### **Tarbutt & Tarbutt Additional Year 2002 Report**

### **Local Government**

# 1.1 OPERATING COSTS FOR LOCAL GOVERNEMNT

2002

16.88 %

### Efficiency Measure

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

### **Objective**

Efficient municipal government.

**Notes** 

### **Fire Services**

# 2.1 OPERATING COSTS FOR FIRE SERVICES

2002

\$ 1.07

### Efficiency Measure

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

### **Objective**

Efficient municipal fire services.

SERVICES

2002

\$42,50

Efficiency Measure

Operating costs for police services per household.

**Objective** 

Efficient municipal police services.

**Notes** 

2002

2.35

Effectiveness Measure

Violent crime rate per 1,000 persons.

Objective

Safe communities.

Notes: Actual Violent Crime in 2002 (1)

Clearance 100%

### **Police Services**

3.3 PROPERTY CRIME RATE

2002

9.39

Effectiveness Measure

Property crime rate per 1,000 persons.

**Objective** 

Safe communities.

3.4 TOTAL CRIME RATE

2002

16.43

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: Actual Property Crimes (4) Clearance 50

%

**Notes:** Other Criminal Code, Non Traffic (2) Total Crime 2002 (7)

### **Police Services**

3.5 YOUTHS CHARGED

3.3 TOOTHO SHARGED			
	2002		
	00.0		
Effectiveness Measure Number of youths charged per 1 000 youths			

<b>Objective</b> Safe communities.	
Notes: Non Charged	

Municipality] \$ Year 2002 Report

### **Road Services**

4.2 OPERATING COSTS FOR UNPAVED ROADS

2002

\$ 112,375.00

### Efficiency Measure

Operating costs for unpaved (loose top) roads per lane kilometre.

### **Objective**

Efficient maintenance of unpaved roads.

**Notes** 

Municipality] \$ Year 2002 Report

### **Road Services**

4.3 OPERATING COSTS FOR WINTER MAINTENANCE OF ROADS

2002

\$ 53,040.00

### Efficiency Measure

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

### **Objective**

Efficient winter control operation.

### **Road Services**

### **4.5 WINTER EVENT RESPONSES**

2002

100.0%

### 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** 

### **Solid Waste**

9.2 OPERATING COSTS FOR GARBAGE DISPOSAL

2002

\$ 29.81

### Efficiency Measure

Operating costs for garbage disposal per tonne or per household.

### **Objective**

Efficient garbage disposal.

### **Solid Waste**

9.3 OPERATING COSTS FOR SOLID WASTE DIVERSION (RECYCLING)

2002

\$3.38

### Efficiency Measure

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

### **Objective**

Efficient solid waste diversion (recycling) services.

**Notes:** Shared service with 7 other Municipalities

### **Solid Waste**

9.5 COMPLAINTS FOR SOLID WASTE AND RECYCLING COLLECTION

2002

0.0000

#### 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

9.6 NUMBER OF SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT SITES

2002

1

#### 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: Jointly operated with Johnson Township

### **Solid Waste**

9.7 FACILITY COMPLIANCE

	OIL LYCOLDING COMMENTATION	
Facility Name		Days 2002
		0.0
		0.0
		0.0
		0.0
		0.0
		0.0

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** 

9.8 DIVERSION OF SOLID WASTE

2002

5.22 %

#### Effectiveness Measure

Percentage of residential solid waste diverted for recycling.

### **Objective**

Municipal waste programs divert garbage from landfills and incinerators.

**Notes:** Recycling is a shared service with 7 other Municipalities.

### Land Use Planning

10.1 GROWTH AND SETTLEMENT PATTERN

2002

0.0%

#### 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.

10.2 PRESERVATION OF AGRICULTURAL LAND IN REPORTING YEAR

2002

100.0%

#### Effectiveness Measure

Percentage of land designated for agricultural purposes which was not re-designated for other uses during 2002.

### **Objective**

Preserve agricultural land.

Notes

# **Land Use Planning**

10.3 PRESERVATION OF AGRICULTURAL LAND (RELATIVE TO 2000)

2002

100.0 %

#### 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.

**Notes** 

# 10.4 CHANGE IN HECTARES AGRICULTURAL LAND (DURING REPORTING YEAR)

2002

0

#### 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

### **Land Use Planning**

10.5 CHANGE IN AGRICULTURAL LAND (SINCE 2000)

2002

0

#### 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.