

# MUNICIPALITY

Municipal Performance Measurement Program (MPMP) • 2011 RESULTS

Questions about MPMP results should be addressed to:

Name: Glenn Martin	Phone: 705-782-6776
Title: Clerk - Treasurer	
Municipality: Tarbutt and Tarbutt Additional	
Email: tarbutttownship@bellnet.ca	

## Local Government

CONTACT PERSON FOR LOCAL GOVERNMENT: Glenn Martin, Clerk

### 1.1 GENERAL GOVERNMENT - EFFICIENCY

	2011	2010	2009
1.1 a) Operating costs for governance and corporate management as a percentage of total municipal operating costs.	23.4%	22.8%	11.0%
1.1 b) Total costs for governance and corporate management as a percentage of total municipal costs.	19.2%	21.0%	

**OBJECTIVE:**

Efficient local government.

**NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:**

**REFERENCE:**

- The formulas for efficiency measures were revised in 2009 to reflect changes in the reporting of expenses consistent with accrual accounting concepts. New total cost measures were introduced and revised in 2010. Total costs mean operating costs as defined in MPMP, plus amortization and interest on long-term debt, less revenue received from other municipalities for tangible capital assets.
- Financial Information Return: 91 0206 35 (Operating costs measure) and 91 0206 45 (Total costs measure).

# MUNICIPALITY

Municipal Performance Measurement Program (MPMP) • 2011 RESULTS

## Fire Services

CONTACT PERSON FOR FIRE SERVICES: Glenn Martin, Clerk

### 2.1 FIRE SERVICES – EFFICIENCY

	2011	2010	2009
2.1 a) Operating costs for fire services per \$1,000 of assessment.	\$ 0.99	\$ 0.94	\$ 0.95
2.1 b) Total costs for fire services per \$1,000 of assessment.	\$ 1.32	\$ 1.11	

**OBJECTIVE:**  
Efficient fire services.

**NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:**

**REFERENCE:**

- The formulas for efficiency measures were revised in 2009 to reflect changes in the reporting of expenses consistent with accrual accounting concepts. New total cost measures were introduced and revised in 2010. Total costs mean operating costs as defined in MPMP, plus amortization and interest on long-term debt, less revenue received from other municipalities for tangible capital assets.
- Financial Information Return: 91 1103 35 (Operating costs measure) and 91 1103 45 (Total costs measure).

### 2.6 NUMBER OF RESIDENTIAL STRUCTURAL FIRES – EFFECTIVENESS

	2011	2010	2009
2.6 Number of residential structural fires per 1,000 households.	1.000	0.000	0.000

**OBJECTIVE:**  
Minimize the number of residential structural fires.

**NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:**

**REFERENCE:**

- Financial Information Return: 92 1160 07.

# MUNICIPALITY

Municipal Performance Measurement Program (MPMP) • 2011 RESULTS

## Police Services

CONTACT PERSON FOR POLICE SERVICES: Glenn Martin, Clerk

### 3.1 POLICE SERVICES – EFFICIENCY

	2011	2010	2009
3.1 a) Operating costs for police services per person. <sup>1</sup>	\$ 50.92	\$ 79.39	\$ 60.47
3.1 b) Total costs for police services per person.	\$ 50.92	\$ 79.39	

**OBJECTIVE:**  
Efficient police services.

**NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:**

**REFERENCE:**

- The formulas for efficiency measures were revised in 2009 to reflect changes in the reporting of expenses consistent with accrual accounting concepts. New total cost measures were introduced and revised in 2010. Total costs mean operating costs as defined in MPMP, plus amortization and interest on long-term debt, less revenue received from other municipalities for tangible capital assets.
- <sup>1</sup> As of 2009, the efficiency measures for police services do not include expenses for prisoner transportation or court security since expenses for these services are being uploaded to the Province over a number of years. The efficiency measures for police services align with effectiveness measures based on crime rates.
- Financial Information Return: 91 1204 35 (Operating costs measure) and 91 1204 45 (Total costs measure).

# MUNICIPALITY

Municipal Performance Measurement Program (MPMP) • 2011 RESULTS

<b>3.2 VIOLENT CRIME RATE – EFFECTIVENESS</b>					
		2011	2010	2009	
3.2	Violent crime rate per 1,000 persons. <sup>1</sup>	0.0	0.0	0.0	
<b>OBJECTIVE:</b> Safe communities.					
<b>NOTES &amp; KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:</b>					
<b>REFERENCE:</b>					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><sup>1</sup> Statistics Canada has expanded the definition of violent crime. Therefore, prior years are not comparable unless restated.</li> <li>Financial Information Return: 92 1258 07.</li> </ul>					

<b>3.3 PROPERTY CRIME RATE – EFFECTIVENESS</b>					
		2011	2010	2009	
3.3	Property crime rate per 1,000 persons. <sup>1</sup>	3.0	1.0	0.0	
<b>OBJECTIVE:</b> Safe communities.					
<b>NOTES &amp; KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:</b>					
<b>REFERENCE:</b>					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><sup>1</sup> Statistics Canada has expanded the definition of property crime. Therefore, prior years are not comparable unless restated.</li> <li>Financial Information Return: 92 1259 07.</li> </ul>					

# MUNICIPALITY

Municipal Performance Measurement Program (MPMP) • 2011 RESULTS

<b>3.4 TOTAL CRIME RATE – EFFECTIVENESS</b>					
	2011	2010	2009	2008	2007
3.4 Total crime rate per 1,000 persons ( <i>Criminal Code</i> offences, excluding traffic).	2.0	0.0	0.0	7.0	0.0
<b>OBJECTIVE:</b> Safe communities.					
<b>NOTES &amp; KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:</b>					
<b>REFERENCE:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Financial Information Return: 92 1263 07.</li> </ul>					

<b>3.5 YOUTH CRIME RATE – EFFECTIVENESS</b>					
	2011	2010	2009	2008	2007
3.5 Youth crime rate per 1,000 youths.	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
<b>OBJECTIVE:</b> Safe communities.					
<b>NOTES &amp; KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:</b>					
<b>REFERENCE:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Financial Information Return: 92 1265 07.</li> </ul>					

# MUNICIPALITY

Municipal Performance Measurement Program (MPMP) • 2011 RESULTS

## Building Permits & Inspection Services

**CONTACT PERSON FOR BUILDING PERMITS & INSPECTION SERVICES:** Glenn Martin, Clerk

### 4.1 BUILDING PERMITS & INSPECTION SERVICES – EFFICIENCY

	2011	
4.1 a) Operating costs for building permits and inspection services per \$1,000 of construction activity (based on permits issued).	\$ 2.65	
4.1 b) Total costs for building permits and inspection services per \$1,000 of construction activity (based on permits issued).	\$ 2.65	

**OBJECTIVE:**

Efficient building permits and inspection services.

**NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:**

**REFERENCE:**

- MPMP measures for building permits and inspection services were introduced in 2011.
- Financial Information Return: 91 1301 35 (Operating costs measure) and 91 1301 45 (Total costs measure).

# MUNICIPALITY

Municipal Performance Measurement Program (MPMP) • 2011 RESULTS

## 4.2 REVIEW OF COMPLETE BUILDING PERMIT APPLICATIONS – EFFECTIVENESS

		2011
4.2	Median number of days to review a complete building permit application and issue a permit or not issue a permit, and provide all reasons for refusal:	
a)	Category 1: Houses (houses not exceeding 3 storeys/600 square metres) Reference: provincial standard is 10 working days.	10
b)	Category 2: Small Buildings (small commercial/industrial not exceeding 3 storeys/600 square metres) Reference: provincial standard is 15 working days.	15
c)	Category 3: Large Buildings (large residential/commercial/ industrial/ institutional) Reference: provincial standard is 20 working days.	20
d)	Category 4: Complex buildings (post disaster buildings, including hospitals, power/water, fire/police/EMS, communications) Reference: provincial standard is 30 working days.	30
<b>OBJECTIVE:</b> Complete bulding permit applications are processed quickly and accurately.		
<b>NOTES &amp; KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:</b>		
<b>REFERENCE:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• MPMP measures for building permits and inspection services were introduced in 2011.</li> <li>• Financial Information Return: (a) 91 1351 07, (b) 91 1352 07, (c) 91 1353 07, (d) 91 1354 07.</li> </ul>		

# MUNICIPALITY

Municipal Performance Measurement Program (MPMP) • 2011 RESULTS

## Roads

**CONTACT PERSON FOR ROADS: Glenn Martin, Clerk**

### 5.1 PAVED ROADS – EFFICIENCY

	2011	2010
5.1 a) Operating costs for paved (hard top) roads per lane kilometre. <sup>1</sup>	\$ 447.22	\$ 844.77
5.1 b) Total costs for paved (hard top) roads per lane kilometre.	\$ 2,864.33	\$ 1,724.46

**OBJECTIVE:**

Efficient maintenance of paved roads.

**NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:**

Hard surface roads are all new within the last couple of years. Each year more roads are being hard surfaced and added to the list.

**REFERENCE:**

- <sup>1</sup> The formulas for efficiency measures for paved roads were revised in 2010 to net out revenue received from utilities for utility cut repairs.
- The Total cost measure was also revised in 2010. Total costs mean operating costs as defined in MPMP, plus amortization and interest on long-term debt, less revenue received from other municipalities for tangible capital assets.
- Financial Information Return: 91 2111 35 (Operating costs measure) and 91 2111 45 (Total costs measure).

### 5.2 UNPAVED ROADS – EFFICIENCY

	2011	2010	2009
5.2 a) Operating costs for unpaved (loose top) roads per lane kilometre.	\$ 2,578.28	\$ 1,348.82	\$ 993.81
5.2 b) Total costs for unpaved (loose top) roads per lane kilometre.	\$ 3,203.48	\$ 1,712.07	

**OBJECTIVE:**

Efficient maintenance of unpaved roads.

**NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:**

Although unpaved roads are being reduced each year as we hard surface more. The money being spent on the remaining unpaved roads increases as we are able to spend more on them with the intent to better prepare them over time for be hard surfaced.

**REFERENCE:**

- The formulas for efficiency measures were revised in 2009 to reflect changes in the reporting of expenses consistent with accrual accounting concepts. New total cost measures were introduced and revised in 2010. Total costs mean operating costs as defined in MPMP, plus amortization and interest on long-term debt, less revenue received from other municipalities for tangible capital assets.
- Financial Information Return: 91 2110 35 (Operating costs measure) and 91 2110 45 (Total costs measure).



# MUNICIPALITY

Municipal Performance Measurement Program (MPMP) • 2011 RESULTS

<b>5.3 BRIDGES AND CULVERTS – EFFICIENCY</b>			
	2011	2010	2009
5.3 a) Operating costs for bridges and culverts per square metre of surface area.	\$ 64.42	\$ 39.29	\$ 31.21
5.3 b) Total costs for bridges and culverts per square metre of surface area.	\$ 122.08	\$ 91.81	
<b>OBJECTIVE:</b> Efficient maintenance of bridges and culverts.			
<b>NOTES &amp; KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:</b>			
<b>REFERENCE:</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The formulas for efficiency measures were revised in 2009 to reflect changes in the reporting of expenses consistent with accrual accounting concepts. New total cost measures were introduced and revised in 2010. Total costs mean operating costs as defined in MPMP, plus amortization and interest on long-term debt, less revenue received from other municipalities for tangible capital assets.</li> </ul>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Financial Information Return: 91 2130 35 (Operating costs measure) and 91 2130 45 (Total costs measure).</li> </ul>			

<b>5.4 WINTER MAINTENANCE OF ROADS – EFFICIENCY</b>			
	2011	2010	2009
5.4 a) Operating costs for winter maintenance of roadways per lane kilometre maintained in winter.	\$ 347.76	\$ 305.27	\$ 559.59
5.4 b) Total costs for winter maintenance of roadways per lane kilometre maintained in winter.	\$ 347.76	\$ 305.27	
<b>OBJECTIVE:</b> Efficient winter maintenance of roads.			
<b>NOTES &amp; KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:</b>			
<b>REFERENCE:</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The formulas for efficiency measures were revised in 2009 to reflect changes in the reporting of expenses consistent with accrual accounting concepts. New total cost measures were introduced and revised in 2010. Total costs mean operating costs as defined in MPMP, plus amortization and interest on long-term debt, less revenue received from other municipalities for tangible capital assets.</li> </ul>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Financial Information Return: 91 2205 35 (Operating costs measure) and 91 2205 45 (Total costs measure).</li> </ul>			

# MUNICIPALITY

Municipal Performance Measurement Program (MPMP) • 2011 RESULTS

5.5 ADEQUACY OF PAVED ROADS – EFFECTIVENESS						
		2011	2010	2009	2008	2007
5.5	Percentage of paved lane kilometres where the condition is rated as good to very good. <sup>1</sup>	100%	100%	100%		
<b>OBJECTIVE:</b> Pavement condition meets municipal objectives.						
<b>NOTES &amp; KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:</b>						
<b>REFERENCE:</b>						
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><sup>1</sup> Pavement condition is rated using a Pavement Condition Index (PCI) such as the Index used by the Ontario Good Roads Association (OGRA) or the Ministry of Transportation's Roads Inventory Management System (RIMS).</li> </ul>						
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Financial Information Return: 92 2152 07.</li> </ul>						

5.6 ADEQUACY OF BRIDGES AND CULVERTS – EFFECTIVENESS						
		2011	2010	2009		
5.6	Percentage of bridges and culverts where the condition is rated as good to very good. <sup>1</sup>	100%	90%	90%		
<b>OBJECTIVE:</b> Safe bridges and culverts.						
<b>NOTES &amp; KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:</b>						
<b>REFERENCE:</b>						
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The effectiveness measure for bridges and culverts was introduced in 2009.</li> <li><sup>1</sup> A bridge or culvert is rated in good to very good condition if distress to the primary components is minimal, requiring only maintenance. Primary components are the main load carrying components of the structure, including the deck, beams, girders, abutments, foundations, etc.</li> </ul>						
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Financial Information Return: 92 2165 07.</li> </ul>						

# MUNICIPALITY

Municipal Performance Measurement Program (MPMP) • 2011 RESULTS

<b>5.7 WINTER EVENT RESPONSES – EFFECTIVENESS</b>					
	2011	2010	2009	2008	2007
5.7 Percentage of winter events where the response met or exceeded locally determined municipal service levels for road maintenance.	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
<b>OBJECTIVE:</b> Response to winter storm events meets locally determined service levels for winter road maintenance.					
<b>NOTES &amp; KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:</b>					
<b>REFERENCE:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Financial Information Return: 92 2251 07.</li> </ul>					

# MUNICIPALITY

Municipal Performance Measurement Program (MPMP) • 2011 RESULTS

## Solid Waste Management (Garbage)

CONTACT PERSON FOR SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT: Glenn Martin, Clerk

### 10.1 GARBAGE COLLECTION – EFFICIENCY

	2011	2010	2009
10.1 a) Operating costs for garbage collection per tonne or per household. <b>(Specify)</b>	\$ 230.30		
10.1 b) Total costs for garbage collection per tonne or per household. <b>(Specify)</b>	\$ 238.32		

**OBJECTIVE:**

Efficient municipal garbage collection services.

**NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:**

Shared service with Johnson Township

**REFERENCE:**

- The formulas for efficiency measures were revised in 2009 to reflect changes in the reporting of expenses consistent with accrual accounting concepts. New total cost measures were introduced and revised in 2010. Total costs mean operating costs as defined in MPMP, plus amortization and interest on long-term debt, less revenue received from other municipalities for tangible capital assets.

- Financial Information Return: 91 3404 35 (Operating costs measure) and 91 3404 45 (Total costs measure).

### 10.2 GARBAGE DISPOSAL – EFFICIENCY

	2011	2010	2009
10.2 a) Operating costs for garbage disposal per tonne or per household. <b>(Specify)</b>	\$ 102.29	\$ 181.80	\$ 102.98
10.2 b) Total costs for garbage disposal per tonne or per household. <b>(Specify)</b>	\$ 102.29	\$ 189.82	

**OBJECTIVE:**

Efficient municipal garbage disposal services.

**NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:**

Shared service with Johnson Township

**REFERENCE:**

- The formulas for efficiency measures were revised in 2009 to reflect changes in the reporting of expenses consistent with accrual accounting concepts. New total cost measures were introduced and revised in 2010. Total costs mean operating costs as defined in MPMP, plus amortization and interest on long-term debt, less revenue received from other municipalities for tangible capital assets.

- Financial Information Return: 91 3504 35 (Operating costs measure) and 91 3504 45 (Total costs measure).

# MUNICIPALITY

Municipal Performance Measurement Program (MPMP) • 2011 RESULTS

<b>10.3 SOLID WASTE DIVERSION (RECYCLING) – EFFICIENCY</b>			
	2011	2010	2009
10.3 a) Operating costs for solid waste diversion per tonne or per household. <b>(Specify)</b>	\$ 21.80	\$ 30.41	\$ 11.45
10.3 b) Total costs for solid waste diversion per tonne or per household. <b>(Specify)</b>	\$ 21.08	\$ 30.41	
<b>OBJECTIVE:</b> Efficient solid waste diversion (recycling) services.			
<b>NOTES &amp; KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:</b>			
<b>REFERENCE:</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The formulas for efficiency measures were revised in 2009 to reflect changes in the reporting of expenses consistent with accrual accounting concepts. New total cost measures were introduced and revised in 2010. Total costs mean operating costs as defined in MPMP, plus amortization and interest on long-term debt, less revenue received from other municipalities for tangible capital assets.</li> </ul>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Financial Information Return: 91 3606 35 (Operating costs measure) and 91 3606 45 (Total costs measure).</li> </ul>			

# MUNICIPALITY

Municipal Performance Measurement Program (MPMP) • 2011 RESULTS

## 10.5 COMPLAINTS – COLLECTION OF GARBAGE AND RECYCLED MATERIALS EFFECTIVENESS

	2011	2010	2009	2008	2007
10.5 Number of complaints received in a year concerning the collection of garbage and recycled materials per 1,000 households.	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
<b>OBJECTIVE:</b> Improved collection of garbage and recycled materials.					
<b>NOTES &amp; KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:</b>					
<b>REFERENCE:</b> • Financial Information Return: 92 3452 07.					

## 10.6 NUMBER OF MUNICIPAL SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT FACILITIES EFFECTIVENESS

	2011	2010	2009	2008	2007
10.6 Total number of solid waste management facilities owned by the municipality with a Ministry of Environment certificate of approval.	1	1	1	1	1
<b>OBJECTIVE:</b> Context for solid waste management facility compliance measure.					
<b>NOTES &amp; KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:</b> Shared with Johnson Township					
<b>REFERENCE:</b> • Financial Information Return: 92 3552 07.					

# MUNICIPALITY

Municipal Performance Measurement Program (MPMP) • 2011 RESULTS

<b>10.8 DIVERSION OF RESIDENTIAL SOLID WASTE EFFECTIVENESS</b>					
	2011	2010	2009	2008	2007
10.8 Percentage of residential solid waste diverted for recycling.	36%	21%	15%	20%	11%
<b>OBJECTIVE:</b> Municipal solid waste reduction programs divert waste from landfills and/or incinerators.					
<b>NOTES &amp; KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:</b> Additional streams have been added. This site now diverts: Styrofoam, Tires, Electronics, Share Shed, Recycle Bins, Metal					
<b>REFERENCE:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Financial Information Return: 92 3655 07.</li> </ul>					

MUNICIPALITY

Municipal Performance Measurement Program (MPMP) • 2011 RESULTS

Parks and Recreation

CONTACT PERSON FOR PARKS AND RECREATION: Glenn Martin, Clerk

11.2 RECREATION PROGRAMS – EFFICIENCY			
	2011	2010	2009
11.2 a) Operating costs for recreation programs per person.	\$ 5.60	\$ 5.60	\$ 5.60
11.2 b) Total costs for recreation programs per person.	\$ 5.60	\$ 5.60	
<b>OBJECTIVE:</b> Efficient operation of recreation programs.			
<b>NOTES &amp; KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:</b>			
<b>REFERENCE:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The formulas for efficiency measures were revised in 2009 to reflect changes in the reporting of expenses consistent with accrual accounting concepts. New total cost measures were introduced and revised in 2010. Total costs mean operating costs as defined in MPMP, plus amortization and interest on long-term debt, less revenue received from other municipalities for tangible capital assets.</li> <li>• Financial Information Return: 91 7203 35 (Operating costs measure) and 91 7203 45 (Total costs measure).</li> </ul>			



# MUNICIPALITY

Municipal Performance Measurement Program (MPMP) • 2011 RESULTS

<b>11.3 RECREATION FACILITIES – EFFICIENCY</b>			
	2011	2010	2009
11.3 a) Operating costs for recreation facilities per person.	\$ 31.52	\$ 32.23	\$ 38.57
11.3 b) Total costs for recreation facilities per person.	\$ 31.52	\$ 37.08	
<b>OBJECTIVE:</b> Efficient operation of recreation facilities.			
<b>NOTES &amp; KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:</b>			
<b>REFERENCE:</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The formulas for efficiency measures were revised in 2009 to reflect changes in the reporting of expenses consistent with accrual accounting concepts. New total cost measures were introduced and revised in 2010. Total costs mean operating costs as defined in MPMP, plus amortization and interest on long-term debt, less revenue received from other municipalities for tangible capital assets.</li> </ul>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Financial Information Return: 91 7306 35 (Operating costs measure) and 91 7306 45 (Total costs measure).</li> </ul>			

<b>11.4 RECREATION PROGRAMS AND RECREATION FACILITIES (SUBTOTAL) EFFICIENCY</b>			
	2011	2010	2009
11.4 a) Operating costs for recreation programs and recreation facilities per person (Subtotal)	\$ 37.12	\$ 32.23	\$ 38.57
11.4 b) Total costs for recreation programs and recreation facilities per person (Subtotal)	\$ 37.12	\$ 37.08	
<b>OBJECTIVE:</b> Efficient operation of recreation programs and facilities.			
<b>NOTES &amp; KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:</b>			
<b>REFERENCE:</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The formulas for efficiency measures were revised in 2009 to reflect changes in the reporting of expenses consistent with accrual accounting concepts. New total cost measures were introduced and revised in 2010. Total costs mean operating costs as defined in MPMP, plus amortization and interest on long-term debt, less revenue received from other municipalities for tangible capital assets.</li> </ul>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Financial Information Return: 91 7320 35 (Operating costs measure) and 91 7320 45 (Total costs measure).</li> </ul>			

# MUNICIPALITY

Municipal Performance Measurement Program (MPMP) • 2011 RESULTS

## Libraries

**CONTACT PERSON FOR LIBRARIES: Glenn Martin, Clerk**

### 12.1 LIBRARY COSTS PER PERSON – EFFICIENCY

	2011	2010	2009
12.1 a) Operating costs for library services per person.	\$ 4.97	\$ 5.30	\$ 4.96
12.1 b) Total costs for library services per person.	\$ 4.97	\$ 5.30	

**OBJECTIVE:**  
Efficient library services.

**NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:**

**REFERENCE:**

- The formulas for efficiency measures were revised in 2009 to reflect changes in the reporting of expenses consistent with accrual accounting concepts. New total cost measures were introduced and revised in 2010. Total costs mean operating costs as defined in MPMP, plus amortization and interest on long-term debt, less revenue received from other municipalities for tangible capital assets.
- Financial Information Return: 91 7405 35 (Operating costs measure) and 91 7405 45 (Total costs measure).

# MUNICIPALITY

Municipal Performance Measurement Program (MPMP) • 2011 RESULTS

## Land Use Planning

CONTACT PERSON FOR LAND USE PLANNING:

### 13.2 PRESERVATION OF AGRICULTURAL LAND DURING REPORTING YEAR EFFECTIVENESS

	2011	2010	2009	2008	2007
13.2 Percentage of land designated for agricultural purposes which was not re-designated for other uses during the reporting year.	100%	100%	100%	100%	100100%

**OBJECTIVE:**

Preservation of agricultural land.

**NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:**

**REFERENCE:**

- Financial Information Return: 92 8163 07.

# MUNICIPALITY

Municipal Performance Measurement Program (MPMP) • 2011 RESULTS

## 13.3 PRESERVATION OF AGRICULTURAL LAND RELATIVE TO 2000 EFFECTIVENESS

	2011	2010	2009	2008	2007
13.3 Percentage of land designated for agricultural purposes which was not re-designated for other uses relative to the base year of 2000.	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
<b>OBJECTIVE:</b> Preservation of agricultural land.					
<b>NOTES &amp; KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:</b>					
<b>REFERENCE:</b> • Financial Information Return: 92 8164 07.					

## 13.4 CHANGE IN NUMBER OF AGRICULTURAL HECTARES DURING REPORTING YEAR EFFECTIVENESS

	2011	2010	2009	2008	2007
13.4 Number of hectares of land originally designated for agricultural purposes which was re-designated for other uses during the reporting year.	0	0	0	0	0
<b>OBJECTIVE:</b> Preservation of agricultural land.					
<b>NOTES &amp; KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:</b>					
<b>REFERENCE:</b> • Financial Information Return: 92 8165 07.					

# MUNICIPALITY

Municipal Performance Measurement Program (MPMP) • 2011 RESULTS

## 13.5 CHANGE IN NUMBER OF AGRICULTURAL HECTARES SINCE 2000 EFFECTIVENESS

	2011	2010	2009	2008	2007
13.5 Number of hectares of land originally designated for agricultural purposes which was re-designated for other uses since January 1, 2000.	0	0	0	0	0

**OBJECTIVE:**

Preservation of agricultural land.

**NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:**

**REFERENCE:**

- Financial Information Return: 92 8166 07.