# Local Government

1.1 GENERAL GOVERNMENT – EFFICIENCY									
2012 2011 2010 2009 2008									
	.4%	.4%	.4%	.9%	1.0%				

# **Efficiency Measure**

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

# **Objective** Efficient municipal government.

Notes

SLC 91 0206 45 Financial Information Return.

# **Fire Services**

2.1 FIRE SERVICES – EFFICIENCY									
<b>2012 2011 2010 2009 2</b>									
	\$2.81	\$2.98	\$3.19	\$3.08	\$3.24				

### **Efficiency Measure**

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

#### Objective

Efficient fire services.

Notes

- St. Thomas covers 35.75 square kilometres with a population base of 37,905 essentially consisting of urban coverage.
- b) The St. Thomas Fire Department consists of full-time Firefighters.

c) The mission of the St. Thomas Fire Department is to minimize the loss of life and property resulting from fire, medical emergencies, and other disasters. We will accomplish our mission through prevention, education, fire suppression, medical services, and other related emergency and non-emergency activities. We will actively participate in our community, serve as role models, and strive to effectively and efficiently utilize all the resources at our command to provide an efficient, effective service for our citizens.

SLC 91 1103 45 Financial Information Return.

2.2 FIRE SERVICES – EFFECTIVENESS								
	2012	2011	2010	2009				
	.132	.053	.111	0				

### Effectiveness Measure

Number of residential fire related civilian injuries per 1,000 persons

## Objective

Minimize the number of civilian injuries in residential fires.

New reporting measure in 2009

2.3 FIRE SERVICES – EFFECTIVENESS									
	2012	2011	2010	2009					
	.079	.185	.194	.194					

## Effectiveness Measure

Number of residential fire related civilian injuries averaged over 5 years per 1,000 persons

### Objective

Minimize the number of civilian injuries in residential fires.

New reporting measure in 2009

SLC 92 1152 7 Financial Information Return.

2.4 FIRE SERVICES – EFFECTIVENESS											
<b>2012 2011 2010 2009</b>											
	0.00	0.00	.000	.028							
Effectiveness Measure Number of residential fire related civilian fatalities per 1,000											
<b>Objective</b> Minimize the number of civilian fatalities in residential fires											
New reporting mea	New reporting measure in 2009										
SLC 92 1155 7 Fir	nancial Information F	Return.									

2.5 FIRE SERVICES – EFFECTIVENESS									
	2012	2011	2010	2009					
	.000	.026	.028	.028					

#### Effectiveness Measure

Number of residential fire related civilian fatalities averaged over 5 years per 1,000 persons

### Objective

Minimize the number of civilian fatalities in residential fires

New reporting measure in 2009

SLC 92 1156 7 Financial Information Return.

2.6 FIRE SERVICES – EFFECTIVENESS									
	2012	2011	2010	2009					
	1.464	1.708	2.430	1.970					

## Effectiveness Measure

Number of residential structural fires per 1,000 persons

### Objective

Minimize the number of residential structural fires

New reporting measure in 2009

SLC 92 1160 7 Financial Information Return.

# **Police Services**

3.1 POLICE SERVICES – EFFICIENCY								
	2012	2011	2010	2009	2008			
	\$289.58	\$281.85	\$290.08	\$280.68	\$260.62			

## Efficiency Measure

Operating costs for police services per person.

### Objective

Efficient police services.


Notes

While this data reflects the cost of police resources for our community, it is not necessarily comparable with other police services for a variety of reasons e.g. Each municipal police service has its own unique characteristics and levels of service based on community expectations. The costs included in police operating and capital budgets differ considerably from one municipality to another.

With the aforementioned in mind, the cost of policing in St. Thomas includes all police operational costs, all business office and administrative costs, and all court services, security operations and associated costs. Includes: the purchase of all police vehicles, marked and unmarked cruisers, prisoner van, community service vehicle, bicycles; fuel, insurance and maintenance of the fleet; all equipment for the business and court office, as well as the equipment for the officers e.g. Use of force options, etc.; uniforms, training, communication equipment and facilities, all technology for the forensic identification lab, computers and computer support, business office technology; all salaries, overtime, court time, benefits for all employees.

**Primary** focus of the Service continues to focus on crime prevention, crime detection and apprehension, traffic safety, positive community relations and education, the use of current technology to effectively analyse trends and appropriately deploy resources to address relevant issues/concerns in our community.

3.2 VIOLENT CRIME RATE									
	2012	2011	2010	2009	2008				
	8.89	6.89	7.09	7.56	8.83				
Effectiveness N Violent crime ra Objective Safe communit	ate per 1,000 per	sons.							
Notes									
	inancial Information	Return.							
SLC 92 1258 07 F									



3.3 PROPERTY CRIME RATE									
	2012       2011       2010       2009       200								
	25.77	28.55	36.86	41.76	46.30				
Effectiveness Property crime	<b>Measure</b> rate per 1,000 pe	ersons.							
Objective									

Objective Safe communities.

#### Notes

3.4 OTHER CRIMINAL CODE CRIME RATE									
	2012	2011	2010	2009					
	5.38	4.06	5.622	7.173					

## Effectiveness Measure

Total crime rate per 1,000 persons (Other Criminal Code offences excluding traffic).

## Objective

Safe Communities.

#### Notes

#### SLC 92 1262 07 Financial Information Return.

3.5 CRIMINAL CODE CRIME RATE									
2012 2011 2010 2009 2008									
	40.05	39.49	49.57	56.49	63.25				

### Effectiveness Measure

Total crime rate per 1,000 persons (Criminal Code offences excluding traffic).

### Objective

Safe Communities.

Notes

SLC 92 1263 07 Financial Information Return.

3.6 YOUTH CRIME							
	<b>2012 2011 2009 2009 2008</b>						
	61.59	73.51	71.43	98.01	108.80		
Effectiveness Measure Number of youths charged per 1,000 youths.							

# **Objective**

Safe communities.

#### Notes

SLC 92 1265 07 Financial Information Return.

4.1 BUILDING PERMITS AND INSPECTIONS SERVICES						
	2012	2011				
	\$9.04	\$2.04				
Effoctivonoss	Mogeuro					
Effectiveness	Neasure	n Activity (hoor	d on normite	icourd)		

Costs per \$1,000 of Construction Activity (based on permits issued)

Objective

Efficient delivery service.

Notes

\$93,070,000 less residential construction in 2012.

SLC 91 1301 45 Financial Information Return.

4.2 BUILDING PERMITS AND INSPECTIONS-HOUSES					
	2012	2011			
	5	5			

## **Effectiveness Measure**

Median number of working days to review a complete building permit application, issue or not issue a permit and provide all reasons of refusal.

#### Objective

Efficient delivery service.

Notes

SLC 92 1351 07 Financial Information Return.

4.3 BUILDING PERMITS AND INSEPCTIONS-SMALL BUILDINGS					
	2012	2011			
	10	10			

## **Effectiveness Measure**

Median number of working days to review a complete building permit application, issue or not issue a permit and provide all reasons of refusal

#### Objective

Efficient delivery service.

Notes

SLC 92 1352 07 Financial Information Return.

4.4 BUILDING PERMITS AND INSPECTIONS-LARGE BUILDINGS						
	2012	2011				
	16	16				

#### **Effectiveness Measure**

Median number of working days to review a complete building permit application, issue or not issue a permit and provide all reasons of refusal.

Objective

Efficient delivery service.

Notes

		-	

SLC 92 1353 07 Financial Information Return.

4.5 BUILDING PERMITS AND INSPECTIONS-COMPLEX BUILDINGS						
	2012	2011				
	22	22				

#### Effectiveness Measure

Median number of working days to review a complete building permit application, issue or not issue a permit and provide all reasons of refusal.

### Objective

Efficient delivery service

Encient delivery service.
Notes
SLC 92 1354 07 Financial Information Return.

# Roads

5.1 PAVED ROADS – EFFICIENCY						
	2012	2011	2010	2009	2008	
	\$9,875.97	\$8,076.54	\$8,656.05	\$8,696.92	\$5,888.94	

## **Efficiency Measure**

Total costs for paved (hard top) roads per lane kilometre.

### Objective

Efficient maintenance of paved roads.

Notes

Addition of amortization in 2009.

Bridges and Culverts reported separately in 2009

Prior to Work Manager Integration, costs were split on a % basis, now we have more reliable splits.

SLC 91 2111 45 Financial Information Return.

5.2 UNPAVED ROADS – EFFICIENCY							
	2012	2011	2010	2009	2008		
	\$2,976.00	\$8,677.40	\$11,141.00	\$9,959.00	\$5,889.00		

# **Efficiency Measure**

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

**Objective** Efficient maintenance of unpaved roads.

#### Notes

City has 5km of unpaved road. Bridges and Culverts reported separately in 2009 Prior to Work Manager Integration, costs were split on a % basis, now we have more reliable splits.

SLC 91 2110 45 Financial Information Return.

5.3 BRIDGES & CULVERTS							
	2012	2011	2010	2009			
	\$22.87	\$12.30	\$13.57	\$11.29			

## **Efficiency Measure**

Total costs for bridges and culverts per sq. metre of surface area

### Objective

Efficient maintenance of bridges and culverts

#### Notes

# Prior to Work Manager Integration, costs were split on a % basis, now we have more reliable splits.

9

SLC 91 2130 45 Financial Information Return.

5.4 WINTER MAINTENANCE OF ROADS-EFFICIENCY						
	2012	2011	2010	2009	2008	
	\$816.92	\$1,590.08	\$1,195.46	\$1,046.31	\$1,289.10	

#### Effectiveness Measure

Total costs for winter maintenance of roadways per lane kilometre maintained in winter

#### Objective

Efficient winter maintenance of roads.

#### Notes

Sidewalks & parking lots excluded starting in 2009 Prior to Work Manager Integration, costs were split on a % basis, now we have more reliable splits.

SLC 91 2205 45 Financial Information Return.

# 5.5 ADEQUACY OF PAVED ROADS

2012	2011	2010	2009	2008
70.9%	81.9%	82.3%	81.9%	73.8%

## **Effectiveness Measure**

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

#### Objective

Pavement condition meets municipal objectives.

#### Notes

SLC 92 2152 07 Financial Information Return. Description of measure has changed, but not its calculation.

5.6 ADEQUACY OF BRIDGES AND CULVERTS							
	2012	2011	2010	2009			
	51.9%	58.3%	58.3%	56.5%			

# Effectiveness Measure

Percentage of bridges and culverts where the condition is rated as good to very good

## Objective

Bridge and culvert conditions meet municipal objectives.

Notes
SLC 92 2165 07 Financial Information Return.

5.7 WINTER EVENT RESPONSES							
	2012	2011	2010	2009	2008		
	100%	100%	100%	100.%	100.%		

#### 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

SLC 92 2251 07 Financial Information Return. Description of measure has changed, but not its calculation.

# **Conventional Transit**

6.1 CONVENTIONAL TRANSIT – EFFICIENCY							
	2012	2011	2010	2009	2008		
	\$7.24	\$5.84	\$4.76	\$4.87	\$3.53		

## **Efficiency Measure**

Total costs for conventional transit per regular service passenger trip.

### Objective

Efficient conventional transit services.

### Notes

Addition of amortization in 2009. Ridership down 6% from 2010 Ridership down 22% from 2011

SLC 91 2303 45 Financial Information Return.

# 6.2 CONVENTIONAL TRANSIT RIDERSHIP

2012	2011	2010	2009	2008
5.46	7.04	7.87	8.09	8.84

# **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

Ridership down 22% from 2011

SLC 92 2351 07 Financial Information Return.

# Wastewater (Sewage)

7.1 WASTEWATER COLLECTION – EFFICIENCY							
	2012	2011	2010	2009	2008		
	\$15,153.47	\$10,766.04	\$16,603.72	\$13,357.21	\$1,678.62		

# **Efficiency Measure**

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

#### Objective

Efficient municipal wastewater collection services.

Notes: Addition of amortization in 2009; 25% less wastewater treated in 2012

SLC 91 3111 45 Financial Information Return.

7.2 WASTEWATER TREATMENT AND DISPOSAL – EFFICIENCY								
	2012	2011	2010	2009	2008			
	\$472.52	\$291.58	\$410.18	\$286.55	\$160.03			

# Efficiency Measure

Operating costs for the treatment and disposal of wastewater per mega litre.

## Objective

Efficient municipal wastewater treatment and disposal services.

**Notes:** Addition of amortization exp. in 2009, less megalitres of wastewater treated in 2010; 25% less wastewater treated in 2012

One mega litre equals 1,000,000 litres or 1,000 cubic metres.

SLC 91 3112 45 Financial Information Return

7.3 WASTEW	ATER INTEGRA	TED SYSTEM -	- EFFICIENCY	

2012	2011	2010	2009	2008
\$948.56	\$554.84	\$918.70	\$659.12	\$205.17

# **Efficiency Measure**

Operating costs for the collection, treatment and disposal of wastewater per mega litre (Integrated System).

## Objective

Efficient wastewater system (Integrated System).

**Notes:** Addition of amortization exp. in 2009, less megalitres of wastewater treated in 2010; 25% less wastewater treated in 2012

	quals 1,000,000 litres		res.		
SLC 91 3113 45 I	Financial Information	Return.			
	7.4	WASTEWATE	R MAIN BACKU	PS	
	7.4 2012	WASTEWATE	R MAIN BACKU 2010	PS 2009	2008
					<b>2008</b> 1.5873
	2012	2011	2010	2009	
Effectiveness	<b>2012</b> 1.0204	2011	2010	2009	
	<b>2012</b> 1.0204	<b>2011</b> 1.0204	<b>2010</b> 1.0811	<b>2009</b> 1.6760	1.5873
Effectiveness Number of was	<b>2012</b> 1.0204 Measure	<b>2011</b> 1.0204	<b>2010</b> 1.0811	<b>2009</b> 1.6760	1.5873

Municipal sewage management practices prevent environmental and human health hazards.

#### Notes

SLC 92 3154 07 Financial Information Return.

# 7.5 WASTEWATER BYPASSES TREATMENT

2012	2011	2010	2009	2008
1.031%	4.922%	1.730%	4.77%	5.19%

#### Effectiveness Measure

Percentage of wastewater estimated to have by-passed treatment.

## Objective

Municipal sewage management practices prevent environmental and human health hazards.

Notes

SLC 92 3155 07 Financial Information Return.

# **Storm Water**

8.1 URBAN STORM WATER MANAGEMENT – EFFICIENCY						
	2012	2011	2010	2009	2008	
	\$10,877.31	\$8,813.88	\$10,832.27	\$9,587.14	\$8,462.89	

## **Efficiency Measure**

Total costs for urban storm water management (collection, treatment, and disposal) per kilometre of drainage system.

## Objective

Efficient urban storm water management.

#### Notes

## Addition of amortization expense in 2009

Reported by municipalities with a separate storm water system.

SLC 91 3209 45 Financial Information Return.

8.2 RURAL STORM WATER MANAGEMENT – EFFICIENCY						
	2012	2011	2010	2009	2008	
	\$x.xx	\$x.xx	\$x.xx	\$x.xx	\$x.xx	

## **Efficiency Measure**

Operating costs for rural storm water management (collection, treatment, disposal) per kilometre of drainage system.

#### Objective

Efficient rural storm water management.

Notes

City does not track.

Reported by municipalities with a separate storm water system.

SLC 91 3210 45 Financial Information Return.

# **Drinking Water**

9.1 DRINKING WATER TREATMENT – EFFICIENCY						
<b>2012 2011 2009 2008</b>						
	\$x.xx	\$x.xx	\$x.xx	\$x.xx	\$x.xx	
Efficiency Measure						

Operating costs for the treatment of drinking water per megalitre.

### Objective

Efficient municipal water treatment services.

#### Notes

The City purchases all treated water from the Elgin Area Primary Water Supply System, of which the City is a Joint Board member. This water is pumped from the Lake Erie Water Treatment Plant to the Edgeware Road reservoir in St. Thomas.

1 mega litre equals 1,000,000 litres or 1,000 cubic metres.

SLC 91 3311 45 Financial Information Return.

# 9.2 DRINKING WATER DISTRIBUTION – EFFICIENCY

2012	2011	2010	2009	2008
\$23,854.65	\$20,604.19	\$21,343.66	\$26,482.51	\$18,300.24

### **Efficiency Measure**

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

## Objective

Efficient municipal water distribution services.

 Notes

 Addition of amortization expense in 2009

 SLC 91 3312 45 Financial Information Return.

9.3 DRINKING WATER INTEGRATED SYSTEM – EFFICIENCY					
	2012	2011	2010	2009	2008
	\$x.xx	\$x.xx	\$x.xx	\$x.xx	\$x.xx

## **Efficiency Measure**

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

#### Objective

Efficient municipal water system (Integrated System).

Notes
1 megalitre equals 1,000,000 litres or 1,000 cubic metres. SLC 91 3313 45 Financial Information Return.

9.4 BOIL WATER ADVISORIES					
	2012	2011	2010	2009	2008
	.0000	.0000	.0003	7.6667	.0000

## **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						
SLC 92 3355 07 F	inancial Information	Return.				
9.5 BREAKS IN WATER MAINS						
	2012	2011	2010	2009	2008	
	13.2231	8.6777	7.5949	14.6119	14.4796	
Effectiveness Number of wat	<b>Measure</b> er main breaks p	er 100 kilometre	s of water distrik	oution pipe in a y	ear.	
<b>Objective</b> Improve syster	n reliability.					

Notes

SLC 92 3356 07 Financial Information Return.

# Solid Waste Management (Garbage)

10.1 GARBAGE COLLECTION – EFFICIENCY						
	2012	2011	2010	2009	2008	
	\$101.52	\$106.47	\$80.43	\$81.41	\$43.03	

## **Efficiency Measure**

Total costs for garbage collection per tonne or per household. (Per tonne)

### Objective

Efficient municipal garbage collection services.

#### Notes

2009 numbers reinstated. Previous year's numbers included diverted tonnes.

Collection down 26% in 2011

SLC 91 3404 45 Financial Information Return.

10.2 GARBAGE DISPOSAL – EFFICIENCY						
	2012	2011	2010	2009	2008	
	\$102.69	\$114.66	\$86.62	\$86.58	\$84.46	

# **Efficiency Measure**

Total costs for garbage disposal per tonne or per household. (Per tonne)

#### Objective

Efficient municipal garbage disposal services.

Notes

# Disposal down 26% in 2011

SLC 91 3504 45 Financial Information Return.

10.3 SOLID WASTE DIVERSION (RECYCLING) – EFFICIENCY
---

2012	2011	2010	2009	2008
\$222.02	\$215.87	\$269.15	\$175.79	\$205.38

# **Efficiency Measure**

Total costs for solid waste diversion (recycling) per tonne or per household. (Per Tonne)

18

# Objective

Efficient municipal solid waste diversion (recycling) services.

#### Notes

31% more solid waste diversion in 2011.

SLC 91 3606 45 Financial Information Return.

10.4 SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT (INTEGRATED SYSTEM) – EFFICIENCY						
	2012	2011	2010	2009	2008	
	\$217.35	\$218.60	\$201.48	\$171.13	\$175.33	

#### Efficiency Measure

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

#### Objective

Efficient municipal solid waste management (Integrated System).

#### Notes

SLC 91 3607 45 Financial Information Return.

10.5 COMPLAINTS — COLLECTION OF GARBAGE						
AND RECYCLED MATERIALS						
	2012	2011	2010	2009	2008	
	0.000	16.026	18.259	29.163	N/A	

## **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 of garbage and recycled materials.

#### Notes

Contractor did not track this information in 2008 or 2012

SLC 92 3452 07 Financial Information Return.

10.6 NUMBER OF MUNICIPAL SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT FACILITIES						
	2012	2011	2010	2009	2008	
	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	

## **Effectiveness Measure**

Total number of solid waste management facilities owned by municipality with a Ministry of Environment Certificate of Approval.

#### Objective

Context for solid waste management facility compliance measure.

Notes

The City of St. Thomas does not own any solid waste management facilities

SLC 92 3552 07 Financial Information Return.

# **10.7 FACILITY COMPLIANCE**

## 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 facility.

## Objective

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

Facility Name	Days	Days	Days	Days
	2012	2011	2010	2009

	x	x	x	x
Notes				

#### Facility Name: SLC 92 3553 03 to SLC 92 3560 03

SLC 92 3553 07 to SLC 92 3560 07 Days:

List facilities in the order they appear in the 2004 FIR.

	2012	2011	2010	2009	2008
	45.6%	48.2%	36.6%	45.8%	39.6%
Notes					
SLC 92 3655 07 F	inancial Information	Return.			
SLC 92 3655 07 F			IDENTIAL SOL	DWASTE	
	10.9 DIVE	RSION OF RES	IDENTIAL SOLI Istrial. Commer		al Tonnage)
	10.9 DIVE Combined Resid	RSION OF RES	strial, Commer	cial, Institutiona	
	10.9 DIVE	RSION OF RES			al Tonnage) 2008

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

2009 numbers recalculated

SLC 92 3656 07 Financial Information Return.

# Parks and Recreation

11.1 PARKS – EFFICIENCY							
	2012	2011	2010	2009	2008		
	\$57.95	\$51.37	\$62.19	\$55.52	\$44.46		
Efficiency Measure Operating costs for parks per person.							
Objective							

Efficient operation of parks.

#### Notes

#### SLC 91 7103 45 Financial Information Return.

11.2 RECREATION PROGRAMS – EFFICIENCY						
	2012	2011	2010	2009	2008	
	\$14.88	\$13.45	\$10.82	\$10.19	\$11.50	

# Efficiency Measure

Operating costs for recreation programs per person.

## Objective

Efficient operation of recreation programs.

#### Notes

SLC 91 7203 45 Financial Information Return. This measure is based on total population, not the population participating in recreation programs.

11.3 RE	CREATION FAC	CILITIES – EFFI	CIENCY

2012	2011	2010	2009	2008
\$55.22	\$58.20	\$58.27	\$58.01	\$39.29

# **Efficiency Measure**

Operating costs for recreation facilities per person.

#### Objective

Efficient operation of recreation facilities.

#### Notes

Addition of amortization expense in 2009

SLC 91 7306 45 Financial Information Return.



11.4 PARKS, RECREATION PROGRAMS AND RECREATION FACILITIES (SUBTOTAL) –						
EFFICIENCY						
	2012	2011	2010	2009	2008	
	\$128.05	\$123.02	\$131.28	\$123.72	\$95.25	

### **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

Addition of amortization expense in 2009

SLC 91 7321 45 Financial Information Return. This measure represents a subtotal and is automatically completed when a municipality reports one or more efficiency measures for parks and recreation.

11.5 PARTICIPANT HOURS FOR RECREATION PROGRAMS						
	2012	2011	2010	2009	2008	
	7,478	9,250	9,705	9,985	9,985	

## Effectiveness Measure

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

## Objective

Recreation programs serve needs of residents.

#### Notes

SLC 92 7255 07 Financial Information Return.

The denominator of this measure is total population divided by 1,000 and does not represent the number of participants in recreation programs.



11.6 OPEN SPACE						
	2012	2011	2010	2009	2008	
	653	653	653	653	653	

## **Effectiveness Measure**

Hectares of open space.

2007 includes ravines and gullies

# Objective

Open space is adequate for population.

SLC 92 7155 05 Financial Information Return.

|--|--|

	2012	2011	2010	2009	2008
	17.227	17.227	18.084	18.084	18.084
Effectiveness Hectares of ope	<b>Measure</b> en space per 1,0	00 persons.			
SLC 92 7155 07 F	inancial Information	Return.			
Notes					



		11.7 TF	RAILS		
	2012	2011	2010	2009	2008
	77	77	77	71	71
<b>Effectiveness</b> Total kilometres					
<b>Objective</b> Trails provide re	ecreation opport	unities.			
SLC 92 7152 05 F	inancial Information	Return.			
	2012	2011	2010	2009	2008
	2.031	2.031	2.132	1.966	1.966
	Measure s of trails per 1,0 inancial Information	-			
Notes					



	2012	2011	2010	2009	2008
	12,459	12,459	12,459	12,459	12,459
Effectiveness	Measure				
	of indoor recreation	on facility space	Э.		
Objective					
•	lity space is adequ	uate for populat	tion.		
SLC 92 7356 05 F	inancial Information F	Return.			
	2012	2011	2010	2009	2008
	329	329	345	345	345
-	<b>Measure</b> of recreation facil inancial Information F		000 persons.		
Notes					
		5			
2006-2009 rest	ated in sd. metres				
2006-2009 rest	ated in sq. metres	•			

11.9 RECREATION FACILITY SPACE-OUTDOOR						
	2012	2011	2010	2009	2008	
	59,270	59,270	59,270	59,270	59,270	

# **Effectiveness Measure**

Square metres of outdoor recreation facility space.

## Objective

Recreation facility space is adequate for population.

#### SLC 92 7359 05 Financial Information Return.

2012	2011	2010	2009	2008
1,564	1,564	1,641	1,641	1,641

## Effectiveness Measure

Square metres of recreation facility space per 1,000 persons.

SLC 92 7359 07 Financial Information Return.

#### Notes

2006-2009 restated in sq. metres

2000-2003 restated in sy. metres



# Library Services

12.1 LIBRARY COSTS PER PERSON – EFFICIENCY						
	2012	2011	2010	2009	2008	
	\$56.53	\$55.53	\$60.04	\$57.22	\$53.48	

# Efficiency Measure

Operating costs for libraries per person.

# Objective

Efficient library services.

Notes
-------

#### SLC 91 7405 45 Financial Information Return.

12.2 LIBRARY COSTS PER USE – EFFICIENCY						
	2012	2011	2010	2009	2008	
	\$2.30	\$2.96	\$2.34	\$2.25	\$2.37	

## Efficiency Measure

Operating costs for libraries per use.

# Objective

Efficient library services

#### Notes

SLC 91 7406 45 Financial Information Return.

12.3 LIBRARY USES								
2012 2011 2010 2009 2008								
	24.594	18.777	25.654	25.473	22.608			
Effectiveness Library uses pe								
<b>Objective</b> Increased use of	of library services	5.						
Notes								

Due to relocation of library for renovations, only 30% of collection was available in 2011, as well as fewer programs and internet stations.

SLC 92 7460 07 Financial Information Return.

12.4 ELECTRONIC LIBRARY USES						
<b>2012 2011 2009 2008</b>						
	22.1%	13.5%	12.0%	11.0%	5.8%	

# **Effectiveness Measure**

Electronic library uses as a percentage of total library uses.

#### Objective

Increased use of library services.

#### Notes

Increase in computer workstation usage


SLC 92 7463 07 Financial Information Return.

12.5 NON-ELECTRONIC LIBRARY USES						
	2012	2011	2010	2009	2008	
	77.9%	86.5%	88.0%	89.0%	94.2%	

## **Effectiveness Measure**

Non-electronic library uses as a percentage of total library uses.

#### Objective

Better information on library usage.

#### Notes

SLC 92 7462 07 Financial Information Return.



# Land Use Planning

13.1 LOCATION OF NEW DEVELOPMENT						
<b>2012 2011 2010 2009 2008</b>						
	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	

# **Effectiveness Measure**

Percentage of new lots, blocks and/or units with final approval, which are located within settlement areas.

# Objective

No longer measured

Notes							
SLC 92 8154 08 Financial Information Return.							
13.2 PRESERVATION OF AGRICULTURAL LAND DURING 2004							
2012 2011 2010 2009 2008							
100% 100% 61.6% 100% 100%							
Effectiveness Measure							
LIICUIVEIIC33 IVICAJUIC							

Percentage of land designated for agricultural purposes, which was not re-designated for other uses during the reporting year.

### Objective

Preservation of agricultural land.

#### Notes

SLC 92 8163 07 Financial Information Return.

# **13.3 PRESERVATION OF AGRICULTURAL LAND RELATIVE TO 2000**

2012	2011	2010	2009	2008
114.9%	114.9%	114.9%	186.5%	186.5%

## **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

Preservation of agricultural land.



SLC 92 8164 07 Financial Information Return.



13.4 CHANGE IN NUMBER OF AGRICULTURAL HECTARES DURING 2004						
	2012	2011	2010	2009	2008	
	0	0	245	0	0	

# **Effectiveness Measure**

Number of hectares of land originally designated for agricultural purposes which was re-designated for other uses during the reporting year.

### Objective

Preservation of agricultural land.

Notes

SLC 92 8165 07 Financial Information Return.

13.5 CHANGE IN NUMBER OF AGRICULTURAL HECTARES SINCE 2000							
	2012	2011	2010	2009	2008		
	-51	-51	-51	+296	+296		

# **Effectiveness Measure**

Number of hectares of land originally designated for agricultural purposes which was re-designated for other uses since January 1, 2000.

#### Objective

Preservation of agricultural land.

#### Notes

SLC 92 8166 07 Financial Information Return.

