Questions about MPMP results should be addressed to:

Name: Lauren D'Argis	Phone: 807 467 2010
Title: Corporate Services Manager	
Municipality: City of Kenora	
Email: Idargis@kenora.ca	

# **Local Government**

	1.1 GE	NERAL GOVER	NMENT - EFF	ICIENCY		
		2012	2011	2010	2009	
1.1 a)	Operating costs for governance and corporate management as a percentage of total municipal operating costs.	2.4%	2.1%	2.6%	2.1%	
1.1 b)	Total costs for governance and corporate management as a percentage of total municipal costs.	2.1%	1.8%	2.3%		
	OBJECTIVE: Efficient local government.	Ļ	·			
	NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDER		ULTS:			
	Kenora's results were the most efficient I for all municipalities in Ontario for 2010,	•		gory of Northerr	n Municipalitie	es. Results
	<b>REFERENCE:</b> • The formulas for efficiency measures consistent with accrual accounting conce costs mean operating costs as defined in received from other municipalities for tan	epts. New total cos MPMP, plus amo gible capital asset	at measures were ortization and intention ts.	e introduced and erest on long ter	d revised in 2 m debt, less	010. Total revenue
	Financial Information Return: 91 0206	35 (Operating co	sts measure) an	id 91 0206 45 (T	otal costs me	easure).

# **Fire Services**

		2.1 FII	RE SERV	VICE	6 — EFFI		CY			
			2012		2011		2010		2009	
2.1 a)	Operating costs for fire services per \$1,000 of assessment.	\$	1.41	\$	1.43	\$	1.41	\$	1.41	
2.1 b)	Total costs for fire services per \$1,000 of assessment.	\$	1.78	\$	1.69	\$	1.50			
	OBJECTIVE: Efficient fire services.	1								
	NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UND	ERSTA	NDING F	RESUL	.TS:					
	Kenora maintains a combination of volution beyond the City's boundaries.	unteer	and salaı	ied Fi	re Fighter	s who	service so	ome of	the unco	ntrolled areas
	<b>REFERENCE:</b> • The formulas for efficiency measure consistent with accrual accounting corr costs mean operating costs as defined received from other municipalities for the	icepts. I in MP	New total MP, plus	cost amort	measures ization an	were	introduce	d and i	revised in	2010. Total
	Financial Information Return: 91 11	03 35	(Operatin	a cost	s measure	e) and	91 1103	45 (To	tal costs n	neasure)

	2.2 & 2.3 CIVILI/	AN FIRE REL	ATED INJURI	ES – EFFECT	IVENESS	
		2012	2011	2010	2009	
2.2	Number of residential fire related civilian injuries per 1,000 persons.	0.065	0.000	0.000	0.075	
2.3	Number of residential fire related civilian injuries averaged over 5 years per 1,000 persons.	0.026	0.016	0.016	0.048	
	<b>OBJECTIVE:</b> Minimize the number of civilian injuries	in residential fire	es.			
	NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDE	RSTANDING R	ESULTS:			
	<ul> <li><b>REFERENCE:</b></li> <li>Financial Information Return: 92 115<sup>-</sup></li> </ul>	1 07 (2.2) and 9	2 1152 07 (2.3)			

2.4 & 2.5 CIVIL	IAN FIRE RELATE	D FATALITIES	6 - EFFECTIVE	ENESS	
	2012	2011	2010	2009	
2.4 Number of residential fire related civilian fatalities per 1,000 persons.	0.065	0.000	0.081	0.000	
2.5 Number of residential fire related civilian fatalities averaged over 5 years per 1,000 persons.	0.026	0.016	0.016	0.000	
<b>OBJECTIVE:</b> Minimize the number of civilian fatalit	ties in residential fires				
NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UN REFERENCE:	DERSTANDING RES	ULTS:			
<ul> <li>Financial Information Return: 92 1</li> </ul>	155 07 (2.4) and 92 1	156 07 (2.5).			

	2.6 NUMBER OF RE	ESIDENTIAL STR	RUCTURAL FI	RES – EFFECT	IVENESS	
		2012	2011	2010	2009	
2.6	Number of residential structural fires per 1,000 households.	2.561	2.948	3.948	1.775	
	<b>OBJECTIVE:</b> Minimize the number of residential stru	ctural fires.	·	·		
	NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDE	ERSTANDING RES	SULTS:			
	<ul><li><b>REFERENCE:</b></li><li>Financial Information Return: 92 116</li></ul>	60 07.				

## **Police Services**

	3.	1 PC		RVIC	ES – EFF	FICIE	ENCY			
			2012		2011		2010		2009	
3.1 a)	Operating costs for police services per person. <sup>1</sup>	\$	425.22	\$	554.01	\$	538.82	\$	689.20	
3.1 b)	Total costs for police services per person.	\$	425.89	\$	554.83	\$	540.73			
	OBJECTIVE: Efficient police services.									
	NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UND	ERST	ANDING F	RESU	LTS:					
	Kenora has almost the highest cost pe	r pers	son reporte	d by	any munici	pality	/ for policing	g cos	sts in 2010.	
	<ul> <li>REFERENCE:</li> <li>The formulas for efficiency measure consistent with accrual accounting concosts mean operating costs as defined received from other municipalities for t</li> <li><sup>1</sup> As of 2009, the efficiency measure court security since expenses for these efficiency measures for police services</li> <li>Financial Information Return: 91 12</li> </ul>	cepts I in M angib es for e serv s aligr	S. New tota PMP, plus le capital a r police ser rices are be n with effec	l cost amor ssets vices eing u tiven	measures tization an s. do not inc uploaded to ess measu	were d inte lude o the res b	e introduced erest on lon expenses f province ov pased on cr	d and g terr or pri ver a ime r	I revised in m debt, less isoner trans number of rates.	2010. Total s revenue sportation or years. The

	3.2 VIC	DLENT CRIME	RATE – EFF	ECTIVENESS		
		2012	2011	2010	2009	
3.2	Violent crime rate per 1,000 persons. <sup>1</sup>	24.8	35.2	38.8	34.4	
	OBJECTIVE: Safe communities.					
	NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDE	RSTANDING R	ESULTS:			
	2012 showed an improvement for Kenc the 2010 highest violent crime rate per Some of the municipalities with populat	1,000 reported v	was by a mid-si	ze, single-tier So	outhern muncipa	
	<ul> <li>REFERENCE:</li> <li><sup>1</sup> Statistics Canada has expanded the restated.</li> </ul>	e definition of vi	olent crime. Th	erefore, prior ye	ars are not com	parable unle
	• Financial Information Return: 92 12	58 07.				

	3.3 PR0	OPERTY CRIM	E RATE – EF	FECTIVENES	S	
		2012	2011	2010	2009	
3.3	Property crime rate per 1,000 persons. <sup>1</sup>	50.9	78.2	71.6	69.3	
	OBJECTIVE: Safe communities.	· · · ·				
	NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UND	ERSTANDING R	ESULTS:			
	Again, Kenora is showing an improven reported median.	nent in 2012 ove	r historical crim	e rates, but we a	are still above th	e provincially
	REFERENCE:					
	• <sup>1</sup> Statistics Canada has expanded t unless restated.	he definition of p	roperty crime. T	herefore, prior y	/ears are not co	mparable
	• Financial Information Return: 92 12	59 07.				

	3.4 T	OTAL CRIME	RATE – EFFE	CTIVENESS		
		2012	2011	2010	2009	2008
3.4	Total crime rate per 1,000 persons ( <i>Criminal Code</i> offences, excluding traffic).	121.7	179.6	165.8	153.9	207.5
	OBJECTIVE: Safe communities.					
	NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDE	RSTANDING R	ESULTS:			
	Again, Kenora is showing an improvem reported median.	ient in 2012 ove	r historical crim	e rates, but we a	are still above th	e provincially
	<ul><li><b>REFERENCE:</b></li><li>Financial Information Return: 92 12</li></ul>	263 07.				

	3.5 Y	OUTH CRIME	RATE – EFFE	CTIVENESS		
		2012	2011	2010	2009	2008
3.5	Youth crime rate per 1,000 youths.	96.6	126.5	70.7	103.2	208.5
	OBJECTIVE: Safe communities.					
	NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDE	ERSTANDING R	RESULTS:			
	Provincially, Youth Crime Rates show g Small Northern municipalities reported					ulation size.
	<ul><li><b>REFERENCE:</b></li><li>Financial Information Return: 92 12</li></ul>	65 07.				

# **Building Permits & Inspection Services**

	4.1 BUILDING P	ERM	ITS & INS	SPEC	TION SE
			2012		2011
4.1 a)	Operating costs for building permits and inspection services per \$1,000 of construction activity (based on permits issued).	\$	13.73	\$	9.59
4.1 b)	Total costs for building permits and inspection services per \$1,000 of construction activity (based on permits issued).	\$	14.20	\$	9.59
	<b>OBJECTIVE:</b> Efficient building permits and inspection	n serv	vices.		
	NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDE	ERST	ANDING F	RESU	LTS:
	There are no significant capital assets include amortization.	assigi	ned to buil	ding ii	nspection
	<ul><li><b>REFERENCE:</b></li><li>MPMP measures for building permi</li></ul>	its and	d inspectio	n ser\	/ices were
	• Financial Information Return: 91 13	301 38	5 (Operatir	ng cos	sts measur

201220114.2Median 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).10Reference: provincial standard is 10 working days.10b)Category 2: Small Buildings (small commercial/industrial not exceeding 3 storeys/600 square metres).15Reference: provincial standard is 15 working days.15c)Category 3: Large Buildings (large residential/commercial/ industrial institutional).20c)Category 4: Complex buildings (post disaster buildings, including hospitals, power/water, fire/police/EMS, communications).30d)Category 4: Complex buildings (post disaster buildings, including hospitals, power/water, fire/police/EMS, communications).30Reference: provincial standard is 30 working days.30
(houses not exceeding 3 storeys/600 square metres).1010Reference: provincial standard is 10 working days.1010b) Category 2: Small Buildings (small commercial/industrial not exceeding 3 storeys/600 square metres).1515Reference: provincial standard is 15 working days.1515c) Category 3: Large Buildings (large residential/commercial/ industrial/ institutional).2020Reference: provincial standard is 20 working days.2020d) Category 4: Complex buildings (post disaster buildings, including hospitals, power/water, fire/police/EMS, communications). Reference: provincial standard is 3030
(small commercial/industrial not exceeding 3 storeys/600 square metres).1515Reference: provincial standard is 15 working days.1515c) Category 3: Large Buildings (large residential/commercial/ industrial/ institutional).2020Reference: provincial standard is 20 working days.2020d) Category 4: Complex buildings (post disaster buildings, including hospitals, power/water, fire/police/EMS, communications). Reference: provincial standard is 3030
(large residential/commercial/ industrial/ institutional).2020Reference: provincial standard is 20 working days.2020d) Category 4: Complex buildings (post disaster buildings, including hospitals, power/water, fire/police/EMS, communications). Reference: provincial standard is 303030
(post disaster buildings, including hospitals, power/water, fire/police/EMS, communications).3030Reference: provincial standard is 3030
5 ,

# Roads

		5.1	PAVED R	DAI	DS – EFFIC	CIEI	NCY	
			2012		2011		2010	
5.1 a)	Operating costs for paved (hard top) roads per lane kilometre. <sup>1</sup>	\$	3,667.75	\$	3,337.92	\$	4,025.70	
5.1 b)	Total costs for paved (hard top) roads per lane kilometre.	\$	8,763.70	\$	8,337.46	\$	8,113.28	
	<b>OBJECTIVE:</b> Efficient maintenance of paved roads.							
	NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDE	ERS	TANDING F	RES	ULTS:			
	<ul> <li><b>REFERENCE:</b></li> <li><sup>1</sup> The formulas for efficiency measu utilities for utility cut repairs.</li> <li>The total cost measure was also repaired amortization and interest on long term assets.</li> </ul>	vise deb	d in 2010. To t, less reven	otal ue r	costs mean received fror	ope n ot	erating costs her municipa	as defined in MPMP, plus alities for tangible capital
	• Financial Information Return: 91 21	11 3	5 (Operatin	g co	sts measure	e) ai	nd 91 2111 4	15 (Total costs measure).

Municipal Performance Measurement Program (MPMP) • 2012 RESULTS

	5	.2 U	NPAVED	RO	ADS – EFF	ICI	ENCY					
			2012		2011		2010		2009			
5.2 a)	Operating costs for unpaved (loose top) roads per lane kilometre.	\$	2,029.09	\$	1,658.29	\$	1,668.54	\$	2,229.68			
5.2 b)	Total costs for unpaved (loose top) roads per lane kilometre.	\$	2,720.11	\$	2,043.55	\$	1,971.65					
	OBJECTIVE: Efficient maintenance of unpaved roads.											
	NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UND	ERS	TANDING F	RES	ULTS:							
	REFERENCE: • The formulas for efficiency measure consistent with accrual accounting con- costs mean operating costs as defined received from other municipalities for	ncep d in N	ts. New tota ⁄IPMP, plus	l co: am	st measures ortization an	wer	re introduce	d an	d revised in			
	<ul> <li>Financial Information Return: 91 2110 35 (Operating costs measure) and 91 2110 45 (Total costs measure)</li> </ul>											

	5.3 B	RIDG	ES AND 2012		VERTS – 2011	EFF	2010		2009	
5.3 a)	Operating costs for bridges and culverts per square metre of surface area.	\$	9.26	\$	8.45	\$	32.05	\$	15.25	
5.3 b)	Total costs for bridges and culverts per square metre of surface area.	\$	34.54	\$	33.86	\$	68.86			
	<b>OBJECTIVE:</b> Efficient maintenance of bridges and of	culvert	S.							
	NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UND	ERST	anding f	RESU	LTS:					
	<ul> <li>REFERENCE:</li> <li>The formulas for efficiency measure consistent with accrual accounting corrections mean operating costs as defined received from other municipalities for the second sec</li></ul>	ncepts d in MI	. New total PMP, plus	l cost amor	measures tization an	were	introduce	d and	revised in	2010. Tot

• Financial Information Return: 91 2130 35 (Operating costs measure) and 91 2130 45 (Total costs measure).

	5.4 WINTE	RM	AINTENA	NCE	E OF ROA	DS ·	– EFFICIE	NC	ſ	
			2012		2011		2010		2009	
5.4 a) Operating costs for maintenance of ro kilometre maintain	adways per lane	\$	1,326.19	\$	1,352.26	\$	1,667.35	\$	1,501.26	
5.4 b) Total costs for wir roadways per lane maintained in win		\$	1,326.19	\$	1,352.26	\$	1,762.92			
OBJECTIVE: Efficient winter ma	OBJECTIVE: Efficient winter maintenance of roads.									
NOTES & KEY F	NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:									
Amortization on e	Amortization on equipment used for winter control is not included with these results.									
consistent with ac costs mean opera	or efficiency measure crual accounting con ting costs as defined er municipalities for ta	cepts I in M	s. New tota IPMP, plus	l cos amo	t measures ortization an	wer	e introduce	d an	d revised in	2010. Tota
Financial Inform	mation Return: 91 22	05 3	5 (Operatin	g co	sts measur	e) ar	nd 91 2205 ·	45 (	Total costs n	neasure).

	5.5 ADEQU	ACY OF PAVED	ROADS – EFI	ECTIVENESS	6	
		2012	2011	2010	2009	2008
5.5	Percentage of paved lane kilometres where the condition is rated as good to very good. <sup>1</sup>	37%	36%	36%	100%	100%
	<b>OBJECTIVE:</b> Pavement condition meets municipal ob	e kilometres ted as good 37% 36% 36% 100% 100 ets municipal objectives. <b>RS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:</b> is rated using a Pavement Condition Index (PCI) such as the Index used by the Ontario a (OGRA) or the Ministry of Transportation's Roads Inventory Management System (RIMS)				
	NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDE	RSTANDING RES	ULTS:			
	REFERENCE:					
	•		· · ·			
	Good Roads Association (OGRA) or the	e Ministry of Transp	ortation's Roads	s Inventory Man	agement Syste	em (RIMS).
	Financial Information Return: 92 215	2 07.				

		2012	2011	2010	2009	
5.6	Percentage of bridges and culverts where the condition is rated as good to very good. <sup>1</sup>	2%	2%	2%	2%	
	OBJECTIVE: Safe bridges and culverts.					
	NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERS	TANDING RESU	ILTS:			
	<ul> <li>REFERENCE:</li> <li>The effectiveness measure for bridges</li> <li><sup>1</sup> A bridge or culvert is rated as being in minimal, requiring only maintenance. Prima</li> </ul>	good to very goo	d condition if di	stress to the prir		

	5.7 WINTE	ER EVENT RE	SPONSES – E	EFFECTIVENE	SS	
		2012	2011	2010	2009	2008
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%
	OBJECTIVE: Response to winter storm events meet	s locally determ	ined service lev	els for winter roa	ad maintenance	
	NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDE	ERSTANDING F	RESULTS:			
	• Financial Information Return: 92 22	251 07.				

# **Conventional Transit**

	6.1 C	ONVE	NTIONA	L TR	ANSIT –	EFFI	CIENCY	1		
			2012		2011		2010		2009	
6.1 a)	Operating costs for conventional transit per regular service passenger trip.	\$	4.88	\$	4.42	\$	4.41	\$	3.96	
6.1 b)	Total costs for conventional transit per regular service passenger trip.	\$	5.98	\$	5.25	\$	5.09			
	<b>OBJECTIVE:</b> Efficient conventional transit services.									
	NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UND	ERST	ANDING R	ESUL	.TS:					
	<ul> <li>REFERENCE:</li> <li>The formulas for efficiency measure consistent with accrual accounting con costs mean operating costs as defined received from other municipalities for t</li> </ul>	icepts. I in MP	New total MP, plus	cost i amort	neasures zation an	were	introduce	d and	revised in 2	2010. Total

• Financial Information Return: 91 2203 35 (Operating costs measure) and 91 2203 45 (Total costs measure).

	6.2 CONVENTIO	ONAL TRANSI	T RIDERSHI	P – EFFECTI\	/ENESS	
		2012	2011	2010	2009	2008
6.2	Number of conventional transit passenger trips per person in the service area in a year.	8.5	9.0	8.5	9.1	9.7
	OBJECTIVE:					
	Maximum utilization of municipal transit	services.				
	NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDER	RSTANDING RE	SULTS:			
	<ul><li><b>REFERENCE:</b></li><li>Financial Information Return: 92 235</li></ul>	1 07.				

# Wastewater (Sewage)

	7.1 WASTEWA		TION/CONVE	YANCE – EFF	ICIENCY	
		2012	2011	2010	2009	
7.1 a)	Operating costs for the collection/conveyance of wastewater per kilometre of wastewater main.	\$ 11,668.66	\$ 11,169.08	\$ 10,316.77	\$ 10,583.71	
7.1 b)	Total costs for the collection/conveyance of wastewater per kilometre of wastewater main.	\$ 15,075.61	\$ 14,234.50	\$ 13,640.69		
	OBJECTIVE: Efficient municipal wastewater collection					
	NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UND	ERSTANDING F	RESULTS:			
	<b>REFERENCE:</b> • The formulas for efficiency measure consistent with accrual accounting con costs mean operating costs as defined received from other municipalities for t	cepts. New total l in MPMP, plus	l cost measures amortization an	were introduce	d and revised in 2	010. Total
	• Financial Information Return: 91 31	11 35 (Operatin	g costs measur	e) and 91 3111	45 (Total costs m	easure).

			2012		2011		2010		2009					
7.2 a)	Operating costs for the treatment and													
	disposal of wastewater per megalitre.	\$	316.95	\$	337.18	\$	271.35	\$	259.52					
disposal 7.2 b) Total cos disposal OBJECT Efficient NOTES REFERE • The fe	Total costs for the treatment and													
	disposal of wastewater per megalitre.	\$	333.65	\$	355.50	\$	285.74							
	OBJECTIVE:									_				
	Efficient municipal wastewater treatment and disposal.													
	NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:													
	REFERENCE:													
	• The formulas for efficiency measure													
	consistent with accrual accounting concepts. New total cost measures were introduced and revised in 2010. Total													
	consistent with accrual accounting con	00010		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.										

Municipal Performance Measurement Program (MPMP) • 2012 RESULTS

	7.3 WASTEN	NAT		GRA	TED SYS	ГЕМ	- EFFICI	ENC	Y	
			2012		2011		2010		2009	
7.3 a)	Operating costs for the collection/conveyance, treatment, and disposal of wastewater per megalitre (integrated system).	\$	896.38	\$	945.50	\$	721.42	\$	714.06	
7.3 b)	Total costs for the collection/conveyance, treatment, and disposal of wastewater per megalitre (integrated system).	\$	1,082.26	\$	1,130.77	\$	880.81			
	OBJECTIVE: Efficient municipal wastewater system (integrated system).									
	NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDE	RS	TANDING F	RES	ULTS:					
	<b>REFERENCE:</b> • The formulas for efficiency measure consistent with accrual accounting con costs mean operating costs as defined received from other municipalities for ta	cept in N	s. New total IPMP, plus	cos amo	st measures ortization an	were	e introduce	d and	revised in	

• Financial Information Return: 91 3113 35 (Operating costs measure) and 91 3113 45 (Total costs measure).

	7.4 WASTEW	ATER MAIN BA	CKUPS – EFI	FECTIVENES	S	
		2012	2011	2010	2009	2008
7.4	Number of wastewater main backups per 100 kilometres of wastewater main in a year.	18.98	5.11	3.65	45.26	40.00
	<b>OBJECTIVE:</b> Municipal sewage management practices	prevent environm	nental and huma	an health hazard	ls.	
	NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERS	TANDING RESU	JLTS:			
	<ul><li><b>REFERENCE:</b></li><li>Financial Information Return: 92 3154</li></ul>	07.				

Municipal Performance Measurement Program (MPMP) • 2012 RESULTS

	7.5 WASTEWAT	TER BYPASSE	ES TREATMEI	NT – EFFECT	VENESS	
		2012	2011	2010	2009	2008
7.5	Percentage of wastewater estimated to have by-passed treatment.	0.021%	0.040%	0.033%	0.002%	0.000%
	OBJECTIVE: Municipal sewage management practic	ces prevent envi	ronmental and h	numan health ha	azards.	
	NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDE	ERSTANDING R	ESULTS:			
	<ul><li><b>REFERENCE:</b></li><li>Financial Information Return: 92 31</li></ul>	55 07.				

# **Storm Water**

		<b>STORM WATE</b> 2012		2010						
8.1 a)	Operating costs for urban storm water	2012	2011	2010	2009	_				
0.1 a)	management (collection, treatment, disposal) per kilometre of drainage system.	\$ 3,294.42	\$ 5,264.56	\$ 7,357.25	\$ 5,260.97					
8.1 b)	Total costs for urban storm water management (collection, treatment, disposal) per kilometre of drainage system.	\$ 13,159.56	\$ 15,297.83	\$ 16,940.97						
	OBJECTIVE:									
	Efficient urban storm water management.									
	NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDE REFERENCE: • The formulas for efficiency measure consistent with accrual accounting con costs mean operating costs as defined	es were revised cepts. New tota	in 2009 to reflect I cost measures	were introduce	d and revised in	2010. Tota				

# **Drinking Water**

	9.1 DRIN	KIN	G WATER	R TR	EATMEN	Г — Е	FFICIEN	CY				
9.1 DRINKING WATER TREATMENT – EFFICIENCY         2012       2011       2010       2009         9.1 a) Operating costs for the treatment of drinking water per megalitre.       \$ 442.23       423.32       365.88       347.65         9.1 b) Total costs for the treatment of drinking water per megalitre.       \$ 456.37       433.85       376.04       365.88       347.65         OBJECTIVE: Efficient municipal water treatment services.         NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS: Combination of Flat Rate and Metred billing system         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 cost measures were introduced and revised in 2010. Total cost measures were introduced and revised in 2010. Total cost measures were introduced and revised in 2010. Total cost measures were introduced and revised in 2010. Total cost measures were introduced and revised in 2010. Total cost measures were introduced and revised in 2010. Total cost measures were introduced and revised in 2010. Total cost measures were introduced and revised in 2010. Total cost measures were introduced and revised in 2010. Total cost measures were introduced and revised in 2010. Total cost measures were introduced and revised in 2010. Total cost measures were introduced and revised in 2010. Total cost measures were introduced and revised in 2010. Total cost measures were introduced and revised in 2010. Total cost measures were introduced and revised in 2010. Total cost measures were introduced and revised in 2010. Total cost measure												
9.1 a)		\$	442.23	\$	423.32	\$	365.88	\$	347.65			
9.1 b)		\$	456.37	\$	433.85	\$	376.04					
	NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UND	ERST	ANDING F	RESU	JLTS:							
	Combination of Flat Rate and Metred b	pination of Flat Rate and Metred billing system										
	REFERENCE:											
		cepts in M	. New total PMP, plus	l cos amo	t measures rtization an	were	e introduce	d and	d revised in	2010. Total		
	• Financial Information Return: 91 33	11 35	6 (Operatin	g co	sts measure	e) an	d 91 3311 4	45 (T	otal costs r	neasure).		

Municipal Performance Measurement Program (MPMP) • 2012 RESULTS

		2012		2011		2010		2009		
9.2 a)	Operating costs for the distribution/ transmission of drinking water per kilometre of water distribution pipe.	\$ 9,620.51	\$	9,107.44	\$	9,383.69	\$	9,506.58		
9.2 b)	Total costs for the distribution/ transmission of drinking water per kilometre of water distribution pipe.	\$ 13,552.24	\$	13,258.54	\$	13,088.71				
	OBJECTIVE: Efficient municipal water distribution/transmission services.									
	NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UND	ERSTANDING F	RES	SULTS:						
	<ul> <li>REFERENCE:</li> <li>The formulas for efficiency measure consistent with accrual accounting con- costs mean operating costs as defined</li> </ul>	ncepts. New tota	l co	st measures	we	re introduce	d an	d revised in	2010. To	

• Financial Information Return: 91 3312 35 (Operating costs measure) and 91 3312 45 (Total costs measure).

Municipal Performance Measurement Program (MPMP) • 2012 RESULTS

	9.3 DRINKING	5 W.		EGF		STE				
9.3 a)	Operating costs for the treatment and distribution/transmission of drinking water per megalitre (integrated system).	\$	2012 1,000.59	\$	2011 969.73	\$	2010 912.22	\$	2009 810.43	
9.3 b)	Total costs for the treatment and distribution/transmission of drinking water per megalitre (integrated system).	\$	1,242.92	\$	1,229.31	\$	1,138.10			
	OBJECTIVE: Efficient municipal water system (integ	rate	d system).							
	NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UND	ERS	Tanding F	ES	ULTS:					
	<b>REFERENCE:</b> • The formulas for efficiency measure consistent with accrual accounting cont costs mean operating costs as defined received from other municipalities for the	cept in N	s. New total IPMP, plus	cos amo	st measures ortization an	wei	e introduce	d and	d revised in 2	2010. Total

• Financial Information Return: 91 3313 35 (Operating costs measure) and 91 3313 45 (Total costs measure).

	9.4 BOIL	WATER ADV	ISORIES – EI	FECTIVENES	SS	
		2012	2011	2010	2009	2008
9.4	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.	0.9116	0.1752	0.5867	2.3713	6.3655
	OBJECTIVE:					
	Water is safe and meets local needs.					
	NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDEF	RSTANDING R	ESULTS:			
	<ul><li><b>REFERENCE:</b></li><li>Financial Information Return: 92 3355</li></ul>	5 07.				

	9.5 BREAKS	IN WATER N	IAINS – EFFE	CTIVENESS		
		2012	2011	2010	2009	2008
9.5	Number of water main breaks per 100 kilometres of water distribution pipe in a year.	11.45	12.21	6.87	7.63	16.79
	OBJECTIVE: Improve system reliability.	·	·	·	·	
	NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERS	TANDING RES	ULTS:			
	<ul><li><b>REFERENCE:</b></li><li>Financial Information Return: 92 3356 0</li></ul>	7.				

# Solid Waste Management (Garbage)

10.1 GARBAGE COLLECTION – EFFICIENCY         2012       2011       2010         10.1 a) Operating costs for garbage collection per tonne.       \$ 246.79       \$ 150.51       \$ 180.27       \$ 2         10.1 b) Total costs for garbage collection per tonne.       \$ 286.93       \$ 270.82       \$ 300.85       \$ 286.93       \$ 270.82       \$ 300.85       \$ 286.93       \$ 270.82       \$ 300.85										
10.1 a) Operating costs for garbage collection per tonne.       \$ 246.79       \$ 150.51       \$ 180.27       \$ 2         10.1 b) Total costs for garbage collection per tonne.       \$ 286.93       \$ 270.82       \$ 300.85       \$ 2         OBJECTIVE: Efficient municipal garbage collection services.         NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:	10.1 GARBAGE COLLECTION	– EFFICIENCY								
per tonne.       \$ 246.79       \$ 150.51       \$ 180.27       \$ 280.27         10.1 b)       Total costs for garbage collection per tonne.       \$ 286.93       \$ 270.82       \$ 300.85         OBJECTIVE:       Efficient municipal garbage collection services.       S Sources       S Sources       S Sources         NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:       S Sources       S Sources       S Sources       S Sources	2012 201	1 2010	2009							
tonne.       \$ 286.93       \$ 270.82       \$ 300.85         OBJECTIVE: Efficient municipal garbage collection services.         NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:		1 \$ 180.27	\$ 230.86							
Efficient municipal garbage collection services. NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:		2 \$ 300.85	_							
REFERENCE:	NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:									
<ul> <li>The formulas for efficiency measures were revised in 2009 to reflect changes in the reportin consistent with accrual accounting concepts. New total cost measures were introduced and re- costs mean operating costs as defined in MPMP, plus amortization and interest on long term of received from other municipalities for tangible capital assets.</li> </ul>	The formulas for efficiency measures were revised in 2009 to refisive the sistent with accrual accounting concepts. New total cost measure ts mean operating costs as defined in MPMP, plus amortization a	es were introduce	ed and revised ir							

	10.2	2 GAR	BAGE D	ISPC	SAL – E	FFIC	IENCY		_		
Per ton 10.2 b) Total c tonne. OBJEC Efficier NOTES REFEF • The consist			2012		2011		2010		2009		
10.2 a)	Operating costs for garbage disposal per tonne.	\$	52.30	\$	80.78	\$	71.34	\$	90.87		
10.2 b)	Total costs for garbage disposal per tonne.	\$	60.49	\$	83.00	\$	73.21				
	OBJECTIVE: Efficient municipal garbage disposal services.										
	NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:										
	• The formulas for efficiency measure consistent with accrual accounting control of the second secon	cepts.	New tota	cost	measures	were	introduced	d and	• •	010. Total	

Municipal Performance Measurement Program (MPMP) • 2012 RESULTS

		2012		2011		2010		2009		
10.3 a) Operating costs for solid waste diversion per tonne.	\$	192.36	\$	201.19	\$	229.22	\$	233.95		
10.3 b) Total costs for solid waste diversion per tonne.	\$	215.70	\$	203.46	\$	230.48				
<b>OBJECTIVE:</b> Efficient solid waste diversion (recyc	OBJECTIVE: Efficient solid waste diversion (recycling) services.									
NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UN	NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:									
<ul> <li>REFERENCE:</li> <li>The formulas for efficiency meas consistent with accrual accounting costs mean operating costs as defined</li> </ul>	oncepts	. New tota	l cost	t measures	were	e introduce	d and	revised in 2	010. Tot	

• Financial Information Return: 91 3606 35 (Operating costs measure) and 91 3606 45 (Total costs measure).

Municipal Performance Measurement Program (MPMP) • 2012 RESULTS

10.4 SOLID WASTE N	/AN/	GEMEN	T (IN	TEGRAT	ED S	SYSTEM)	– EF	FICIENC	(
		2012		2011		2010		2009	
10.4 a) Average operating costs for solid waste management (collection, disposal and diversion) per tonne.	\$	73.47	\$	113.79	\$	105.33	\$	126.73	
0.4 b) Average total costs for solid waste management (collection, disposal and diversion) per tonne.	\$	84.53	\$	128.55	\$	116.87			
OBJECTIVE:									
Efficient solid waste management (integ	grated	d system).							
NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDE	RST	ANDING F	RESU	LTS:					
REFERENCE:									
The formulas for efficiency measure     consistent with accounting constants						•	•	• •	
consistent with accrual accounting cond costs mean operating costs as defined received from other municipalities for ta	in MF	PMP, plus	amor	tization and					

• Financial Information Return: 91 3607 35 (Operating costs measure) and 91 3607 45 (Total costs measure).

	10.5 COMPLAINTS – CO	LLECTION OF G EFFECTI		D RECYCLED	MATERIALS	
		2012	2011	2010	2009	2008
10.5	Number of complaints received in a year concerning the collection of garbage and recycled materials per 1,000 households.	0.5	0.0	1.1	0.5	0.0
	OBJECTIVE: Improved collection of garbage and recy	cled materials.				
	NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDER	RSTANDING RESU	JLTS:			
	<b>REFERENCE:</b> • Financial Information Return: 92 3452	2 07.				

Municipal Performance Measurement Program (MPMP) • 2012 RESULTS

	10.6 NUMBER OF MUNICIPAL SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT FACILITIES EFFECTIVENESS									
		2012	2011	2010	2009	2008				
10.6	Total number of solid waste management facilities owned by the municipality with a Ministry of Environment certificate of approval.	3	3	3	3	3				
	OBJECTIVE: Context for solid waste management fa	acility complianc	e measure.							
	NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDE	ERSTANDING F	RESULTS:							
	REFERENCE:     ● Financial Information Return: 92 3552 07.									

FIR ne #	Facility Name	<b>Days</b> 2012	<b>Days</b> 2011	<b>Days</b> 2010	<b>Days</b> 2009	<b>Days</b> 2008
553	Kenora Area Solid Waste Facility	0	0	0	0	
554	Kenora Area Solid Waste Landfill Site	0	0	0	0	
555	Tri-municipal Landfill Site	0	0	0	0	
	OBJECTIVE: Municipal solid waste services do not h	nave an adverse in	npact on enviror	iment.		

• Days: 92 3553 07 to 92 3562 07.

	10.8 DIVERSION OF RESIDENTIAL SOLID WASTE EFFECTIVENESS										
		2012	2011	2010	2009	2008					
10.8	Percentage of residential solid waste diverted for recycling.	25%	41%	26%	13%	14%					
	OBJECTIVE: Municipal solid waste reduction program	ms divert waste fro	om landfills an	d/or incinerators							
	NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDE	ERSTANDING RE	SULTS:								
	<ul><li><b>REFERENCE:</b></li><li>Financial Information Return: 92 36</li></ul>	55 07.									

# Parks and Recreation

	1	1.1 PAR	(S –	EFFICIEN	NCY				
		2012		2011		2010		2009	
11.1 a) Operating costs for parks per person.	\$	43.20	\$	48.97	\$	50.89	\$	46.80	
11.1 b) Total costs for parks per person.	\$	59.84	\$	64.75	\$	61.28			
OBJECTIVE: Efficient operation of parks. NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:									
<ul> <li>REFERENCE:</li> <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>									
• Financial Information Return: 91 71	03 35	(Operatin	g cos	ts measure	e) and	d 91 7103 4	45 (To	otal costs n	neasure).

Municipal Performance Measurement Program (MPMP) • 2012 RESULTS

Operating costs for recreation		2012							
Operating costs for recreation				2011		2010		2009	
programs per person.	\$	14.90	\$	17.78	\$	27.77	\$	44.69	
Total costs for recreation programs over person.	\$	16.32	\$	19.38	\$	29.28			
Efficient operation of recreation progra		ANDING F	RESU	LTS:					
consistent with accrual accounting cor costs mean operating costs as defined	ncepts. d in MF	New total MP, plus	l cost amor	measures tization an	were	introduced	d and	revised in	2010. Total
	BJECTIVE: ifficient operation of recreation progra IOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UND EFERENCE: • The formulas for efficiency measur onsistent with accrual accounting cor osts mean operating costs as defined	<b>BJECTIVE:</b> Ifficient operation of recreation programs. <b>IOTES &amp; KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERST EFERENCE:</b> The formulas for efficiency measures were onsistent with accrual accounting concepts. osts mean operating costs as defined in MF	<b>BJECTIVE:</b> Ifficient operation of recreation programs. <b>IOTES &amp; KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING F EFERENCE:</b> • The formulas for efficiency measures were revised onsistent with accrual accounting concepts. New tota osts mean operating costs as defined in MPMP, plus	<b>BJECTIVE:</b> Ifficient operation of recreation programs. <b>IOTES &amp; KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESU EFERENCE:</b> The formulas for efficiency measures were revised in 200 onsistent with accrual accounting concepts. New total cost osts mean operating costs as defined in MPMP, plus amort	<b>BJECTIVE:</b> ifficient operation of recreation programs. <b>IOTES &amp; KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS: EFERENCE:</b> • The formulas for efficiency measures were revised in 2009 to reflect onsistent with accrual accounting concepts. New total cost measures	<b>BJECTIVE:</b> Ifficient operation of recreation programs. <b>IOTES &amp; KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS: EFERENCE:</b> The formulas for efficiency measures were revised in 2009 to reflect char onsistent with accrual accounting concepts. New total cost measures were osts mean operating costs as defined in MPMP, plus amortization and inter	<b>BJECTIVE:</b> Ifficient operation of recreation programs. <b>IOTES &amp; KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS: EFERENCE:</b> The formulas for efficiency measures were revised in 2009 to reflect changes in the onsistent with accrual accounting concepts. New total cost measures were introduced osts mean operating costs as defined in MPMP, plus amortization and interest on lon	<b>BJECTIVE:</b> Ifficient operation of recreation programs. IOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS: EFERENCE: The formulas for efficiency measures were revised in 2009 to reflect changes in the repo onsistent with accrual accounting concepts. New total cost measures were introduced and osts mean operating costs as defined in MPMP, plus amortization and interest on long term	BJECTIVE:     Ifficient operation of recreation programs.     IOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:     EFERENCE:     The formulas for efficiency measures were revised in 2009 to reflect changes in the reporting of exp onsistent with accrual accounting concepts. New total cost measures were introduced and revised in 2 osts mean operating costs as defined in MPMP, plus amortization and interest on long term debt, less

11.3 R	ECRI		FAC		EFF	ICIENCY	
		2012		2011		2010	2009
<ol> <li>A) Operating costs for recreation facilities per person.</li> </ol>	\$	206.77	\$	257.24	\$	253.77	\$ 218.17
11.3 b) Total costs for recreation facilities per person.	\$	214.65	\$	266.47	\$	262.08	
<b>OBJECTIVE:</b> Efficient operation of recreation facilitie	s.						
NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDE	RSTA		RESU	LTS:			

#### **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 7306 35 (Operating costs measure) and 91 7306 45 (Total costs measure).

Municipal Performance Measurement Program (MPMP) • 2012 RESULTS

		2012		2011		2010		2009	
11.4 a) Operating costs for recreation programs and recreation facilities per person (Subtotal).	\$	221.67	\$	275.02	\$	281.54	\$	262.86	
<ul><li>11.4 b) Total costs for recreation programs and recreation facilities per person (Subtotal).</li></ul>	\$	230.97	\$	285.85	\$	291.36			
<b>OBJECTIVE:</b> Efficient operation of recreation program	ms and	facilities							
NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDE	ERSTA	NDING F	RESU	LTS:					
<ul> <li>REFERENCE:</li> <li>The formulas for efficiency measure consistent with accrual accounting cond costs mean operating costs as defined received from other municipalities for tag</li> </ul>	cepts. I in MPN	New total MP, plus	cost amor	measures tization and	were	introduced	d and	revised in	2010. T

• Financial Information Return: 91 7320 35 (Operating costs measure) and 91 7320 45 (Total costs measure).

		11.5 TRAILS	- EFFECTIVE	ENESS					
		2012	2011	2010	2009	2008			
11.5	Total kilometres of trails.	90	90	82	82	77			
11.5	Total kilometres of trails per 1,000 persons.	5.86	7.26	6.61	6.11	5.74			
	OBJECTIVE: Trails provide recreation opportunities.								
	NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UND	ERSTANDING R	ESULTS:						
	<ul><li><b>REFERENCE:</b></li><li>Financial Information Return: 92 71</li></ul>	52 05 and 92 71	52 07.						

	11	.6 OPEN SPA	CE – EFFECT	IVENESS		
		2012	2011	2010	2009	2008
11.6	Hectares of open space (municipally owned).	573	573	483	483	483
11.6	Hectares of open space per 1,000 persons (municipally owned).	37.3	46.2	38.9	36.0	36.0
	<b>OBJECTIVE:</b> Open space is adequate for population	).				
	NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UND	ERSTANDING F	RESULTS:			
	<ul><li><b>REFERENCE:</b></li><li>Financial Information Return: 92 71</li></ul>	55 05 and 92 71	155 07.			

	11.7 PARTICIPANT HOURS FOR RECREATION PROGRAMS EFFECTIVENESS										
		2012	2011	2010	2009	2008					
11.7	Total participant hours for recreation programs per 1,000 persons.	24,236.4	29,456.7	27,915.2	27,834.1	12,154.3					
	OBJECTIVE: Recreation programs serve needs of re	esidents.									
	NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDE	ERSTANDING RE	SULTS:								
	<ul><li>REFERENCE:</li><li>Financial Information Return: 92 72</li></ul>	55 07.									

	11.8 INDOOR RE	ECREATION FA	ACILITY SPACI	E – EFFECTIVI	ENESS			
		2012	2011	2010	2009	2008		
11.8	Square metres of indoor recreation facilities (municipally owned).	12,211	12,211	12,211	12,211	12,211		
11.8	Square metres of indoor recreation facilities per 1,000 persons (municipally owned).	795.6	984.7	984.7	910.3	910.3		
	OBJECTIVE: Indoor recreation facility space is adequ	uate for populatio	n.					
	NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:							
	<ul> <li>REFERENCE:</li> <li>Financial Information Return: 92 7356 05 and 92 7356 07.</li> </ul>							

	11.9 OUTDOOR RECREATION FACILITY SPACE – EFFECTIVENESS								
		2012	2011	2010	2009	2008			
11.9	Square metres of outdoor recreation facility space (municipally owned).	0	0	0	0	0			
11.9	Square metres of outdoor recreation facility space per 1,000 persons (municipally owned).	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0			
	OBJECTIVE:								
	Outdoor recreation facility space is ade	equate for popul	ation.						
	NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:								
	<ul><li>REFERENCE:</li><li>Financial Information Return: 92 7359 05 and 92 7359 07.</li></ul>								

# Libraries

12.1 LIBRARY COSTS PER PERSON – EFFICIENCY									
		2012		2011		2010		2009	
12.1 a) Operating costs for library services per person.	\$	49.23	\$	56.33	\$	51.53	\$	46.10	
12.1 b) Total costs for library services per person.	\$	54.29	\$	62.45	\$	57.60			
OBJECTIVE:	OBJECTIVE:								
Efficient library services.	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 7	405 35	(Operatin	g cos	ts measure	e) and	91 7405	45 (To	otal costs n	neasure).
		· •	-		•		`		,

Municipal Performance Measurement Program (MPMP) • 2012 RESULTS

12	2 LIBRA	RY COS	TS PE	R USE -	- EFF	ICIENCY	1		
		2012		2011		2010		2009	
12.2 a) Operating costs for library services per use. <sup>1</sup>	s \$	2.39	\$	1.91	\$	1.18	\$	1.04	
2.2 b) Total costs for library services per use.	\$	2.63	\$	2.12	\$	1.32			
<b>OBJECTIVE:</b> Efficient library services.									
NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR L	NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:								
REFERENCE:	REFERENCE:								
<ul> <li>The formulas for efficiency mea consistent with accrual accounting costs mean operating costs as defined received from other municipalities</li> </ul>	concepts. fined in MF	New tota MP, plus	l cost i amort	measures ization an	were	introduce	d and r	evised in 20	10. Tota
<ul> <li><sup>1</sup> The calculation of electronic li</li> </ul>	• <sup>1</sup> The calculation of electronic library uses was updated in 2009 to include the number of people using the public								

• <sup>1</sup> The calculation of electronic library uses was updated in 2009 to include the number of people using the public library wireless connection. In 2011 three additional categories of reference transactions were added to the definition of library uses. This may affect the comparability of 2011 results with earlier years.

• Financial Information Return: 91 7406 35 (Operating costs measure) and 91 7406 45 (Total costs measure).

	12.3 LIBRARY USES – EFFECTIVENESS									
		2012	2011	2010	2009					
12.3	Library uses per person. <sup>1</sup>	20.63	29.46	43.56	44.51					
	OBJECTIVE: Increased use of library services.									
	<ul> <li>REFERENCE:</li> <li><sup>1</sup> The calculation of electronic library uses was updated in 2009 to include the number of people using the public library wireless connection. In 2011 three additional categories of reference transactions were added to the definition of library uses. This may affect the comparability of 2011 results with earlier years.</li> <li>Financial Information Return: 92 7460 07.</li> </ul>									
	<ul> <li>Line numbers for prior years:</li> <li>The FIR reference for the measure, library uses per person, did not change in 2009.</li> </ul>									

	12.4 ELECTRONIC LIBRARY USES – EFFECTIVENESS										
		2012	2011	2010	2009						
12.4	Electronic library uses as a percentage of total library uses. <sup>1</sup>	34%	32%	31%	19%						
	OBJECTIVE: Better information on library usage.										
<ul> <li>REFERENCE:</li> <li><sup>1</sup> The calculation of electronic library uses was updated in 2009 to include the number of people using the pullibrary wireless connection. In 2011 three additional categories of reference transactions were added to the define of library uses. This may affect the comparability of 2011 results with earlier years.</li> </ul>											
	• Financial Information Return: 92 746	3 07.	<ul> <li>of library uses. This may affect the comparability of 2011 results with earlier years.</li> <li>Financial Information Return: 92 7463 07.</li> </ul>								

12.5 NON - ELECTRONIC LIBRARY USES – EFFECTIVENESS									
		2012	2011	2010	2009				
12.5	Non-electronic library uses as a percentage of total library uses. <sup>1</sup>	66%	68%	69%	81%				
	OBJECTIVE: Better information on library usage.								
	<ul> <li>REFERENCE:         <ul> <li><sup>1</sup> The calculation of electronic library uses was updated in 2009 to include the number of people using the public library wireless connection. In 2011 three additional categories of reference transactions were added to the definition of library uses. This may affect the comparability of 2011 results with earlier years.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>								

• Financial Information Return: 92 7462 07.

# Land Use Planning

	13.1 LOCATION OF NEW RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT – EFFECTIVENESS								
		2012	2011	2010	2009	2008			
13.1	Percentage of new residential units located within settlement areas.	100%	100%	100%	0%	100%			
	OBJECTIVE: New residential development is occurring within settlement areas.								
	• Financial Information Return: 92 8170 07.								