Objective Safe Communities.</p>					
<p>Notes</p> <p>Calculation</p> $\frac{\text{Total number of actual incidents}}{\text{Total population} / 1,000} = \frac{3,063}{30,424 / 1,000}$					
3.5 YOUTH CRIME RATE					
	2005				
	69.53				
<p>Effectiveness Measure Youth crime rate per 1,000 youths.</p> <p>Objective Safe Communities.</p>					
<p>Notes</p> <p>In 2005, the measure was changed to include youths who received pre-charge resolutions such as warnings and cautions. The current OPP data gathering system is currently not able to provide this information. Therefore, the measurement result only includes youths charged.</p> <p>The method for calculating this measure in 2005 has changed. The 2005 results are not comparable to previous years.</p> <p>Calculation</p> $\frac{\text{Total number of youths cleared by charge or cleared otherwise}}{\text{Youth population} / 1,000} = \frac{162}{2,330 / 1,000}$					

Roads

4.1 PAVED ROADS – EFFICIENCY	
	2005 \$821.42
<p>Efficiency Measure Operating costs for paved (hard top) roads per lane kilometre.</p> <p>Objective Efficient maintenance of paved roads.</p>	
<p>Notes</p> <p>The following costs are included in this measure: patching & crack filling, road restoration, leaf pickup, summer sweep & flush, and shoulder maintenance.</p> <p>Operating costs include a \$24,009 charge for program support overhead.</p> <p>The method for calculating this measure was changed in 2005. The 2005 measure is not comparable to previous years.</p> <p>Calculation</p> $ \begin{array}{r} \frac{\text{Operating costs for paved roads}}{\text{Total paved lane kilometres}} \\ = \\ \frac{\$288,317}{351} \end{array} $	
4.2 UNPAVED ROADS – EFFICIENCY	
<p>Notes</p> <p>There are no unpaved roads maintained by the City.</p>	

4.3 WINTER MAINTENANCE OF ROADS – EFFICIENCY	
	2005
	\$2,557.11
<p>Efficiency Measure Operating costs for winter maintenance of roadways per lane kilometre maintained in winter.</p> <p>Objective Efficient winter maintenance of roads.</p>	
<p>Notes</p> <p>The cost of winter control maintenance is related to the weather conditions. Any comparisons must take into account the unique weather conditions of each season and regional location.</p> <p>Operating costs include sand cleanup and removal.</p> <p>Costs include a portion of administration and centralized expenses for the Public Works department.</p> <p>Operating costs include a \$70,906 charge for program support overhead.</p> <p>The method for calculating this measure was changed in 2005. The 2005 measure is not comparable to previous years.</p>	
<p>Calculation</p> $ \begin{array}{r} \frac{\text{Operating costs for winter maintenance}}{\text{Total lane kilometres maintained in winter}} \\ = \\ \frac{\$897,547}{351} \end{array} $	

4.4 ADEQUACY OF PAVED ROADS					
	2005	2004	2003	2002	2001
	34.8%	37.4%	36.7%	33.1%	34.6%

Effectiveness Measure

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

Objective

Pavement condition meets municipal objectives.

Notes

Calculation

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \frac{\text{Number of paved lane kilometres where} \\
 & \text{the condition is rated as good to very good}}{\text{Total number of paved lane kilometres}} \times 100 \\
 & = \\
 & \frac{122}{351} \times 100
 \end{aligned}$$

4.5 WINTER EVENT RESPONSES					
	2005	2004	2003	2002	2001
	96.3%	93.8%	95.1%	91.2%	96.2%

Effectiveness Measure

Percentage of winter events where the response met or exceeded locally determined municipal service levels for road maintenance.

Objective

Appropriate response to winter storm events.

Notes

Calculation

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \frac{\text{Number of winter events where the response met or} \\
 & \text{exceeded locally determined municipal service levels for road maintenance}}{\text{Total number of winter events}} \times 100 \\
 & = \\
 & \frac{52}{54} \times 100
 \end{aligned}$$

Conventional Transit

5.1 CONVENTIONAL TRANSIT – EFFICIENCY

	2005				
	\$3.46				

Efficiency Measure

Operating costs for conventional transit per regular service passenger trip.

Objective

Efficient conventional transit services.

Notes

Costs have increased in 2005 due to increased fuel costs and contract rates.

Operating costs include a \$7,007 charge for program support overhead.

The method for calculating this measure was changed in 2005. The 2005 measure is not comparable to previous years.

Calculation

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \frac{\text{Operating costs for conventional transit}}{\text{Total number of regular service passenger trips on conventional transit in service area}} \\
 & = \\
 & \frac{\$940,166}{271,561}
 \end{aligned}$$

5.2 CONVENTIONAL TRANSIT RIDERSHIP

	2005	2004	2003	2002	2001
	8.93	9.24	8.29	7.82	7.83

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

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \frac{\text{Total number of regular service passenger trips on conventional transit in service area}}{\text{Population of service area}} \\
 & = \\
 & \frac{271,561}{30,424}
 \end{aligned}$$

Wastewater (Sewage)

6.1 WASTEWATER COLLECTION – EFFICIENCY	
	2005
	\$2,602.10
<p>Efficiency Measure Operating costs for the collection of wastewater per kilometre of wastewater main.</p> <p>Objective Efficient municipal wastewater collection services.</p>	
<p>Notes</p> <p>Costs include a portion of administration and centralized expenses for the Public Works department.</p> <p>Operating costs include a \$33,344 charge for program support overhead.</p> <p>The method for calculating this measure was changed in 2005. The 2005 measure is not comparable to previous years.</p>	
<p>Calculation</p> <div style="text-align: center; margin-top: 20px;"> $\frac{\text{Operating costs for wastewater collection}}{\text{Total kilometres of wastewater mains plus (0.010 KM times number of connections)}} = \frac{\\$645,321}{248}$ </div>	

6.2 WASTEWATER TREATMENT AND DISPOSAL – EFFICIENCY				
	2005			
	\$248.14			
<p>Efficiency Measure Operating costs for the treatment and disposal of wastewater per megalitre.</p> <p>Objective Efficient municipal wastewater treatment and disposal services.</p>				
<p>Notes</p> <p>Costs include a portion of administration and centralized expenses for Public Works department.</p> <p>The number of megalitres of wastewater treated is down by 6.6% from 2004.</p> <p>Operating costs include a \$77,509 charge for program support overhead.</p> <p>The method for calculating this measure was changed in 2005. The 2005 measure is not comparable to previous years.</p>				
<p>Calculation</p> $ \begin{array}{r} \frac{\text{Operating costs for wastewater treatment and disposal}}{\text{Total megalitres of wastewater treated}} \\ = \\ \frac{\$1,488,832}{6,000} \end{array} $				

6.3 WASTEWATER INTEGRATED SYSTEM – EFFICIENCY				
	2005			
	\$355.69			
<p>Efficiency Measure Operating costs for the collection, treatment and disposal of wastewater per megalitre (Integrated System).</p> <p>Objective Efficient wastewater system (Integrated System).</p>				
<p>Notes</p> <p>This measure reports the combined cost of measure 6.1 and 6.2.</p> <p>Costs include a portion of administration and centralized expenses for Public Works department.</p> <p>The number of megalitres of wastewater treated is down by 6.6% from 2004.</p> <p>Operating costs include an \$110,853 charge for program support overhead.</p> <p>The method for calculating this measure was changed in 2005. The 2005 measure is not comparable to previous years.</p> <p>Calculation</p> <div style="text-align: center; margin-top: 20px;"> $\frac{\text{Operating costs for wastewater collection, treatment and disposal}}{\text{Total megalitres of wastewater treated}} = \frac{\\$2,134,153}{6,000}$ </div>				

6.4 WASTEWATER MAIN BACKUPS					
	2005	2004	2003	2002	2001
	15.54	43.92	0.00	0.00	0.51
<p>Effectiveness Measure Number of wastewater main backups per 100 kilometres of wastewater main in a year.</p> <p>Objective Municipal sewage management practices prevent environmental and human health hazards.</p>					
<p>Notes</p> <p>Calculation</p> $\frac{\text{Total number of backed up wastewater connections}}{\text{Total kilometres of wastewater mains /100}} = \frac{23}{148/100}$					
6.5 WASTEWATER BYPASSES TREATMENT					
	2005	2004	2003	2002	2001
	0.000%	0.003%	0.000%	0.000%	0.000%
<p>Effectiveness Measure Percentage of wastewater estimated to have by-passed treatment.</p> <p>Objective Municipal sewage management practices prevent environmental and human health hazards.</p>					
<p>Notes</p> <p>Calculation</p> $\frac{\text{Estimated megalitres of untreated wastewater}}{\text{Total megalitres of treated wastewater plus estimated megalitres of untreated wastewater}} = \frac{0.000}{6,000} \times 100$					

Storm Water

7.1 URBAN STORM WATER MANAGEMENT – EFFICIENCY				
	2005			
	\$351.48			
<p>Efficiency Measure Operating costs for urban storm water management (collection, treatment, disposal) per kilometre of drainage system.</p> <p>Objective Efficient urban storm water management.</p>				
<p>Notes Operating costs include a \$7,584 charge for program support overhead. The method for calculating this measure was changed in 2005. The 2005 measure is not comparable to previous years.</p>				
<p>Calculation</p> <div style="text-align: center; margin-top: 20px;"> <p><u>Operating costs for urban storm water management</u></p> <p>Total km of urban drainage system plus (0.010 KM times number of connections) plus (0.005 KM times number of catch basins)</p> <p>=</p> <p><u>\$99,117</u></p> <p>282</p> </div>				

Drinking Water

8.1 DRINKING WATER TREATMENT – EFFICIENCY	
	2005
	\$260.29
<p>Efficiency Measure Operating costs for the treatment of drinking water per megalitre.</p> <p>Objective Efficient municipal water treatment services.</p>	
<p>Notes</p> <p>Costs include a share of billing and meter reading expenses. Costs also include a portion of administration and centralized expenses for Public Works department.</p> <p>The total megalitres of drinking water treated is down from 2004 by 2.4%.</p> <p>Operating costs include a \$77,963 charge for program support overhead.</p> <p>The method for calculating this measure was changed in 2005. The 2005 measure is not comparable to previous years.</p>	
<p>Calculation</p> <div style="text-align: center; margin-top: 20px;"> $\frac{\text{Operating costs for treatment of drinking water}}{\text{Total megalitres of drinking water treated}} = \frac{\\$1,220,753}{4,690}$ </div>	

8.2 DRINKING WATER DISTRIBUTION – EFFICIENCY				
	2005			
	\$2,454.51			
<p>Efficiency Measure Operating costs for the distribution of drinking water per kilometre of water distribution pipe.</p> <p>Objective Efficient municipal water distribution services.</p>				
<p>Notes</p> <p>Costs include a share of billing and meter reading expenses. Costs also include a portion of administration and centralized expenses for Public Works department.</p> <p>Operating costs include a \$41,384 charge for program support overhead.</p> <p>The method for calculating this measure was changed in 2005. The 2005 measure is not comparable to previous years.</p>				
<p>Calculation</p> <div style="text-align: center; margin-top: 20px;"> <p><u>Operating costs for distribution of drinking water</u></p> <p>Total kilometres of water distribution pipe plus (0.010 KM times number of connections) plus (0.005 KM times number of hydrants)</p> <p style="margin-left: 100px;">=</p> <p style="margin-left: 100px;"><u>\$647,990</u></p> <p style="margin-left: 100px;">264</p> </div>				

8.3 DRINKING WATER INTEGRATED SYSTEM – EFFICIENCY	
	2005
	\$398.45
<p>Efficiency Measure Operating costs for the treatment and distribution of drinking water per megalitre (Integrated System).</p> <p>Objective Efficient municipal water system (Integrated System).</p>	
<p>Notes</p> <p>This measure reports the combined cost of measure 8.1 and 8.2.</p> <p>Costs include billing and meter reading expense. Costs also include a portion of administration and centralized expenses for Public Works department.</p> <p>The total megalitres of drinking water treated is down from 2004 by 2.4%.</p> <p>Operating costs include an \$119,347 charge for program support overhead.</p> <p>The method for calculating this measure was changed in 2005. The 2005 measure is not comparable to previous years.</p> <p>Calculation</p> <div style="text-align: center; margin-top: 20px;"> $\frac{\text{Operating costs for treatment and distribution of drinking water}}{\text{Total megalitres of drinking water treated}} = \frac{\\$1,868,743}{4,690}$ </div>	

8.4 BOIL WATER ADVISORIES					
	2005	2004	2003	2002	2001
	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
<p>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.</p> <p>Objective Water is safe and meets local needs.</p>					
<p>Notes There were no boil water advisories issued.</p>					
8.5 BREAKS IN WATER MAINS					
	2005	2004	2003	2002	2001
	12.50	12.5	16.88	12.90	12.90
<p>Effectiveness Measure Number of water main breaks per 100 kilometres of water distribution pipe in a year.</p> <p>Objective Improve system reliability.</p>					
<p>Notes</p> <p>Calculation</p> $\frac{\text{Number of water main breaks in a year}}{\text{Total kilometres of water distribution pipe} / 100} = \frac{20}{160 / 100}$					

Solid Waste Management (Garbage)

9.1 GARBAGE COLLECTION – EFFICIENCY				
	2005			
	\$52.35			
<p>Efficiency Measure Operating costs for garbage collection per tonne.</p> <p>Objective Efficient municipal garbage collection services.</p>				
<p>Notes The City uses a contracted garbage collection service.</p> <p>The method for calculating this measure was changed in 2005. The 2005 measure is not comparable to previous years.</p>				
<p>Calculation</p> $ \begin{array}{r} \frac{\text{Operating costs for garbage collection}}{\text{Total tonnes collected from all property classes}} \\ = \\ \frac{\$265,451}{5,071} \end{array} $				
9.2 GARBAGE DISPOSAL – EFFICIENCY				
	2005			
	\$59.83			
<p>Efficiency Measure Operating costs for garbage disposal per tonne.</p> <p>Objective Efficient municipal garbage disposal services.</p>				
<p>Notes Tonnages reported exclude soil from spill cleanups (766 tonnes).</p> <p>Operating costs include a \$54,786 charge for program support overhead.</p> <p>The method for calculating this measure was changed in 2005. The 2005 measure is not comparable to previous years.</p>				
<p>Calculation</p> $ \begin{array}{r} \frac{\text{Operating costs for garbage disposal}}{\text{Total tonnes disposed of from all property classes}} \\ = \\ \frac{\$696,325}{11,638} \end{array} $				

9.3 SOLID WASTE DIVERSION (RECYCLING) – EFFICIENCY				
	2005			
	\$82.94			
<p>Efficiency Measure Operating costs for solid waste diversion (recycling) per tonne.</p> <p>Objective Efficient municipal solid waste diversion (recycling) services.</p>				
<p>Notes</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Operating costs include a \$26,522 charge for program support overhead.</p> <p>The method for calculating this measure was changed in 2005. The 2005 measure is not comparable to previous years.</p>				
<p>Calculation</p> $ \begin{array}{r} \frac{\text{Operating costs for solid waste diversion}}{\text{Total tonnes diverted from all property classes}} \\ = \\ \frac{\$751,242}{9,058} \end{array} $				

9.4 SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT (INTEGRATED SYSTEM) – EFFICIENCY	
	2005
	\$82.77
<p>Efficiency Measure Average operating costs for solid waste management (collection, disposal and diversion) per tonne.</p> <p>Objective Efficient municipal solid waste management (Integrated System).</p>	
<p>Notes</p> <p>This measure reports the combined cost of measure 9.1 and 9.2 and 9.3.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Tonnages reported exclude soil from spill cleanups (766 tonnes).</p> <p>See also Measures 9.1, 9.2 and 9.3 for further notes related to this measure.</p> <p>Operating costs include an \$81,308 charge for program support overhead.</p> <p>The method for calculating this measure was changed in 2005. The 2005 measure is not comparable to previous years.</p> <p>Calculation</p> $ \begin{array}{r} \frac{\text{Operating costs for solid waste management}}{\text{Total tonnes disposed of and total tonnes diverted from all property classes}} \\ = \\ \frac{\$1,713,018}{20,696} \end{array} $	

9.5 COMPLAINTS — COLLECTION OF GARBAGE AND RECYCLED MATERIALS					
	2005	2004	2003	2002	2001
	21.69	22.98	46.87	29.95	Not available
<p>Effectiveness Measure Number of complaints received in a year concerning the collection of garbage and recycled materials per 1,000 households.</p> <p>Objective Improved garbage collection of garbage and recycled materials.</p>					
<p>Notes</p> <p>Calculation</p> <div style="text-align: center; margin-top: 20px;"> $\frac{\text{Number of complaints received in a year concerning the collection of garbage and recycled materials}}{\text{Total households / 1,000}} = \frac{278}{12,816 / 1,000}$ </div>					

9.6 NUMBER OF MUNICIPAL SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT FACILITIES					
	2005	2004	2003	2002	2001
	1	1	1	1	1
<p>Effectiveness Measure</p> <p>Total number of solid waste management facilities owned by municipality with a Ministry of Environment Certificate of Approval.</p> <p>Objective</p> <p>Context for solid waste management facility compliance measure.</p>					
<p>Notes</p>					
9.7 FACILITY COMPLIANCE					
<p>Effectiveness Measure</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Objective</p> <p>Municipal solid waste services do not have an adverse impact on environment.</p>					
Facility Name	Days 2005	Days 2004	Days 2003	Days 2002	Days 2001
Kitchener Street Waste Diversion Site	0	0	0	0	0
<p>Notes</p> <p>There were no orders for remediation.</p>					

**9.8 DIVERSION OF RESIDENTIAL SOLID WASTE
(RESIDENTIAL ONLY)**

Notes

The City does not measure residential solid waste diversion separate from other types of diversion. See measure 9.9 for the combined solid waste diversion measure.

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

	2005	2004	2003	2002	2001
	43.8%	51.4%	49.3%	49.8%	49.8%

Effectiveness Measure

Percentage of residential solid waste diverted for recycling
(based on combined residential and Industrial/Commercial/Institutional tonnage.)

Objective

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

Notes

Tonnages reported exclude soil from spill cleanups (766 tonnes).

Starting in 2005, the landfill site now receives street sweepings. Although the street sweepings are primarily used for cover, they were included in the total tonnage amounts.

Calculation

$$\begin{array}{r}
 \text{Total tonnes of solid waste diverted} \\
 \text{from all property classes} \\
 \hline
 \text{Total tonnes of solid waste disposed of} \\
 \text{and total tonnes diverted from all property classes} \\
 = \\
 \frac{9,058}{20,696} \quad \times 100
 \end{array}$$

Parks and Recreation

10.1 PARKS – EFFICIENCY				
	2005			
	\$39.06			

Efficiency Measure

Operating costs for parks per person.

Objective

Efficient operation of parks.

Notes

Operating costs include a \$95,948 charge for program support overhead.

The method for calculating this measure was changed in 2005. The 2005 measure is not comparable to previous years.

Calculation

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \frac{\text{Operating costs for parks}}{\text{Total population}} \\
 & = \\
 & \frac{\$1,188,505}{30,424}
 \end{aligned}$$

10.2 RECREATION PROGRAMS – EFFICIENCY				
	2005			
	\$39.12			

Efficiency Measure

Operating costs for recreation programs per person.

Objective

Efficient operation of recreation programs.

Notes

Operating costs include a \$86,699 charge for program support overhead.

The method for calculating this measure was changed in 2005. The 2005 measure is not comparable to previous years.

Calculation

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \frac{\text{Operating costs for recreation programs}}{\text{Total population}} \\
 & = \\
 & \frac{\$1,190,295}{30,424}
 \end{aligned}$$

10.3 RECREATION FACILITIES – EFFICIENCY				
	2005			
	\$43.01			
<p>Efficiency Measure Operating costs for recreation facilities per person.</p> <p>Objective Efficient operation of recreation facilities.</p>				
<p>Notes Operating costs include a \$111,365 charge for program support overhead.</p> <p>The method for calculating this measure was changed in 2005. The 2005 measure is not comparable to previous years.</p>				
<p>Calculation</p> <div style="text-align: center; margin-left: 100px;"> $\frac{\text{Operating costs for recreation facilities}}{\text{Total population}} = \frac{\\$1,308,567}{30,424}$ </div>				

**10.4 PARKS, RECREATION PROGRAMS AND RECREATION FACILITIES (SUBTOTAL)
EFFICIENCY**

	2005				
	\$121.20				

Efficiency Measure

Operating costs for parks, recreation programs and recreation facilities per person (Subtotal).

Objective

Efficient operation of parks, recreation programs and recreation facilities.

Notes

This measure reports the combined cost of measure 10.1, 10.2 and 10.3

Operating costs include a \$294,012 charge for program support overhead.

The method for calculating this measure was changed in 2005. The 2005 measure is not comparable to previous years.

Calculation

$$\frac{\text{Operating costs for parks, recreation programs and recreation facilities}}{\text{Total population}} = \frac{\$3,687,367}{30,424}$$

10.5 PARTICIPANT HOURS FOR RECREATION PROGRAMS

	2005				
	16,973				

Effectiveness Measure

Total participant hours for recreation programs per 1,000 persons.

Objective

Recreation programs serve needs of residents.

Notes

The method for calculating this measure was changed in 2005. The 2005 measure is not comparable to previous years.

Calculation

$$\frac{\text{Total participant hours for recreation programs (registered, drop-in and permitted program)}}{\text{Total population}/1,000} = \frac{516,375}{30,424 / 1,000}$$

City of Orillia
Municipal Performance Measurement Program • 2005 RESULTS

10.6 OPEN SPACE				
	2005	2004		
	283	283		
<p>Effectiveness Measure Hectares of open space.</p> <p>Objective Open space is adequate for population.</p>				
	2005	2004		
	9.3	10.1		
<p>Effectiveness Measure Hectares of open space per 1,000 persons.</p>				
<p>Notes</p> <p>Calculation</p> $\frac{\text{Total hectares of open space}}{\text{Total population}/1,000} = \frac{283}{30,424 / 1,000}$				
10.7 TRAILS				
	2005	2004		
	17	17		
<p>Effectiveness Measure Total kilometres of trails.</p> <p>Objective Trails provide recreation opportunities.</p>				
	2005	2004		
	.56	.61		
<p>Effectiveness Measure Total kilometres of trails per 1,000 persons.</p>				
<p>Notes</p> <p>Calculation</p> $\frac{\text{Total kilometres of trails}}{\text{Total population}/1,000} = \frac{17}{30,424 / 1,000}$				

10.8 RECREATION FACILITY SPACE				
	2005	2004		
	8,766	8,766		
<p>Effectiveness Measure Square metres of recreation facility space.</p> <p>Objective Recreation facility space is adequate for population.</p>				
	2005	2004		
	288.1	312.0		
<p>Effectiveness Measure Square metres of recreation facility space per 1,000 persons.</p>				
<p>Notes The City is in the process of adding a Multi-use Recreation Facility that will increase facility space by approximately 14,000 square metres.</p>				
<p>Calculation</p> $ \begin{array}{r} \frac{\text{Square metres of recreation facility space}}{\text{Total population}/1,000} \\ = \\ \frac{8,766}{30,424 / 1,000} \end{array} $				

Libraries

11.1 LIBRARY COSTS PER PERSON – EFFICIENCY	
	2005
	\$41.53
<p>Efficiency Measure Operating costs for libraries per person.</p> <p>Objective Efficient library services.</p>	
<p>Notes</p> <p>The library provides services to surrounding townships on a contract basis. The revenue received from the townships is deducted from operating costs for this measure.</p> <p>Operating costs include a \$119,047 charge for program support overhead.</p> <p>The method for calculating this measure was changed in 2005. The 2005 measure is not comparable to previous years.</p> <p>Calculation</p> $ \begin{array}{r} \frac{\text{Operating costs for library services}}{\text{Total population}} \\ = \\ \frac{\$1,263,467}{30,424} \end{array} $	

11.2 LIBRARY COSTS PER USE – EFFICIENCY				
	2005			
	\$2.46			
<p>Efficiency Measure Operating costs for libraries per use.</p> <p>Objective Efficient library services</p>				
<p>Notes</p> <p>The library provides services to surrounding townships on a contract basis. The revenue received from the townships is deducted from operating costs for this measure. The provincial formula for prorating the share of usage is based on the percentage financial contribution of the townships. The actual usage by the townships is estimated to be higher than the percentage financial contribution.</p> <p>Operating costs include a \$119,047 charge for program support overhead.</p> <p>The method for calculating this measure was changed in 2005. The 2005 measure is not comparable to previous years.</p> <p>Calculation</p> <div style="text-align: center; margin-top: 20px;"> $\frac{\text{Operating costs for library services}}{\text{Total library uses for city residents}} = \frac{\\$1,263,467}{514,545}$ </div>				

11.3 LIBRARY USES				
	2005	2004		
	16.9	19.6		
<p>Effectiveness Measure Library uses per person.</p> <p>Objective Increased use of library services.</p>				
<p>Notes</p> <p>The library provides services to surrounding townships on a contract basis. The provincial formula for prorating the share of usage is based on the percentage financial contribution of the townships. The actual usage by the townships is estimated to be higher than the percentage financial contribution.</p> <p>Total Library uses is based on projections using study data taken over a 1-week period during the year. The sample period may not accurately reflect usage over the entire year due to several factors.</p>				
<p>Calculation</p> <div style="text-align: center; margin-left: auto; margin-right: auto;"> $\frac{\text{Total library uses}}{\text{Total population}} = \frac{514,545}{30,424}$ </div>				

11.4 ELECTRONIC LIBRARY USES				
	2005	2004		
	9.8%	7.0%		
<p>Effectiveness Measure Electronic library uses as a percentage of total library uses.</p> <p>Objective Increased use of library services.</p>				
<p>Notes Libraries count electronic uses in many different ways which make comparisons between municipalities difficult and potentially misleading.</p>				
11.5 NON-ELECTRONIC LIBRARY USES				
	2005	2004		
	90.2%	93.0%		
<p>Effectiveness Measure Non-electronic library uses as a percentage of total library uses.</p> <p>Objective Better information on library usage.</p>				
<p>Notes Libraries count electronic uses in many different ways which make comparisons between municipalities difficult and potentially misleading.</p>				

Land Use Planning

12.1 LOCATION OF NEW DEVELOPMENT					
	2005	2004	2003	2002	2001
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
<p>Effectiveness Measure Percentage of new lots, blocks and/or units with final approval which are located within settlement areas.</p> <p>Objective New lot creation is occurring in settlement areas.</p>					
<p>Notes The entire municipality is classified as a settlement area.</p>					
12.2 to 12.5 PRESERVATION OF AGRICULTURAL LAND					
<p>Notes There is no agricultural land indicated in the City's Official Plan. Therefore, the measures have not been calculated.</p>					